

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD**

June 7, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Ann Arrington
Dean Stokes
Keith Preece
Kristi Hales
Jeff Hill
James Cummings, Excused
Ken Francis
Nate Karras, Excused
Bill Cobabe, City Administrator
Jill Hunt, Admin Assistant
Sara Urry, City Council
Jerry Burns, City Council

VISITORS

Stephanie Clifton	Troy Call
Pat & Bill Wendell	Peggy Empey
Eric Loud	Anna Rodriguez
Tony Pitman	Eric Sitterud
Paul Reddish	Mike & Blake Bastian
Curt Waters	Jerry & Julie Lund
Jim Blanchard	Bob Gardner
Jan A Chambley Gardner	Kerry Reynolds & Family
Jerald Erickson	Tom & Joy Bartlett
Diane Budge	Amy Brierley
LeeAnn Barker	Bob & Hang Yamayuchi
Marilyn Woodbury	Jerrod & Stacy Storey
Amanda Dew	Aaron Stringer
Dustin Cameron	Amy Landman
Shane & Mirylon Garner	Robert Harbin
Alan Jacques	Lyle Earl
Brent Stuart	Bruce & Joyce Jones
Aaron Olson & Family	Nathan & Ashton Grimley
Christhian Villarreal &Family	
Corinne & Kevin Green	Brad Clark
Kelly Hewlett	Bob Torick
Marilyn Southwick	Heidi Barney
Mina Robbins	David Parker
Steve Collier	Wyatt Smale
Colton & Kristi Law	Karilyn & Troy Taylor
Daniel Schmeling	Otto Krauss
Tyler Alexander	Dwight Olsen
Kevin Hurd	Russ Pryor
Randi Hoehn	Tatianna Pryor

Commission Chair, Keith Preece called meeting to order at 6:03 P.M.

OPENING PRAYER: Ken Francis

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Andy Nef

CONSENT AGENDA:

Ann Arrington moved to approve the agenda as well as the minutes from May 17th meeting. Motion was seconded by Dean Stokes. Voting was unanimous in favor.

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

1. Discussion on revisions to the zoning ordinance. (Presenter: Bill Cobabe, City Administrator)

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps with recommendation of denying the change of the future land use map as it doesn't work with the general plan. Bill wanted to emphasize this is not to change zoning but just for the future land use map at this time.

Mike Bastian, representative for the property, came up stated they are wanting the 55 and older patio homes due to this location has no hills. There would be an HOA for this area. They aren't trying to share walls or put townhomes in. They are looking at those people that are retiring and wanting the patio home maintenance free life styles. He stated not to just take his word for it. Once we get this changed and allowing more to the acre, he would like to do a development agreement showing what the subdivision they will create, products they are going to build and if that isn't what works for us then go back to what everyone agreed on. Also stated that both he and Bill have talked about it not being ideal for that location but this is what they are able to do. The development agreement will hold them to what they were going to do and agree what would go in there.

Keith stated this will open a can of worms so we have a development agreement with you and then a similar person partitions to do the same where do you stop. There becomes a legal issues and setting the precedent of changing the map. Mike confirmed he understood that but his thought regarding it is if the person before you presents something not what the city wants then but is open to see what the city would like or would work for the city. A thought was working with the neighboring developer and making a larger detention pond which the HOA would take care of. If it was acceptable then go ahead and if it wasn't acceptable then deny the request. Dean stated right now it is zoned for 2 to 3 per acre and you are partitioning to go to 4 per acre which is just one more that it is currently zoned as. Mike stated that is what it is drawn there as which we would like to propose in a development agreement with. Dean stated with the code, which it is zoned in for today, he doesn't understand why he came for one more home per acres. Mike stated it is due to frontage issues with the current zoning. Patio homes are less maintenance which would need to be changed for them. He also stated everyone would think of cheap homes but 55 and older community homes nice communities which are nice maintained. It allows for a nice home for the footprint. Keith asked if he platted out for the current zoning. Mike said he has. Keith said he is asking for an amendment so they were wanted to change something. Mike stated they can't get 3 to the acre with the frontage requirements. This is the only way to work and either way he would have to do an amendment for the frontage requirements.

