

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

**November 3, 2022**

[\(3\) Planning Commission Meeting - November 3, 2022 - YouTube](#)

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Nef  
Dean Stokes  
Jeff Bolingbroke  
Julie Farr  
Manya Stolrow  
Chad Kotter

**EXECUSED**

David Gossner  
Sean Wilkinson

**STAFF PRESENT**

Amy Mabey, City Administrator  
Brandon Bell, Planning and Zoning Administrator

**VISITORS**

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

Brooke Smith, MMC

**MINUTES APPROVED:**

October 5, 2023

Commission Chair, Andy Neff called the meeting to order at 6 pm

**OPENING PRAYER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order on Thursday, November 3, 2022, at 6 PM. The Chair opened the meeting with a quote and pledge of allegiance which was offered by Manya Stolrow a member of the Commission.

Moving forward, the next agenda item focused on the declaration of conflicts of interest. The Chair inquired whether any of the Commissioners needed to disclose any conflicts of interest for the meeting. No conflicts were noted by any of the Commissioners.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:**

**Site Plan for Boyer Pleasant View Warehouse.**

**Site Plan for the Boyer Pleasant View Warehouse located at 3205 North Highway 89. (Approve/Not Approve)**

The agenda proceeded to the Site Plan for the Boyer Pleasant View Warehouse located at 3205 North Highway 89. The Chair clarified that this item had already been approved by the Commission in a previous meeting on January 18. Therefore, it was unnecessary to address this item again during the current meeting, as it had already received consent and was no longer on the agenda.

**Conditional Use and Site Plan for RV and Truck Fuel Station.**

**Conditional Use and Site Plan for the construction of an RV and Truck Fuel Station located at 2709 Rulon White. (Approve/Not Approve)**

During the Planning Commission meeting, the focus shifted to the Conditional Use and Site Plan for the construction of an RV and Truck Fuel Station at 2709 Rulon White.

City staff recommended approval of the project, and the Development Review Committee had also given their approval. There was a question from the commission regarding adjustments made for Fire Flow. However, it was mentioned that there was a gap in information regarding additional sanitary sewer requirements, which would be looked into further.

Commissioners raised questions and concerns about various aspects, such as the oil-water separator, the RV dump, truck traffic, queuing, and access. The engineer present at the meeting provided clarifications on these matters.

#### **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Public hearing open, no comments were made and the citizen comment period of the public hearing was closed.

#### **MOTION**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Conditional Use and Site Plan for the RV and Truck Fuel Station, with the conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was passed unanimously.

#### **Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan for Pole Patch II Subdivision.**

#### **Conditional Use and Site Plan for the construction of a single-family home at Waterfall Drive Lot #28 Pole Patch II Subdivision.**

During the Planning Commission meeting, the focus shifted to the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan for a single-family home at Waterfall Drive, Lot #28 in the Pole Patch II Subdivision. The Chair mentioned that the applicant had shown up and walked them through the proposal.

However, it was mentioned that the application did not meet the setback requirements, and the applicant may need to revise their plans or seek approval from the Board of Adjustment. It was recommended to table the item for now and ask the applicant to come back with a revised proposal that complies with the ordinances.

#### **MOTION**

A motion was made and seconded to table the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan for Lot #28 in the Pole Patch II Subdivision. The motion was passed without opposition.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS - LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

#### **Zoning ordinance text amendments to disallow the uses of Car Wash, Self-Service Manual Spray, and Car Wash, Automatic in the following zones:**

- i. **Manufacturing/Commercial Mix Zone (MCM);**
- ii. **Planned Manufacturing Zone (MP-1);**
- iii. **Neighborhood Commercial Zone (C-1);**
- iv. **General Commercial Zone (C-2);**
- v. **Planned Commercial Zone (CP-1); and**
- vi. **Planned Commercial Zone (CP-2).**

The agenda item involved the discussion of three distinct items related to carwash regulations. The participants decided to address these items separately. The session began by turning over the floor to the staff members, who were tasked with presenting the recommendations regarding carwash

regulations. The discussion revolved around potential changes to the existing carwash regulations, considering various zones and recent developments in the area, particularly concerning water usage.

