

*Disclaimer: Audio recording is available by request. Due to low audio volume on the recording, some specific details may be missing.*

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD  
February 17, 2022**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Nef  
Dan Crandell  
David Park  
Dean Stokes  
James Cummings *aka Jim*  
Jeff Bolingbroke  
Julie Farr  
Manya Stolrow  
Leonard Call, Mayor  
Sara Urry, City Council  
Amy Mabey, City Administrator

**VISITORS**

Council Member Ann Arrington  
Council Member Dave Marriott  
Jennie Knight  
Michael Knight  
Yvonne Tams  
Travis Tams

Commission Chair, Andy Nef, called meeting to order at 6pm

**OPENING PRAYER:** David Park

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** David Park

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** There were no conflicts of interest designations.

**CONSENT AGENDA:** David Park moved to approve the agenda and the meeting minutes from February 3, 2022 with a correction to add Manya to the list of members present. Motion was seconded by Manya. Voting was unanimous in favor.

**SCHEDULED ITEMS:**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**LEGISLATIVE**

**Discussion/Recommend to City Council:** Amending Pleasant View Municipal Code § 18.27 – Commercial Zones (C-1 & C-2) to remove verbiage regarding driveways.

Amy said this is a clean up item that was considered during the last Planning Commission meeting. Andy asked what limitations are included. Amy said there's another reference to driveways listed in another section that will be used.

A motion was made to open a public hearing. With no public comment, a motion was made to close the public hearing. Voting was unanimous in favor for both motions.

Motion was made by Manya to recommend approval of removing the verbiage regarding driveways from the C-1 and C-2 Commercial zones based on the discussion and staff report. Motion was seconded by David. Voting was unanimous in favor.

**Discussion/Recommend to City Council:** Amending Pleasant View Municipal Code § 17.18 to modify cul-de-sac length requirements.

Amy explained the history of the current code and said that we've looked at what other communities are doing. Staff is recommending a maximum 750' cul-de-sac length instead of the current 650' requirement. Dean asked that Amy gets something in writing from the fire department so we have more than just their verbal approval. Dean asked if the county has additional requirements for cul-de-sacs. Amy said there's nothing that she's aware of.

Julie asks something, but the audio is not clear enough to hear what is being said. Amy responded but once again the audio is so soft, no words can be heard. A discussion took place regarding current cul-de-sac's and Amy said that there may be some currently longer than 650', but those would be listed in development agreements. Amy explained how some cul-de-sacs could be grandfathered in but there are standards in place. Manya asked for clarification that if we go up to the 750' cul-de-sac's, there will still be a turnaround in place. Amy said that's correct. Andy asked how many areas this would relate to as Pleasant View is becoming land locked. Can we look into how many areas this would actually fit into? Amy said she can look into that. Andy asked that the open ended sentence somehow be amended so it's not up to interpretation. Julie spoke again with nothing picked up on the microphone. Jeff said he liked the idea, but he has some concern that someone will come in and say they want 850'. Amy said they would have to come in and ask and it would come before this body again. Dean asked why we would have two different lengths in the language and asked what the point was of having 2 options, why not just say no more than 750'? Amy said that's a good point, we are trying to give options. Dean said it will only add minutia and leave it up to interpretation. It doesn't make sense to leave both in.

A motion was made to open the public hearing and voting was unanimous in favor.

Yvonne Tams said this would have given them 2 more lots, which would have been \$400,000 towards their development. From her point of view, she thinks it would be a great option if she ever decided to develop again.

Manya asked why would want 750' instead of 650'? Amy said she's not a public works director but you're creating another valve, so it helps with connections.

With no further public comment, the public hearing was closed, and voting was unanimous in favor.

Dean pulled the Weber County code and read their language, which says you should cut it off at 650'. Julie spoke again with no audio picked up. Andy asked if people would be trapped in an emergency because there's only one way out. Dan asked if there's a way to keep the language as is and work with individual developers if they need something more? Andy said that's why he wants to know how many areas this would impact. Andy asked if Dean would like to table the item while staff looks into the County code or just continue. Dean said he's comfortable moving ahead.

