



## Project Management Meeting Minutes

Harrisville City Offices

363 W Independence – Harrisville

Thursday, October 9, 2025 – 9:00 a.m.

**Present:** Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Matt Robertson, City Engineer, Sarah Wichern, City Planner, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Cynthia Benson, Deputy City Recorder, Angie Francom, Planning Commission Chair, Tyler Seaman, Building Official, Dan Johnson, Pineview, Kenny Hefflefinger, Bona Vista Water, Ryan Barker, North View Fire.

**Visitors:** Regina Hokanson, Jase Feichko, Joe Mwanthi, Jim Hyde, Tyler Burton, Leslie Clifton, Glad McCombs.

Jennie Knight, City Administrator, began the meeting by having the committee members present introduce themselves.

### 1. Discussion on potential development of Parcel 11-019-0007 located at approximately 1701 N Highway 89. – Tyler Williams, Regina Hokanson, Jase Feichko

Tyler Williams, VanTrust Real Estate developer, is looking to build a small business park in Weber County. His office is in Salt Lake City. Mr. Williams began the discussion by sharing a rendering of a current project to give the committee an idea of what he was envisioning for his project. He is looking at placing warehouse buildings on the property with office frontage along Highway 89. He is currently working with the landowner to potentially buy part of the parcel behind this one for more acreage. If he is able to obtain the property, he would place two (2) smaller 50,00 square foot buildings along Highway 89 with the larger warehouse facilities behind. He feels this would be a good fit since the BDO is not able to accommodate smaller tenants. Planned access is from new road (1750 North) and new light on Highway 89. His full proposal is to build four (4) to five (5) buildings with office space along Highway 89 with a truck court and warehousing in the rear. He would like to know the city appetite for a rezone commercial (CP-2) to manufacturing (M-1) and how the city feels about having this parcel as warehouse space.

Ms. Knight thanked Mr. Williams for his presentation. She described the city involvement in this area including the city complex area. 1750 North is being constructed by the city. UDOT plans to have a signal light here, but it is contingent on the development of Ben Lomond Subdivision which is 646 homes. To ask for a rezone is a concern and is not a palatable option. The city likes to encourage commercial development around signal lights. There is concern with manufacturing expanding to the highway.

Sarah Wichern, City Planner, reviewed the differences between manufacturing (M-1) and commercial (C-1). Commercial use protects the visible frontage. General plan would like to stay as commercial services to service the residents in the area. From a planning standpoint, we would like to leave as commercial and leave manufacturing as manufacturing.

Mr. Williams said their intent is to provide warehouse space for the smaller users like plumbers, tile, HVAC. Perhaps some assembling and some light manufacturing with minimal outdoor storage. The frontage would have offices with a store front. He is suggesting true Class A

warehouse product. He asked for clarification on whether the concern was with the esthetics of the buildings or the lack of retail availability. Ms. Wichern answered it was more the lack of retail availability.

Ms. Knight added that most of the uses Mr. Williams stated were allowed in the commercial zone. Her concern with rezoning manufacturing is due to the fact the manufacturing code is for a true manufacturing zone. There is no differentiation between light, moderate, or heavy manufacturing. She encouraged him to review the commercial building standards (HCMC 11.13.020 – Main Building Development Standards) and the uses in the commercial zone (HCMC §11.12.020 – Commercial Uses).

Mr. Williams asked if there were any restrictions. Ms. Knight clarified the services relating to plumbing or HVAC are not our preferred commercial but are in some of our commercial zones as an approved use. If talking about more manufacturing uses, then she suggested reviewing the manufacturing codes.

The committee suggested Mr. Williams review the city code on what would be permitted and what would be conditional. Mr. Williams signed off from Zoom after obtaining contact information for any further questions he might have.

The discussion turned to the owner of the manufacturing parcel, Regina Hokanson. Mr. Robertson asked if there was an updated subdivision plat since the Preliminary approval is nearing its expiration date. An extension was granted which would place the expiration date as January 2026. He stressed that if they did not wish to start the process over, they would need to have everything for the subdivision final approval wrapped up by then. Ms. Hokanson said she does not have an updated subdivision plat but will look into it. She emphasized that she does not wish to change anything already agreed to with the city. She continued by asking for clarification on what needed to be placed on the plat to obtain final approval. She does not want to affect anything she does internally with the parcels since she is not certain what she truly wants to do with the land. She asked if she would need to include all the parcels now or could that be done at a later date. She expressed her concerns about the greenbelt and property taxes being imposed on her because of the road being created.