Keith opened it up for public discussion.

Tony Pitman, 1322 W 3200 N, came up stated not in favor of this and why we don't want medium density for this location. For the same reasons as the Chair stated. Once we go to this change who knows what if the developers aren't able to finish and we have had development agreements before which didn't end well. Their lawyers are usually better than ours and they can usually get things in the agreement to work out better for them. He liked the statement of setting a precedent, it does set a precedents. If this is really what the developer really wants to do then let's do it right and have another future land use, use destination of 4 units per acre patio homes. If we are going to do it lets do it concretely and not leave any open doors or further possibilities. So I recommend denial and hope you will back us up on this.

Corinne Green, 3103 N 1375 W, we aren't in favor for this. I believe in a time and a place for patio homes, they aren't a bad thing, and this is neither. This 1375 W has 38 elementary children that play on the street. And to scab a bunch of 55 and older on a piece of property to maximize the profit for a developer is wrong. I don't understand why we have to change. We have all done research before we bought the homes. We knew what it was. To increase the traffic just for 9 homes makes her sick. She feels we shouldn't do it. There is a time and place for it and it isn't in that property.

Marilyn Woodbury, 3728 Evergreen Dr., when she was notified of this she was concerned for the overall safety of the children, just as Corinne Green recommended. She said on the Planning Commission when the land use was developed. We should stick with what we had already planned and I go with Bill with the denial of this request.

Mina Robbins, 3298 N 1250 W, She is opposed to the current plan and yet she is one that is actually looking at patio homes. She is recently widowed and yet how small, and what everyone else would mentioned. None of the patio home meets her needs. Give room for parks and trees. Make it safe for children.

Russ Pryr, 1379 W 3125 N, he is against this development. He went off good faith with the government with Pleasant View. He did his research and this wasn't medium density development. Now he wanted to with good faith with the community when they bought and stick to what the government said they would do. Stated we currently live in a time where the government is changing every 5 minutes based off the whims of money, which we currently have money so let's look at change. Yes it could make more money. However, when the population moved in and Pleasant View City stated this wasn't a Medium or High Density area. He in good faith invested 100s of thousands of dollars which is immense to him. His wife is a nurse and he a social worker and they don't make a lot of money and this is his only investment. On good faith he checked in with the city and this is what he was told. He asks as a resident, as a voting citizen, have a government entity stay to what they were going to do and not change due to profit.

Stephanie Clifton, 3227 N 1375 W, she too is opposed to it for the president it would set and the change it would make in our community. They have looked at patio homes but they would like to have a place for their trailer. They like the one level but there is not enough room. They are going to stay and make due. They would like to have Pleasant View stay the way it is when they moved in.

Stacy Storey, 1389 W 3125 N, she too is opposed to the change. There is already a traffic issue with a lot of cars funneling in and out off of 89. With the developers stating they will build 3 car garages this wouldn't help with the traffic. They already have people running the stop signs. They would like us to consider the safety of the children.

Tyler Alexander, 3109 N 1250 W, he is open and receptive to the discussion around it; he is generally opposed to it but would like and encourage to revisit plan. What he has been hearing are concerns on investments and property value. If there were an agreement to hold property value and how many units are to go into. He doesn't think the 55 and older community would post quiet the danger as people are depicting to be or speeding with the age group. He asks for a visitation of the plan and number of units of homes going into that area.

Tatianna Pryor, 1379 W 3125 N, Russ Pryor is her father and though they do live in the same home but she has different reasons to oppose this lot. She doesn't have the same contribution to the house as he does and investment but she does love her backyard as he does. From the backyard you would be able to see only a parking lot for an area in which they are accepted it as a nature area. We really like the view that we have. Another concern she has is the children in the area. Having a small lot with construction on it for the next 2 years she believes and then a group of 55 and older, not only will the children play and go down. Not only that our community would decrease and change a lot. As she looks around the room, more than half are her immediate neighbors and if they are all disagreeing with it and live on the same street it says that there is something wrong. She isn't opposed to 55 plus housing and she thinks patio lots are great but she doesn't think a lot behind her house where there is such a young community should go there. Asking if we could reconsider what the lot is for she would like a park there since there are so many children and nature there. She doesn't think it would work for 55 plus back there.

