



Project Management Meeting Minutes

Harrisville City Offices

363 W Independence Blvd

Thursday, August 13, 2026 – 9:00 am

Present: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Matt Robertson, City Engineer, Sarah Wichern, City Planner, Bryan Fife, Public Works Director, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Cynthia Benson, Deputy City Recorder, Grover Wilhelmson, City Council, Angie Francom, Planning Commission Chair, Ryan Barker, North View Fire, Mark Wilson, Police Chief, Tyler Seaman, Building Official, Brady Hansen, Bona Vista Water, Dakota Thacker, Pineview.

Visitors: Mark Apuna, Devin Pettit, Brandis O'Toole, Shiloh Veda, Kaitlynn Kleebl, Randy Smith, Marvin Farrell, Preston Mobius, Katie Jones, Brent Bailey.

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

1. Discussion on right-of-way within Golf View / Golf Crest Estates subdivision located at approximately 425 West 2000 North.

Kaitlyn Kleebl, representative of the Golf View/Golf Crest Estates HOA, stated the HOA has concerns with visibility when turning left off from 1975 N onto 250 W. After work hours, this area is blocked and the visibility is hard to see oncoming traffic. Jennie Knight asked if the inquiry was from an enforcement stand point or from the HOA perspective. Kaitlyn Kleebl replied she understands the area is controlled by the HOA. However, she would like to have a site review to see what the HOA can enforce.

After some discussion on road widths, and vegetation blockage, Ryan Barker, North View Fire, said if the street is twenty-six (26) feet, then there is no parking on it via fire code. In order to have enough room for emergency vehicles the road needs to be unobstructed. The road would need to be thirty-four (34) feet wide, which is eight (8) feet for a car and twenty-six (26) feet for asphalt. Matt Robertson, City Engineer, confirmed the road width is twenty-eight (28) feet. Ryan Barker offered to stop by to see if there was anything such as signs, painting of the curb, or anything else he could do to assist the HOA in enforcement of the visibility issue. Jennie Knight said there is little the city can do because this is a private street. Mark Wilson, Police Chief, said that from a police standpoint there are certain violations they can enforce when it is private parking. He suggested utilizing towing companies. Kaitlyn Kleebl clarified the HOA plans on doing the enforcement. They are looking for ways they can. The committee agreed this is more of a fire code issue.

2. Discussion on new concept drawing for Sunflower development located at approximately 640 West Harrisville Road.

Randy Smith, Fieldstone Homes, introduced a new concept plan of twelve (12) new lots with the one existing home making the concept a total of thirteen (13) homes. He stated they are three quarters (3/4) and a third (1/3) acre lots, varying in size. Based on the shape of the property they

are wider than they are deep. The road width is thirty-two (32) feet of asphalt with an attached sidewalk. The setbacks are twenty-five (25) foot setbacks to the garage and twenty (20) to the house. The sides are seven (7). He stated we may need some flexibility on the rear setbacks due to the lots being wider than they are deep. He would like to go to ten (10) foot setbacks on the rear because of the larger front setback.

Sarah Wichern, City Planner, asked what the depth of the lots are. Randy Smith replied the shallowest lots are eighty-seven (87). These are located at the end of the subdivision. They are evaluating which floor plans would fit on these lots. He discovered one house he would need to change the direction it faced with this concept. In that case, Sarah Wichern said he would need a twenty (20) foot setback for the side yard if turning this house to face north.

Randy Smith asked what the city stance is on patios in regard to their setbacks. Sarah Wichern replied that patios are not considered structures. Tyler Seaman, Building Inspector, added they can encroach up to five (5) feet into the rear setback. The committee discussed the yard layouts and setbacks. Matt Robertson would like to see no less than twenty (20) feet on the front due to the public utility easement. Randy Smith said he would not go less than fifteen (15) for the same reason.

