

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING HELD
June 27, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Wade
Larry Wadman
Richard Evans
Richard Rhees
Robert Knapp

VISITORS

Marvin Ferrell
Stacey Ferrell
Guy Adair
Brenan Pepper

STAFF:

Amber Corbridge

Commission Chair, Larry Wadman, called meeting to order at 1:00pm

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

ADMINISTRATIVE

Board of Adjustments Training Session

Ms. Corbridge said the Board received a packet of training and stated that due to the length of time between meetings and new board members present, she would briefly cover some training. She said she would focus on discussing the five conditions for variances to be granted. She listed the conditions from the training packet and asked the Board if they had any questions or needed to cover more material. The Board stated they did not have any questions. There was no further discussion.

Variance request brought on behalf of Caleb Fairclough for parcel number 16-023-0030 at approximately 3747 N 900 W. The request is for a variance to allow a lot without frontage to develop a single-family home.

Caleb Fairclough presented his case to the Board requesting the property in question be allowed to develop a single-family home on a lot without frontage. The developer stated the land is surrounded by other lots which have frontage leaving it land locked. The Board asked the developer if they would be the new owners of the lot and potential home if granted the variance. The developer claimed they would buy this property and the adjacent lot facing 900 W with the purpose of renovating the existing home on the lot facing the street and developing a new home on the land locked parcel. He stated they would then sell the properties to separate owners. The Board had concerns about whether or not the developer knew how the surrounding neighbors would react to a new home being developed on this parcel. The developer said they did not know and would surely go out and talk to the neighbors.

The Board also expressed concerns about how snowplow would affect the neighboring properties. The developer stated that the snow would be pushed to the back on the property away from neighboring properties.

The Board asked staff to show how the property is land locked on an aerial. Ms. Corbridge showed on a map the surrounding land developed and this property being land locked. The developer stated that the adjacent property owner facing 900 W would grant access and easement for ingress and egress. The Board asked about the engineering and staff review comments that will need to be met in order for a single-family home to develop. Ms. Corbridge stated the applicant submitted a simple site plan which does not provide enough information for engineering, public works, fire to review, and stated that if the developer is granted a variance to develop a home on the lot, they will need to hire an architect and submit a civil/site plan package which includes utility connections, surface materials, setbacks, and other required information. Ms. Corbridge stated the report includes a redlined copy of the site plan of which the developer will need to review and meet all requirements.

The Board asked the setback requirement for the side yard, for the zone. Ms. Corbridge stated the current setback of the existing home where the new sixteen-foot-wide access would go is twenty feet wide.

Ms. Corbridge stated the Board may only grant the variance if they find the request meets all five conditions in the training, and report. She said that it will be up to the developer to submit plans which staff can approve. The Board asked who staff consisted of. Ms. Corbridge stated that staff consists of a city engineer, fire marshal, public works director, building official and planning administrator.

Mr. Adair stated the property is land locked and creates a problem with ever being developed. He stated the property to the north is currently vacant but has enough lot area and street frontage to develop. He stated this property should have those same rights.

Mr. Farrell stated the property owners are approached by many investors wanting to develop the land for a single-family home. He stated that every time they approach the owners the owner state the property requires a variance in order to develop a home due to the lot not fronting a street. He stated the property is not fit for horses and the best use of the ground would be a single-family home. He stated the property does not have value, unless granted the variance.

Mr. Wadman made a motion to approve the variance conditional on meeting staff requirements. Mr. Wade second the motion. The vote passed unanimously, 5-0.

Adjourned at: 1:45 pm