The staff highlighted that the proposed recommendations encompassed ordinance amendments related to carwash usage, including both automatic and self-service carwashes. They expressed concerns about water usage and the need to evaluate zoning regulations in light of these developments. The suggestion put forward was to restrict new carwash establishments, except in the Commercial Entertainment Park (CEP) zone. The Planning Commission would consider this recommendation, and if approved, it would move forward to the city council for the drafting of an ordinance. The zoning map was also discussed to illustrate the proposed changes.

During the discussion, there was mention of CP3 zoning, which play a significant role in the conversation. The availability of carwash establishments within this zone was discussed, but it was clarified that zoning alone would not guarantee their allowance, as it depended on other factors. The participants discussed specific areas and their suitability for carwash facilities. The potential impact of recent developments on this process was acknowledged, leading to questions about relocating or changing dimensions.

Regarding Item A, the discussion revolved around disallowing carwashes in various zones. Item B focused on changing the status of carwashes in the CP3 zone from allowed too conditional. There was an acknowledgment that water usage needed further attention, not just for carwashes but also for other water-intensive activities. The emphasis was on ensuring water supply and responsible development rather than limiting growth.

## **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

During the citizen comment period of the public hearing, the session began with a motion to open the hearing for Item A, which was seconded and approved.

A citizen expressed their concern. They voiced opposition to the proposed changes, emphasizing that they neither had plans for a carwash nor any ties to the carwash industry. The citizen highlighted the potential negative impact of removing carwash facilities from certain zones, arguing that it could discourage developers from establishing such facilities. They specifically mentioned the need for car washes in industrial areas for cleaning trucks, implying that such businesses are essential.

In response, the staff clarified that the proposed changes might not preclude on-site carwashes if they were part of the site plan. They acknowledged the validity of the feedback and emphasized the importance of considering specific proposals. The citizen then mentioned a scenario where travelers off the freeway during winter storms might require carwash services. However, they expressed disagreement with removing carwashes entirely, asserting that there was a need for them.

The discussion continued with a citizen suggesting the need for an exception in MP1 zones within the industrial area, rather than limiting carwashes exclusively to the CEP zone. They questioned the logic of this restriction, especially in areas that were not prominently located on main streets.

The citizen comment period concluded with the staff thanking the citizens for their feedback and opening the floor for any additional comments, but no one else from the city or meeting provided comments.

A motion was made and seconded to close the public hearing, which was approved, and the session ended with the acknowledgment of the received feedback.

## **DISCUSSION**

During the follow-up discussion among the Planning Commission members and staff, various options and considerations were explored regarding the proposed changes related to carwashes in different zones. Staff clarified that the primary concern was water usage, and they were open to modifications based on the Commission's comfort level with different zones.

The discussion revolved around whether to recommend all the zones as is or make specific changes to certain zones. The members debated whether to differentiate between carwashes and truck washes, especially in manufacturing zones (MP1) where the need for truck washes might be higher. There were questions about how to control water usage effectively and whether zoning was the most appropriate tool for addressing this issue.

Some members expressed the need for more information and data on water usage by carwashes compared to other commercial businesses, emphasizing that decisions should be evidence-based. They also raised concerns about the potential unintended consequences of zoning restrictions on carwashes, such as limiting development.

There was a discussion about potentially making carwashes conditional uses in specific zones, which would require each proposal to go through the Planning Commission for approval, allowing for more oversight. However, the legal complexities of this approach were acknowledged.

## **MOTION**

A motion was made regarding the zoning ordinance text amendment to restrict the use of carwashes (Self Service Manual Spraying or Wash Automatic) in specific zones. The motion proposed disallowing carwashes in the following zones: Neighborhood Commercial Zone (CC-1), General Commercial Zone (C-2), Planned Commercial Zoning (CP-1), and Planned Commercial Zone (CP-2). Additionally, it recommended that carwashes be conditional use permits in the Manufacturing Commercial Mixed Zone (MCM) and the Manufacturing Planned Zone (MP-1).

## **MOTION WITHDRAWN**

However, it appears that there was no second to the motion, and some members expressed concerns or reservations. Therefore, the motion was ultimately withdrawn by the individual who made it. The meeting then continued without any motions on the table.