Randy Smith said they are still onboard to install the storm basin to improve the water conditions in the area. Sarah Wichern said she thinks the lots size is a reasonable ask. This concept is plausible. The main concerns from the public were that the concept was too dense for the area. These are rather large estates. Across the street, the lot sizes are similar. Grover Wilhelmsen, City Council, said this concept fits better with the neighborhood. Angie Francom, Planning Commission, said the issues she heard at the public hearing were density, timing, and location. Some did not want houses anywhere. Some of the commissioners feel the same way. Randy Smith said these homes would be priced below million-dollar homes. Jennie Knight clarified they would be more around the \$750,000 price on a third (1/3) acre lots. She added the HOAZ would not be applicable. The developer will need to submit a subdivision agreement.

Jennie Knight asked if the developer was planning on mending his original application or submitting this concept under a new application. Randy Smith said he would like to amend his application and present it to the City Council to show them the options they have for this development. Grover Wilhelmsen said one of the biggest challenges he got from the City Council and from the feedback of the residents is they want to remain a rural type feel. Allowing the building but at the same time try to remain the rural atmosphere.

Jennie Knight said she thinks it is important to stick with the feedback we already got, which was density related. Her understanding of the prior application is it was under the HOAZ ordinance and based on affordability. She wishes to make it clear to the public this new concept is not affordable housing. She does not wish to give the perception this is affordable housing. Randy Smith agreed and added this is a development agreement. Jennie Knight clarified that this request of a developer's agreement is allowable on any parcel of land.

Randy Smith would like to see the new process begin in September with a recommendation to City Council in October. Matt Robertson added he would like to move this along as well because of the time sensitivity of the future road work. Sarah Wichern said this is a valuable add to the city for the storm drain upgrade and the addition of property taxes. They need to show the community this

is of value to them as a whole and a good fit.

Sarah Wichern said the rear setback of ten (10) feet is tight. She would like to see it increased to twenty (20) feet, but the patio can encroach up to five (5) feet creating a fifteen (15) foot rear setback. Matt Robertson said this is already in city code. Randy Smith said he will look at the product to see what would work. The committee agreed he could reduce the rear setback to fifteen (15) foot setback. This will need to be a part of the developer's agreement.

Jennie Knight asked how quickly a developer's agreement could be sent over. She would need time for the legal team to look it over. Randy Smith said it would not take him long to get a new agreement turned into the city. Sarah Wichern added the following verbiage would need to be included in the agreement; "in exchange for increased density, the city is asking for a storm drain" unless this will be a requirement. The committee discussed storm drain installation as a requirement for the development.

Matt Robertson said he would need to review the findings of the GeoTech study for the storm basin installation. The basin will solve the water issues in this area. The storm drain gives the water a place to go. He further said the decision to have basements is based on a specific GeoTech report which gives the elevations for each lot. Randy Smith said the only way they can have basements is by building a day basement and they do not build those. Jennie Knight clarified this subdivision will not be an HOA. Randy Smith stated the storm basin will be dedicated to the city.

Brady Hansen, Bona Vista, said the developer should be good with their culinary water plan. Dakota Thacker, Pineview Water, said the secondary water line they need to tie into may need to be scoped depending on timing of installation. Marv Farrell, Western Irrigation, said to keep in mind the tail water ditch. If the setback for the house is fifteen (15) that will work because the ditch easement requirement is ten (10) feet from the center of the pipe. Randy Smith he would work with Western Irrigation on the ditch flow.

Discussion came back around to the Storm Drain installation. Sarah Wichern asked if this needed to be in the development agreement. Matt Robertson replied they need to tie into all other utilities. The storm drain falls into the same category as a tie in to the storm drain system. Randy Smith asked if his team needed to be the ones that put in the connection or will the city be including this in their plans and they have to pay for it. Jennie Knight said it may be complicated to do it that way because they are using Federal Funding to install the road. It would be best for the developer to install the connection.

Randy Smith clarified that the extension of the storm drain for his project is not in the city's designs for the road widening project. Matt Robertson said he has designed up to where Fieldstone will need to tie in but not further. They will need to work with the city engineers on timing and installation. Matt Robertson will work with Randy Smith to coordinate road cuts, stubbing utilities, and curb wrap before road installation along with timing for utility stubs.