Ms. Knight said it is in the best interest of all interested parties to record the subdivision, define the roadway, and define the lots. The committee continued with a discussion of the lots and various options on the timeline of the subdivision. They also discussed the pending road dedication, the lot to the north, the surrounding roadways, construction of the new road, and the future UDOT light placement. The discussion ended with Ms. Hokanson stating that she would meet with the county about the road and get back with the city on what she finds out.

Jase Feichko asked if there would be street parking along the new road. Ms. Knight said currently it is not planned since the road narrows. Parking is planned for the city complex. Mr. Robertson stated that the lanes for the light will restrict what would be available. Ms. Hokanson asked if there was going to be truck access. Ms. Knight said the city has identified this road as a collector.

## **2. Discussion on commercial site plan amendments for Family Promise located at approximately 324 E 1100 N. – Jim Hyde, Tyler Burton**

Jim Hyde, contractor, assisting Family Promise adding a Tuff Shed to the property. They are contracted to place a 15' x 20' shed behind the building. Mr. Hyde said after talking with Tyler Seaman, building official, they discovered they were out of compliance with adding the structure. Since discovering this, they have already extended the pad to place shed.

Ms. Knight said the code requires interior side setbacks next to a residential zone to be 20 feet from the property line. (HCMC §11.13.020 (2) – Main Building Development Standards). Mr. Hyde asked if it was possible to obtain a variance. Ms. Knight said that a variance would not be applicable to this situation, but he was more than welcome to apply.

Mr. Hyde asked what the clearance from the building needed to be. Ms. Knight said the code does not have a requirement for this. Mr. Seaman said the building requirement typically likes to see 5 or 6 feet. Discussion occurred on possible placements of the shed and the purpose of the setback requirement being established for a buffer zone between commercial business and residential. They also discussed shed sizes. Ms. Knight said if they wish to go with this size shed then Family Promise would be required to return to Planning Commission for a site plan amendment. However, if the shed would not require a building permit, then the site plan would not need to be amended.

They also discussed what the shed would be used for. Mr. Hyde said it was requested by Family Promise to meet the immediate need since they feel they have already outgrown the building. It was revealed that an addition to the building was in the planning stages.

### **3. \*Discussion on potential development of parcels 11-027-0011, 11-027-0010, and 11-027-0115 located at approximately 817 N Washington Blvd. – Joe Mwanthi**

Joe Mwanthi is the principal of Pillar 25, a Utah based developer for mixed-use projects. They build commercial units which have an emphasis of commercial on the base with a residential element above. They also build townhomes. He is proposing commercial mixed-use project of three (3) buildings, two (2) to three (3) stories, along Washington Boulevard with bottom floors being primarily commercial retail. The top would be multi-family units, one (1) or two (2) bedrooms. He verified a 20-foot setback is required for this type of use. Ms. Knight replied 20-foot is what is required from the right-of-way but to check with UDOT since Washington is their road.

Mr. Mwanthi continued saying the rear portion will first area will be parking spaces to support the commercial. Then he would have 4-unit buildings or 6-unit buildings townhomes separating the units with parking & greenspace. He is proposing 20-foot or 30-foot private roads depending on feedback from the committee. Ms. Wichern said she would like to see some type of connectivity between adjacent parcels. Due to this the city would like to see at least one public street connecting into the subdivision to the west. Ms. Knight added UDOT will require the proposed road aligning with the residential road (800 North) across Washington. She also would like to keep this road public for connectivity.

