

Tooele City Planning Commission  
Business Meeting Minutes

**Date:** February 25, 2026

**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

**Place:** Tooele City Hall, Council Chambers  
90 North Main Street, Tooele, Utah

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Melanie Hammer  
Chris Sloan  
Jon Proctor  
Tyson Hamilton  
Weston Jensen  
Kelley Anderson  
Sarah Faircloth

**Excused:**

Amanda Cordova  
Frank Linford, Alternate

**Council Member Liaisons:**

Ed Hansen  
Jon Gossett, Excused

**Staff Present:**

Andrew Aagard, Community Development Director  
Anna Anglin, City Planner  
Matt Johnson, City Attorney  
Police Chief Adrian Day

Minutes Prepared by Teresa Young

1. **Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Hamilton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Melanie Hammer, Present  
Chris Sloan, Present  
Jon Proctor, Present  
Sarah Faircloth, Present  
Weston Jensen, Present  
Kelley Anderson, Present  
Tyson Hamilton, Present

3. **Recommendation on a proposed text amendment to Tooele City Code 7-9-2; Recreational Vehicles and Recreational Vehicle Parks, regarding the accommodation of recreational vehicles in parking lots of non-profit 501-c3 organization whose purpose is to assist persons who are unhoused (tabled from February 11, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting)**

Mr. Aagard reintroduced the proposed ordinance amendment allowing limited, temporary use of recreational vehicles (RVs) at a homeless shelter facility. This item was previously tabled to allow staff and the Police Chief to address questions raised by the Planning Commission.

Before beginning the presentation, Mr. Aagard introduced the city's new planner, Anna Anglin, noting that she recently joined the team and brings more than 20 years of planning experience from Salt Lake City, Moab City, and Wasatch County, and will be taking on planning responsibilities to support department operations.

Mr. Aagard explained that the amendment would permit up to three recreational vehicles to stay in the paved parking lot of a homeless shelter for a maximum of four weeks while services are being provided. Under the proposal, the shelter must provide at least one meal per day and access to bathrooms and showers for individuals staying in the RVs. The ordinance prohibits the accumulation of garbage or unsightly conditions and clarifies that RVs may not be used for storage. Violations would be enforced against the shelter operator under existing city code. The definition of a homeless shelter was refined to exclude overflow shelters, micro-shelters, medical facilities, correctional facilities, and behavioral health facilities. Mr. Aagard also noted that the Mr. Johnson, City Attorney provided comments, including concerns that the use of "notwithstanding the foregoing" language could override other applicable code requirements.

Police Chief Day stated that the proposal originated from a request by the Tooele County Housing Authority due to ongoing enforcement challenges related to homeless individuals living in RVs throughout the city. He explained that towing RVs is often difficult, costly, and may require the use of force, creating safety concerns for officers. The intent of the ordinance is to reduce repeated citations, avoid forced removals when possible, and allow individuals to access services while repairing their vehicles or transitioning to more stable housing. Police Chief Day emphasized that while enforcement remains the city's responsibility, the shelter operator could be cited for code violations if conditions are not maintained.

The Planning Commissioners raised several concerns during the discussion. Questions were asked about how the four-week time limit would be enforced and whether individuals could leave briefly and return to restart the allowed time period. The Planning Commissioners discussed limiting the allowance to a specific RV or individual within a defined timeframe, such as four weeks within six or twelve months. Additional concerns focused on enforcement responsibilities, including whether the shelter operator should be responsible for towing costs if an RV must be removed. The Planning Commissioners also expressed concern that the "notwithstanding" language could unintentionally eliminate other important code requirements related to setbacks, screening, and utilities.