Ryan Barker said the fire department is okay with hammerhead at the top of the subdivision. He does not like hammerheads, but it is acceptable as a short-term fix.

Jennie Knight reviewed the application review process. There will be a public hearing for the September 9, 2026, Planning Commission meeting. Assuming the project receives a positive

recommendation, it will go to City Council for the October 13, 2026, meeting. The deadline for the Planning Commission is August 26, 2026. The deadline for the development agreement is August 19, 2026.

3. Discussion on a potential mixed-use commercial project located at approximately 2440 North Highway 89.

Mark Apuna handed out new concepts to the committee. He said his last project hit far too many snags as it entered the nuts-and-bolts stage including the investors backing out. The total land is 9.4 acres he wishes to develop. He is presenting the development as a mixed-use. He wants to sell off the residential side and keep the commercial side on a smaller scale. He is proposing only a restaurant for the commercial. He would like to increase the density of the residential to eight (8) instead of six (6) units per acre. He will give the city a park for higher density.

Sarah Wichern said the city is not looking for a park in this area. A park this size would be hard to manage and are generally HOA parks. Sarah Wichern said when a prior development came in on the parcels to the north, the staff discussed what the City Council and Planning Commission would want to see, which is four (4) to five (5) units per acre. The residents are really resistant to anything more than six (6) units per acre. She said if the development went with the HOAZ it may be a possibility.

The committee discussed the density, the connection between the frontage on Highway 89 and 750 East and other possibilities on this parcel including mixed-use residential. Sarah Wichern said the frontage along Highway 89 is preferred for the commercial area. Then the remaining area could be under the HOAZ ordinance. She reviewed the ordinance requirements for the developer to see if this idea had merit.

Angie Francom said any development in this area will not be well received by the community because patio homes or town homes will be placed between homes on larger lots. The residents want to preserve the community and what that area is. She does not think the commercial is as big of a concern since it will integrate well with what is happening along Highway 89. The concerns she has received from the residents over the two years she has been on the Planning Commission are not necessarily for the look of the proposed neighborhood in this area but for the traffic it will produce. 2550 North and 750 West are major thoroughfares for around five (5) different schools. There are no sidewalks, no curb, and no gutters.

Mark Apuna asked about the curb and gutter improvement planned for 750 West. This was an item heavily discussed with his last project proposal. Jennie Knight said it is on our transportation plan to improve this road. She added said the city has received funding for the southern half of 750 West, but it takes 5-10 years for the city to receive funding for projects like this. Sarah Wichern said if they wished to pursue the higher density then some gave and take would be to improve a portion of 750 West. Matt Robertson said this would be a requirement for access. The developer will need to make their own improvements. The city has applied for the funding but has not been rewarded yet. Sarah Wichern suggested possibly seeing if connecting to 2550 North would change the project.

The committee discussed possible road access to 2550 North to help with traffic and to please the residents. This access could be a consideration for the density. Sarah Wichern asked Angie

Francom if the concern from the residents was with the road width. Angie Francom replied that is one of the concerns. Adding homes here is not palpable for the citizens who live here. However, we are all trying to find what would be palpable in this area.

Sarah Wichern said the commercial property in the middle is not viable. We would receive more revenues from a higher density project in the middle than having it commercial. Jennie Knight asked what about the park idea. Angie Francom said she likes parks, but it depends on accessibility. Matt Robertson said if the property to the north developed similarly then a park in the middle would make more sense. Grover Wilhelmsen said one of the parks committee members suggested a park in this area. However, this needs to fit in the committee's variables, but it also needs to fit the needs of the city in terms of maintenance. When you have a higher density in the area, having a park there would have a lot more merit. As for density, if the lots sizes were more blended like what is already on 750 West, he feels it would be more feasible. Angie Francom added if the project had 4-6 homes to match what is already on 750 West, it would be a better fit. Mark Apuna said they have different aspects from different parties to create this development. The various ideas being presented are ones he and his team have not thought about.