Randi Hoehn, 3104 N 1375 W, she moved from North Ogden a few months ago lived on a busy street and have 4 children. When they moved in they did their research like everyone else has done. They spent quite a bit on their home. Then to find out that it wants to be changed to let more with her children just doesn't work. Especially when the rest has said you put everything into your home, investment and equity. It would down play on equity in homes. To have more traffic on that road where her children go out and play worries

her and a mom sick. She doesn't think 55 and older isn't bad but there are other places building these like North Ogden and Plan City. She doesn't understand other need for another 55 and older here in Pleasant View. Plus in North Ogden by country boy that they just built and then change it putting in apartments and townhomes. The community was in an uproar when it was changed. She is hoping we will keep this the same.

Colton Law, 3111 N 1375 W, he wanted to second what everyone already said. They did the research before buying their home to make sure it would stay the way it was. They knew it would be developed due to the road not being a cul-de-sac. They stated when it is developed out it was to be the same type of housing which is low density and that was the reason why we bought the home. As Tony Pittman said if we make the change it would cascade into other possible changes and he thinks that is reason to have it stay the way it is. Also if they wanted to designate areas as medium or even high density he isn't opposed but as Tony stated let's do it now as to designate what we want where and we would like it developed rather than as the developers come pick and choosing.

Marilyn Southwick, 1328 W Pine Cir, she moved into Pleasant View 28 years ago. The reason why they moved here and decided to stay here were due to the size of lots. There have been changes since they moved in. However, a 55 and older development she is totally great with that but where it would be at, at the end of an already there cul-de-sac you will have unhappy people. The noise level and that hasn't been discussed. She knows there are patio homes for senior citizens that are designated for 55 and older and if the children happen to ride their skateboard or anything else in there they are all up in arms. Maybe we need to take that in consideration as this wouldn't be an ideal place for this type of community. This would be at the end of a very busy little neighborhood filled with children including her grandchildren. With that she would have it looked elsewhere for this type of community.

Bob Yamayuchi, 3253 N 1375 W, he understands the 55 and older as he is 65. He understands things change over time but you don't always get a 55 year old to buy the home unless they are going to have a sign up when selling the home but I don't see how that works. It is a good concept but you can't promise it. Getting to the size to the property for what it is zoned for is the property is the right thing to do. I am opposing this change.

Andy motioned to close the public hearing and Dean seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor to close the public hearing.

Keith stated it is a very personal thing and envision the outlay of homes. Things change and change comes when growth comes. We will not

Andy Nef moved to deny the request along with the recommendation from the staff based on the information both heard and brought before them in staff minutes. Ken Francis seconded the motion. All in favor to deny the request along with the staff recommendation was unanimous in requesting the future land use map.

****we had the Form Based Code workshop****

2. Discussion/Decision on Heart of Pole Patch Phase 1:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps. Did state we will ask for the name change as we already have a Heart of Pole Patch Subdivision. Carson stated they will look at another name.

Dean Stokes moved to approve Heart of Pole Patch Phase 1 with the conditions mentioned in the packet. Motion was seconded with the conditions by Ken Francis and Kristi Hale. Voting was unanimous in favor of approval of Heart of Pole Patch Phase 1.

Bill Wendell came up and was upset about the road not being punched out to 350 as 250's size isn't wide enough to hold the traffic. Bill Cobabe stated we aren't talking about phase 2 or phase 3. Bill W stated the letter states Phase 1 and 2. Bill C stated it was a typo and he will get another letter for phase 2 and we are still reviewing the phase. LeeAnn Barker explained in more depth of the request of the road direction change. Also talked about the moratorium years ago and asked if we really have enough water when they are such low pressure when it gets to August and September. Bill C stated the issue should be fixed with the well and if it persists to let him know. She is concerned over the HOA and if it would affect her. Bill stated it wouldn't.