Sara Urry spoke but the microphone didn't pick up her voice.

Jeff moved to recommend approval modifying the cul-de-sac length requirements in chapter 17.18 to a maximum length shall be no more than 650' removing the proposed option for a 750' based on topography, contingent on the discussion and staff report. Motion was seconded by Dean. Voting was unanimous in favor.

**Discussion/Decision:** Amending Pleasant View Code § 18.43.250 C to modify the length of curb-cuts for a driveway adjacent to Highway 89 and/or 2700 North.

Amy said this would be for properties on highway 89 and 2700 north. Amy said that this would help with new developments because of the UDOT requirements that are in place. Amy has UDOT's response in writing.

A public meeting was opened. With no public comment, the public meeting was closed.

Dean moved to approve the modification to the curb-cut lengths for driveways adjacent to highway 89 and 2700 north. Motion was seconded by Dave. Voting was unanimous in favor.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE**

**Discussion/Decision:** Reconsideration of a proposed Plat Amendment, which was tabled during the January 6, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting, to change the size of the storm water easement located on Lot 1 of Rockwell Estates, at 677 West 3000 North.

Amy presented several options in the staff report. Amy said there's been a lot of conversation with the developers and our engineers and there's actually another late breaking option on the table. Amy went through the options that were presented in the staff report. Julie asked something but the microphone didn't pick up any sound. Amy turned to answer Julie and her words are too soft to make out on the audio recording.

Andy said he wants to make sure he understands everything. We were able to get the approval with the North Ogden Canal Company, so we don't need to override the engineers recommendation because they're able to work with the canal company. So we now need to just work with the DRC? Which way are we going? Andy said we're not necessarily changing the easement. Amy broke down the options.

Options 1 and 2 would still require the approval and requirements. Julie spoke with no audio captured. Amy responded to Julie but the audio is not clear. Andy said 1 or 2 would alleviate the 3<sup>rd</sup> option.

Jennie Knight said that she prepared a packet to help understand the options. Jennie continued to speak but the audio was not picked up clearly. Dean asked if money wasn't a consideration which option Jennie would choose to protect her home in the best way. Jennie speaks again but the audio is not clear. Yvonne Tams spoke from the audience, but the microphones did not pick up what she was saying.

Amy said that they are butted up against another subdivision and they were surprised about the way things lined up to that infrastructure. Andy asked if we go with option number 1, do we need to add any language to protect Serenity. Amy said no, they are already covered. Amy said that the city is not involved, however we're trying to help the developers. Manya said that she was actually at the canal board meeting when this was discussed and there was no hesitation on signing off on it because the people in charge were very comfortable with this option. Manya added that there was very little discussion because they were so comfortable. Jennie spoke again with nothing clear enough to understand on the recording.

Jeff said there was a variance being applied for at the beginning and he appreciates their help in resolving the issues. How do we approve this as there's still an easement that needs to be vacated? Amy said the easement will still have to be vacated, that's correct. Andy said it would be abandonment of the easement but what about the new items, do we need all that wording? Yvonne joined Jennie at the microphone, but no clear audio was picked up.

Julie spoke but no audio was picked up. Dave said there was a problem, they came back with options to fix it and it seems that everyone should be happy.

Julie moved to Convey 25-year metered discharge to receiving storm drain on 3000 N, re-configure and pipe 100-year overflow to enter North Ogden Canal, and abandon easement on Lot 1. This includes the condition that the revised plat will not be signed or recorded until final plan approval by the city's Development Review Committee (DRC). Motion was seconded by Dean. Voting was unanimous in favor.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Commission Communications**

### **Staff Communications/Training**

Amy thanked everyone for being at the meeting.

**Adjourned at: 7:10pm**