The Planning Commissioners further discussed the physical placement of RVs on the property and whether additional standards should be included to require parking in the rear of the lot, increased distance from streets or neighboring properties, or visual screening. The importance of keeping the ordinance narrowly tailored to avoid loopholes and unintended long-term use was emphasized throughout the discussion. The possibility of requiring a conditional use permit was also discussed as a way to address site-specific impacts, though concerns were raised about practicality and how such a requirement would apply over time.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Planning Commissioners agreed that additional clarification and refinement of the ordinance language were necessary.

**Motion: Commissioner Proctor moved to table until the Planning Commissioners questions and concerns are addressed within the code.** Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”, Commissioner Faircloth, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; and Chairman Hamilton “Aye”. Motion passed 7-0.

4. **Public Hearing and Decision on a Conditional Use Permit request by Dave Stapel, on behalf of PH Utah Holdings, LLC (property owner), for approximately 2.81 acres located in the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district to authorize the use of a warehouse that may consist of office and industrial/warehouse uses, located approximately at 1121 West Utah Avenue**

Mr. Aagard presented the conditional use permit request for a flex space-type project on a light industrial-zoned property. A similar request for this property was brought to the Planning Commission several years ago, but no action was taken and the prior conditional use permit has since expired. The current application proposes essentially the same use and applies to the property identified on the aerial map, bounded by Utah Avenue to the north, 1100 West to the east, the Union Pacific Railroad to the west, and vacant land to the south. Surrounding uses include residential zoning to the north and south, a nonconforming mobile home park to the north, and light industrial uses to the northwest and southeast.

Mr. Aagard explained that the applicant provided a conceptual site plan but emphasized that a conditional use permit approves the use, not the site plan itself. Because the zoning ordinance does not specifically list “flex space,” planning staff recommended treating the proposal as a warehouse use, which would allow storage and contractor-related functions, while office uses are already permitted in the zone. Planning Staff recommended approval of the conditional use permit with standard conditions outlined in the staff report. The application was properly noticed to property owners within 200 feet, and no public comments were received.

Chairman Hamilton opened the public hearing at 7:27 p.m. Seeing no members of the public coming forward Chairman Hamilton closed the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

The applicant, Dave Stapel, addressed the Planning Commission and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present the project. He explained that similar properties developed by his company exist throughout the state and provide value by offering small, flexible spaces that allow individuals to move business activities out of their homes and grow locally. Mr. Stapel emphasized that his company maintains strict standards for cleanliness and property upkeep. He clarified that while the concept plan shows four buildings, one building on the western portion of the site would likely be delayed due to its location within a flood zone and would only proceed if FEMA mapping is revised. He also stated the willingness to comply with all construction codes and city requirements to ensure the project is a good fit for the community.

During the Planning Commission discussion, Commissioner Sloan raised concerns about traffic safety at the nearby intersection of 1100 West and 200 North, noting high speeds, limited stopping, and proximity to the railroad tracks. While expressing support for the project, Commissioner Sloan emphasized the importance of carefully reviewing ingress and egress during the site plan process. Mr. Aagard responded that the city controls both roadways and that access spacing, safety standards, and potential traffic study requirements would be addressed during site plan review, or could be included as a condition of the conditional use permit.

Mr. Stapel further responded that traffic and intersection safety are already being addressed through a traffic engineering study conducted at the applicant’s expense. The study includes coordination with the railroad and will determine appropriate access locations and necessary improvements. He indicated that intersection improvements are planned and will be constructed by the applicant, with the goal of improving overall

safety in the area. The Planning Commissioners acknowledged the response and noted appreciation for the proactive approach to traffic and safety concerns.

**Motion: Commissioner Jensen moved to approve we the conditional use permit request by Dave Stapel to authorize the use of warehouse to occur at the subject property located at 1121 Utah Avenue, application number 2026010, based on the findings and subject to the conditions lifted in the staff report dated February 19, 2026.** Commissioner Sloan seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Faircloth, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”, Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; and Chairman Hamilton, “Aye”. The motion passed 7-0.