After some brainstorming on possible development ideas, the committee suggested talking with the other property owners to the north. The discussion then led into development possibilities of the whole area with access points on 2550 North, 750 West, and Highway 89. The committee suggested a concept to give the residential area a buffer. For instance, commercial along Highway 89, some higher density such as townhomes behind that, an HOA acre-community park, and ending with more single-family homes closer to existing. Sarah Wichern interjected not to go more than eleven (11) units per acre for townhomes.

The committee continued brainstorming potential development of the whole area along with the pros & cons from past applications submitted. The committee discussed the idea of purchasing more land or developing with the landowner to the north. More land would mean pushing the density more towards the highway and away from the residents on 750 West. The committee discussed treating this development as a mixed-use with different percentages. All agreed it would be beneficial for the landowners to get together to present a nicer master planned community with larger homes, cleaner infrastructure, a common park, no parking on the streets, walking trails and accessibility, and better access points to distribute traffic. The whole development would be through a developer's agreement.

Angie Francom said something that is well-planned and well-presented would be more palpable than something shoved into the space. She would also like to see the needs of 2550 North thoughtfully addressed. She liked the idea of preserving the commercial corner along Highway 89 but asked the committee to keep in mind roof tops bring commercial.

Grover Wilhelmsen said when one looks at the development going on in the area, this would fit in. This corner will always be bottlenecked. Jennie Knight said UDOT has identified 2550 and Highway 89 as a signalized light at some point. This is why we are working hard to preserve this corner because it will be prime commercial once the light goes in. Some other things to keep in mind, online shopping is economic development for the city. Online sales taxes are a return from home shopping.

Sarah Wichern said if you do development with the north property owner, 2550 North will need

to be completely improved on that side. It would be best to put all the land together. If it all comes in as one conglomerate it would be a lot easier to present. It would be ideal to see the different access points 750 West, 2550 North, and through the commercial. Skeen was struggling with his development idea. Now you are struggling with yours. To combine it all would make for a better project. Matt Robertson added Skeen was also struggling with road widths. Putting this area altogether with better access makes more sense.

Discussion ended with the decision of all three developers coming to the table to design the area as one development with third (1/3) acre single family next to the existing houses, then quarter (1/4) acre lots, 8,000-10,000 square feet, and then blend into townhomes closer to the commercial along Highway 89.

4. Dixon Creek – Preston Mobius and Katie Jones and Brent

Preston Mobius said the main discussion today is to update the city on the LOMR and FEMA application as well as begin Preliminary Plat approval for 2B through Project Management and the Planning Commission. Katie Jones said the LOMR is on its 2nd round and received minor comments. This was resubmitted a month ago. She called to find out status and was told FEMA is reviewing the comments on this round now. They are looking forward to a response in the upcoming weeks. She said they are getting close. Only minor technical things at this point.

Matt Robertson said once the LOMR is approved and the flood plain is updated, then the intent is to come back with Phase 2B to build on the parcels with the flood plain removed. Preston Mobius asked to start the city approvals process and hold off the plat recordation until the LOMR is approved.

Jennie Knight clarified you would like to go for preliminary plat approval to Planning Commission and complete your county review. Then hold final approval. Preston Mobius said this is correct. He even suggested having a plat notation for the LOMR recordation number and acceptance date. Matt Robertson clarified that the infrastructure is all in. The developer cannot pull building permits until this is all completed. Preston Mobius answered in the affirmative. Jennie Knight asked if this was alright with the Planning Commission. Angie Francom replied in the affirmative. Matt Robertson suggested starting with the county review. Then send the city a new plat for the Planning Commission review in September. Then the city will wait for final until LOMR is completed. Jennie Knight said it would go a long way if the county was signed off before the project was seen at Planning Commission. Jennie Knight said they would actually hold the final approval letter until the LOMR is completed. Jennie Knight publicly thanked Katie Jones for including her with the FEMA emails.

5. Discussion on a detached accessory dwelling unit for North Valley Bible Church located at approximately 2224 North Highway 89.

Item was tabled until a future meeting due to applicant did not appear.

6. Continuing Projects.

There were no continuing projects discussed.
Meeting adjourned at 10:22 am.