3. Discussion/Decision on Deer Crest Phase 4:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps. Carson Jones came up and stated there was a little change with Skyline Dr. Andy asked to reiterate the storm drain as there were some issues on previous phases. Carson stated the tie in will be in the same drain. It is sized for 137 lots which covers the whole Deer Crest. Tom Bartlett stated it was done illegally and it goes through his lot causing issues. Bill verified who he is and stated he has a pending lawsuit with the city. Bill preferred we don't speak about that issue in the meeting. It continued to go back and forth with Tom letting him know we aren't able to speak about this. Andy asked concerns with demolition and blasting with being up by the gravel pit. Bill stated hopefully will do their research like the people have earlier tonight before buying property up there. Carson stated there aren't plans to develop on the west side of Skyline. Andy asked staff for getting more information from engineer of the general plan for the drainage. Bill stated for phase 4 has been reviewed by our engineers.

Ken Francis moved to approve Deer Crest Phase 4 with the conditions mentioned in the packet. Motion was seconded with the conditions by Dean Stokes. Voting was unanimous in favor of approval of Deer Crest Phase 4.

Commissioner Andy Nef left to attend a previously scheduled engagement.

4. Discussion/Decision on Hurd-Jenkins Subdivision, adjusting lot line:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps. Kevin Hurd came up to answer questions and to verify the current lot line does go through the home sitting on the lot.

Ann Arrington moved to approve the proposed amendment to the Hurd-Jenkins Subdivision Plat. Motion was seconded by Kristi Hale. Voting was unanimous in favor of the approval of amendment to the Hurd-Jenkins Subdivision Plat.

5. Discussion/Decision on Capstone Classical Academy Subdivision:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps, did state he wants them to change the name of lot 1A. Keith asked for the applicant to step forward. Daniel Schmeling stated Bill went through everything. Someone from the audience asked the questions if there was intent of what the lots were going to be used for in the subdivision. Daniel stated the 1A is for the release building and the one just north of the school will end up being Alpine Church but the farthest north lot there isn't anything.

Ken Francis motioned to approve with the conditions noted by staff for the Capstone Classical Academy Subdivision. Motion was seconded by Dean Stokes. Voting was unanimous in favor of the approval with the conditions by staff for Capstone Classical Academy Subdivision.

6. Discussion/Decision on Attached Accessory Apartment for Jerald Erickson:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps. Dean Stokes moved to approve the attached accessory apartment with the conditions mentioned in the packet. Motion was seconded by Kristi Hale. Voting was unanimous in favor of approval of the attached accessory apartment located at 3767 N 500 W.

7. Discussion/Decision on Oakley's Court Subdivision:

Bill Cobabe presented information on the application and maps. Ken Francis moved to approve the Oakley's Court Minor Subdivision with the conditions mentioned in the packet. Motion was seconded by Dean Stokes. Voting was unanimous in favor of approval of the Oakley's Court Minor Subdivision located at 3367 N 850 W.

8. Commission Communications.

Keith asked for clarification on legal issues and approving things. This is ok to do and if we should have declined the approval until it has been fixed. Bill stated we didn't approve it City Council approves it. This is just preliminary plat not final plat. We are working on the litigation actively. Ann asked for future as this was thrown at them tonight how do they know. Bill apologized for not notifying them. Keith stated another concern was regarding the letter for phase 1 and 2. Bill stated it was a typo and it wouldn't happen again. Ken wanted to make it noted that it is appreciated the community being so involved. Keith asked if there is no public hearing do we allow people to make comments. Bill stated the Chair is in charge and you can decide.

9. Staff Communications.

Bill stated if they would like to walk in the Founder's Day Parade to meet at 9:30am. Also asked if they would be interested in helping with the Salmon Bake to let him or Becky Stokes know. Jeff Hill stated he would.

Ann Motioned to close the meeting. Ken Francis seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor of closing the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.