

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2025

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, April 24, 2025, at 7:00 pm in the Kaysville City Hall located at 23 East Center Street.

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chair Mike Packer, Commissioners Debora Shepard, Paul Allred, and Paul Toller

Planning Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Wilf Sommerkorn, Megan Sevy, Katie Ellis, and Erin Young

Staff Present: Melinda Greenwood, Anne McNamara and Mindi Edstrom

Public Attendees: City Councilmember Abbi Hunt, Amy Birt, Brady Birt, Bart Peterson, Phil Holland, Cash Knight, Spencer Brown, Andrew Marsh, Brand and Melanie Christensen, Michael Baker, Kristin Baker, Conner Ridenour, David Jensen, Cindy Kerr, Tom Kerr, Kim Anderson, Rick Moore, Shelley Moore, Jackie Knight, David Stringfellow, Marvin Hill, and Liz Child

1- WELCOME AND MEETING ORDER

Chair Packer welcomed all in attendance to the Kaysville City Planning Commission meeting.

2- DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MAJOR B HOME OCCUPATION LOCATED AT 135 SOUTH 500 EAST FOR GREEN PEAK LANDSCAPING FOR JAROM JORGENSEN

Ms. Edstrom introduced the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Jarom Jorgensen, residing at 133 South 500 East. It was noted that the residence is part of a duplex, which initially caused confusion regarding the address, but the correct location of 133 South was confirmed.

This agenda item came before the Commission following a resident's inquiry in September 2024 about whether Mr. Jorgensen's business, Green Peak Landscaping, was licensed with the city. Upon investigation, it was found that while the business was registered with the Utah Department of Commerce, it lacked both a Contractor's License from the Utah Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing (DOPL) and a business license with the city, and a Conditional Use Permit which all are required.

Despite multiple attempts to contact Mr. Jorgensen via voicemail and email, city staff did not initially receive a response. Follow-up code enforcement efforts resumed in February 2025, and contact was made on March 6. Mr. Jorgensen was given two weeks to bring his business into compliance by obtaining both a City Business License and the required Conditional Use Permit. When that deadline passed without resolution, the city contacted DOPL for further guidance. DOPL confirmed that they were working with Mr. Jorgensen, and that the city could not issue a business license until he obtained the proper contractor's license and a Conditional Use Permit.

Green Peak Landscaping is a residential and commercial landscaping business that offers services such as HOA maintenance, excavation, seasonal cleanup, sprinkler system installation, and snow removal, all of which require a contractor's license. According to his application, Mr. Jorgensen operates with one work truck and possibly a trailer, though it is unclear whether the trailer is used for business purposes. There are no employees or customers visiting the home, and city staff confirmed there are currently no outstanding code enforcement complaints on the property.

Two neighboring residents called city staff to inquire about the meeting, and the Mayor received a message from a resident referencing potential illegal parking and previous dirt piles on the sidewalk—though the latter issue has since been resolved.

City staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit for a Major B Home Occupation at 133 South 500 East, contingent upon any additional conditions the Planning Commission may find appropriate in accordance with city code section 17-30-3. Mr. Jorgensen was present and available to respond to questions from the Commission.

Planning Commission members invited Mr. Jorgensen to answer questions regarding prior code enforcement concerns.

Commissioner Paul Toller inquired about the source of the March 2025 complaint.

Mr. Jorgensen explained that it likely stemmed from his work truck being parked in front of his residence, which displays company badging. He speculated that neighbors may have been irritated by the appearance of his front yard, which was in the process of being renovated.

Commissioner Toller then asked whether the dirt piles observed near the property were related to landscaping business operations.

Mr. Jorgensen clarified that the piles resulted from digging trenches to install sprinklers for his personal yard project.

Ms. Edstrom corrected the record to note that the dirt was not on the road, but on the sidewalk, which still violates city code.

Commissioner Toller emphasized that approval of the Conditional Use Permit would increase, not reduce, the city's ability to enforce ordinances, especially concerning trailer and vehicle storage. He reminded Mr. Jorgensen that work-related equipment, such as trailers, must not be left on the street long-term and should be properly stored on the property.

Mr. Jorgensen confirmed that he does not dispatch employees from his home and instead meets them directly at job sites.

Mr. Jorgensen asked for clarification on trailer parking regulations.

Ms. Edstrom confirmed that trailers may be parked on the street for up to 48 hours, including utility or recreational trailers, and must be relocated afterward. She noted that the side of Mr. Jorgensen's property appears to be a suitable long-term storage location for his trailer.

Ms. Greenwood addressed concerns that had been forwarded to the Mayor by a resident regarding Mr. Jorgensen's property and business operations. The Mayor shared these concerns with the City Manager, the Police Chief, and Ms. Greenwood. The concerns included photos showing Mr. Jorgensen's truck parked against oncoming traffic, which is a violation as vehicles must be parked in the direction of traffic flow. Additional photos showed the truck and possibly a trailer parked on the street during the winter months, which may also be subject to seasonal parking restrictions. There were also complaints about the condition of the yard and dirt being left out. However, Ms. Greenwood clarified that issues such as these need to be reported when they occur, as the city is unable to enforce or retroactively address complaints long after the fact.