Mr. Mwanthi is still working with the developer to the west to obtain the lots necessary to create the public right-a-way. Mr. Robertson said city preference would be to obtain the public right-of-way to connect through the adjacent subdivision and align with 800 North. Ms. Wichern said with these many units, having the two access points would meet the fire code requirement. The city code allows for 5 connected units at a time and 20% open space. When townhomes and/or

apartments are developed, the city would like to see some form of an amenity to support the residents. Mr. Mwanthi asked if the amenity space counts towards the 20% open space requirement. The committee answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Mwanthi asked if they are unable to come to terms with the developer behind, would this concept still work with the proposed access points. Discussion the number of units and access points to meet the fire code occurred. The committee also reviewed HCMC §11.13.030 – parking requirements. For restaurants, the requirement is 1 parking space for 300 sq feet, or professional parking is 1 parking space for every 400 sq feet. Ms. Wichern suggested to plan 1 per 300 sq feet as a good target for the commercial element. For the residential units, the code requires 2 to 2.5 per unit but can be negotiated by development agreement.

Ms. Knight clarified the townhomes are rear loading with no driveway spaces. This creates limited spacing for visitors. Ms. Wichern said to plan for more parking for the townhomes. With as small as the units are, there would be no on-street parking. She suggested Mr. Mwanthi plan for driveways in front of the townhomes. The committee reviewed some options to meet the parking requirements. Ms. Wichern stated the number of bedrooms would imply the number of stalls required. For instance, if there are two (2) bedrooms, the city would like to see two (2) parking stalls and so on.

Ms. Knight said this concept suggests a really high-density project but is in a good spot. The main concern is the flow of traffic and parking issues. Mr. Mwanthi said assuming we can provide open space, and the number of parking stalls, would there be the appetite for mixed-use on these parcels. Ms. Knight stated that these parcels qualify for mixed use with 51% commercial units. The code for this is HCMC §11.11. Something to keep in mind, since this is zoned commercial, the code would require the development to be in our Mixed-Use Commercial subzone. (HCMC §11.11.030 (2) – Mixed-use Commercial (MU-C) Sub-zone) This also goes along with our General Plan so to rezone to residential would not work. The code also states the frontage of 150 feet needs to be commercial.

Discussion occurred on how best to calculate the commercial percentage. They also discussed the building height restriction of 45 feet. Parking is not counted as green space, but a detention basin is. The green space requirement is 10% for commercial minimum and 20% for residential requirement minimum. Since this is a higher density project, the public road width of 60 feet with 36 feet asphalt is the standard.

Mr. Mwanthi asked what the release flow rate. Mr. Robertson replied .1 cfs/acre. The storm drain, sewer, and secondary water would work best through the development to the West since these are not available to connect to on Washington Boulevard. Culinary water through Bona Vista is available with an 8" line. The discussion ended with where the infrastructure connections were located and who maintained what.

**4. \*Discussion on current development status for Oak Hollow subdivision located at approximately 255 E Larsen Lane. – Leslie Clifton, Rick Scadden**

Rick Skadden began the discussion by saying they are under contract to buy the Oak Hollow project. They wanted to know the actual status of the project, what issues still need to be resolved, and some general questions.

Ms. Knight said as far as status goes Preliminary Plat Approval has been granted with the Planning Commission, but no final has been given. She added there was a problem with the final plat. The buildable area needs to be added back onto the plat.

Mr. Skadden asked by Parcel "A" was. Ms. Knight replied according to the MDA, this is open area, a walking track, pickleball courts, and a pavilion.

Mr. Skadden asked if there were any issues with a flood plain in this area. Mr. Robertson replied there is no flood plain. There are a handful utilities going south to 700 North such as storm drain, sewer, and secondary which are in the through a right-a-way agreement. He asked for entry numbers on the plat for Love parcel to the south.

Discussion turned to what Will Serve letters have been collected. Kenny Hefflefinger, Bona Vista Water, said they are waiting on Pineview. Don Johnson, Pineview, said they are waiting for the remaining steps of the inclusion to be finalized. The requirements will be to tie into Larsen Lane and into Warren Hollow to create the flow loop.

Ms. Wichern said because the city is very interested in connectivity between the two potential developments there are options to make a more viable product. Ms. Knight added any change would mean a new amendment to the MDA would need to occur. They ended the discussion with various options the developer could take and access points.

## **5. Continuing Projects**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:23 a.m.

\*Applications received after posting of PM agenda