## **DISCUSSION**

The discussion commenced with the introduction of a motion to disallow specific types of car washes, including self-service, manual spraying, and automatic washes, in multiple zoning categories, such as Neighborhood Commercial (C1), General Commercial (C2), Plan Commercial (CP1 and CP2), Manufacturing Commercial Mixed (MCM), and Plan Manufacturing (MP1).

Throughout the conversation, participants raised concerns about water usage, particularly in some car wash operations that consume significant quantities of water. There were debates about whether it was fair to regulate car washes based on water consumption while other businesses that also used substantial amounts of water remained unregulated. Additionally, participants discussed the potential visual impact and density of car washes along commercial corridors. Conditional use permits and zoning considerations were examined as possible solutions, and there was an ongoing dialogue about striking a balance between municipal regulation and allowing market forces to determine the number of car washes.

The commissioners repeatedly emphasized the need for more research and information, especially regarding water usage and zoning regulations in other cities.

#### **MOTION TO TABLE**

A motion to table the discussion was requested and approved, allowing for further exploration and informed decision-making at a later Planning Commission meeting, scheduled for January.

#### **Zoning ordinance text amendment modifying the use of Car Wash, Self-Service Manual Spray in the Planned Commercial Zone (CP-3) from a permitted to conditional use.**

The meeting proceeded to item B on the agenda, which discusses a zoning ordinance text amendment related to car washes, specifically focusing on "Car Wash, Self-Service Manual Spray" within the Planned Commercial Zone (CP-3). The proposed amendment seeks to change the status of these car washes from being permitted to conditional use within this zoning category.

#### **CITIZEN COMMENT**

The discussion begins with the motion to open a public hearing on this proposed amendment. No comments were made. Afterward, a motion is made to close the public hearing.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Following these procedural steps, a motion was then proposed to table the zoning ordinance text amendment until January, allowing for more time to gather additional information and conduct further discussions on the matter.

#### **Zoning ordinance text amendment to consider disallowing Single-Family Dwellings as a use in the Planned Manufacturing Zone (MP-1).**

During the discussion regarding item C on the agenda, a zoning ordinance text amendment was proposed to disallow Single-Family Dwellings as a permitted use in the Planned Manufacturing Zone (MP-1).

Commission comments during the discussion expressed support for this amendment, emphasizing that it should have been implemented much earlier to prevent inappropriate use of the MP-1 zone. The discussion involved reviewing the zoning map, highlighting the industrial character of the area, and noting the presence of some single-family homes in the vicinity.

The consensus among those participating in the discussion was that allowing single-family homes in the MP-1 zone did not align with the zone's intended industrial purpose, and it was deemed a cleanup item.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

A motion was made to open the topic for a public hearing, followed by a second and unanimous approval. No comments were made.

**MOTION**

After closing the public hearing, a motion was put forth to recommend to the city council the approval of the zoning ordinance text amendment, disallowing single-family dwellings in the MP-1 zone. The motion was seconded and approved without further discussion.

**Commission Discussion**

During the final commission chair discussion at the end of the meeting, several important topics were addressed. The chair began by reminding the commission about the upcoming meetings scheduled for the month and noted that one of them was not a regular meeting but a holiday gathering celebration that could be discussed during the other meeting for convenience.

A key point of discussion revolved around the distinction between official public meetings and informal social gatherings. The chair clarified that the holiday gathering was not considered a public meeting but rather a social event, emphasizing that it should not involve planning commission business to avoid potential legal issues, including recording and GRAMA (Government Records Access and Management Act) requests.

The chair also highlighted the importance of communication protocols within the commission and recommended that questions and discussions among commissioners and staff should be conducted through direct communication rather than email chains. This approach aimed to prevent unintentional creation of meetings through email discussions and to maintain professionalism.

One commissioner raised a question regarding whether, as a citizen of Pleasant View, they could express their opinions on community issues outside of commission meetings. The chair affirmed that citizens had the right to voice their opinions but cautioned against making comments that might suggest predetermined notions or bias, particularly when the commission had already made recommendations on specific matters. The chair encouraged transparency when addressing the city council to clarify the commission's role in making recommendations.

The discussion concluded with a brief mention of dietary restrictions for the holiday gathering, ensuring that all members were accommodated.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made. The meeting ended at 8:05 p.m.