5. **Public Hearing and Decision on a consider a Conditional Use Permit request by Tim Fries, on behalf of Tooele 1000, LLC (property owner), for approximately 1.04 acres located in the General Commercial (GC) zoning district to authorize the operation of an accessory drive-thru facility, located approximately at 975 North Main Street**

Ms. Anglin presented a conditional use permit request for a proposed drive-through facility located at 975 North Main Street. The project is on a vacant 1.04-acre parcel within the General Commercial zone, where drive-through facilities require conditional use approval. The site is surrounded by commercial uses, with a mix of developed and undeveloped properties nearby.

Ms. Anglin noted that the site contains existing trees and evidence of prior grading, and emphasized that any trees that can be preserved should remain. The proposed site plan includes shared access via an easement from 1000 North that will serve future commercial development, and planning staff recommends requiring a maintenance agreement for the shared driveway. The drive-through design includes two lanes, an escape lane, and separate ingress and egress.

Ms. Anglin advised that in addition to standard conditional use conditions, planning staff recommends requiring notification and justification for removal of any existing trees and submission of a maintenance agreement for the shared access driveway. The Planning staff also raised potential concerns about vehicle headlights facing Main Street and noted that additional landscaping or screening may be required to mitigate impacts. The Planning Commissioners acknowledged that the request was for a conditional use permit only, not site plan approval, and no questions were raised by the Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Hamilton opened the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Kalani Mascherino expressed concern about traffic safety at the nearby intersection, particularly questioning whether a traffic study would be required for the proposed project. Ms. Mascherino noted the intersection’s history of serious accidents, including a recent fatality, and stated that adding additional traffic makes the area feel unsafe. She also raised concerns that landscaping alone may not adequately mitigate headlight glare or other impacts associated with increased traffic.

Seeing no other members of the public coming forward Chairman Hamilton closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Ms. Anglin addressed public concerns regarding traffic safety, confirming that a traffic study will be conducted and reviewed by the city engineer to ensure safety standards are met. It was noted that when the site was originally developed by Kimball, a traffic study was completed for the entire development, and many improvements to 1000 North and Main Street were implemented based on that study. Ms. Anglin

emphasized that ongoing efforts will continue to prioritize safety, while acknowledging the challenge that the intersection is controlled by the UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation).

Tim Fries, representing Encore Restaurant Enterprises, addressed the Planning Commission regarding traffic concerns raised by the public. He explained that their CUP application included a traffic analysis and clarified that Seven Brew Coffee is not a primary destination but a secondary, ancillary location. Most customers stop by incidentally while already on the road, such as when dropping children off at school or visiting nearby businesses. While acknowledging that any business contributes some traffic, he emphasized that the coffee shop is not expected to significantly increase traffic at the intersection. He noted that the traffic study is expected to confirm this and expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

**Motion: Commissioner Proctor moved to approve the conditional use permit request by Justin Kimball to authorize an accessory drive through facility for the commercial development located at 973 North Main Street, application number 2026009, based on the findings, is subject to the conditions listed in a staff report dated February 20, 2026.** Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Faircloth, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; and Chairman Hamilton, “Aye”. The motion passed 7-0.

6. City Council Reports

Councilman Hansen expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission, commending their thorough discussion and thoughtful consideration of the agenda items. He noted that their insights help him recognize important details he might otherwise miss and praised the Commission for contributing valuable ideas that support local businesses and city development.

7. Review and Decision – February 11, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

There were no corrections made to the minutes.

**Motion: Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the February 11, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.** Commissioner Hammer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”; Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”; Commissioner Proctor, “Aye”; Commissioner Faircloth, “Aye”; Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”; Commissioner Anderson, “Aye”; and Chairman Hamilton, “Aye”. The motion passed 7-0.

8. Adjourn

Chairman Hamilton adjourned the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

*Note: The content of the minutes is not intended, nor submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.*

Approved this  11  day of March, 2026

  
Tyson Hamilton, Tooele City Planning Commission Chair