Commissioner Deborah Shepard asked Mr. Jorgensen about the status of his sprinkler installation project. He responded that the project was completed and now covered with grass. Commissioner Shepard acknowledged the improved appearance of the property, noting that it looked more finished. Mr. Jorgensen added that he had recently installed new concrete steps and a walkway.

With no further questions from the commission, Mr. Jorgensen was thanked and invited to sit down. Commissioner Mike Packer concluded that no additional conditions beyond what is already required by city code were necessary for the approval of the Conditional Use Permit. Other commissioners appeared to agree.

Commissioner Allred made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 133 West 500 East with no additional conditions. Commissioner Shepard seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Shepard: Yay
Commissioner Allred: Yay

4- PUBLIC HEARING FOR A REZONE FOR 13 WEST 950 NORTH (PARCEL #08-065-0079) FROM R-A TO LI

Anne McNamara introduced the rezone application of approximately 3.77 acres located at roughly 13 West 950 North. The parcel, formerly owned by UDOT, is situated on the south side of 950 North and is currently zoned R-A. The proposed zoning is Light Industrial (LI).

Ms. McNamara explained that all rezone applications must be evaluated in terms of their alignment with the city's Future Land Use Map and General Plan. According to the Future Land Use Map, the parcel is designated for General Commercial use. However, the applicant has

requested Light Industrial zoning. Ms. McNamara clarified that the General Commercial designation is distinct from Light Industrial, though both are non-residential. The General Plan itself is neutral regarding Commercial Development outside the city center, but certain goals and objectives were highlighted in support of the application.

Specifically, from Chapter 1 on Land Use and Placemaking:

Goal 3 promotes enhancing the commercial profile along community and regional corridors, especially near highway exits, like those along the West Davis Corridor and Shepherd Lane expansion. Objective 3.1 supports leveraging the corridor by establishing small-scale commercial developments at interchanges, a factor supporting the proposal due to the parcel's proximity to the West Davis Corridor.

Goal 7 emphasizes land use compatibility and buffering between differing uses. The adjacent parcel proposed for RM zoning could serve as a transitional buffer between this light industrial zone and the existing residential area across 950 North, including properties within Farmington City. Objective 7.1 supports development buffers to reduce incompatibility between land uses. From Chapter 5 on Economic Development Goal 3 encourages mixed-use development to generate additional rooftops and prevent retail sales leakage. Although this proposal is not a mixed-use development, the overall land use strategy—balancing nearby residential (RM) and commercial/light industrial uses—would support that goal.

For public noticing, 94 notices were sent to property owners within an 800-foot radius (expanded from the standard 500 feet due to the location's unique context), and a sign was posted on-site on April 18. As of the report's publication, one comment had been received; by the time of the meeting, six comments were submitted, all in opposition. Primary concerns included increased traffic and pedestrian safety, especially given the nearby elementary schools. One additional phone inquiry asked whether the rezone had already been approved or if it would be discussed during the meeting.

While the General Plan does not provide specific guidance on the placement of Light Industrial zoning across the city, it frequently references the importance of the West Davis Corridor as a major regional commercial route. The applicant's preference for Light Industrial zoning is attributed to the broader range of permitted uses in the Light Industrial zone compared to General Commercial. Staff acknowledged the limited alignment with the Future Land Use Map, but recommended approval based on the strategic commercial intent of the General Plan, the parcel's location relative to major infrastructure corridors, and the flexibility offered by the Light Industrial zone. The Planning Commission was advised that it may make a recommendation to the City Council to either approve or deny the rezone request.

Phil Holland, representing the Holland Group and applicant for the rezone request, addressed the Planning Commission to provide context and support for the proposal. He expressed appreciation for working with Kaysville City and stated he felt fortunate to own the subject parcel. Referring to the Land Use Map displayed during the meeting, Mr. Holland explained that

he had been involved in a similar public hearing about a decade prior regarding nearby property now known as Parkwood. At that time, the area lacked a defined development vision, and it was unclear whether the adjacent freeway off-ramp would materialize. Despite the uncertainty, the Holland Group chose to invest in the area, confident in its long-term appeal.

The parcel in question, which was formerly a milk farm and later used by UDOT as a construction staging site, was eventually surplused and sold at auction, at which point it was acquired by Mr. Holland's group. He described the site as a "crucial piece" of property in Kaysville due to its strategic location next to the West Davis Corridor exit, which he frequently uses and believes is a key access point for residents of west Kaysville.

Mr. Holland stated that he has already received multiple offers for gas station development on the parcel, with such a use likely occupying one to two acres. While he has not yet accepted any of those offers, he is waiting for the right proposal. The remaining portion of the property, he explained, is intended for flexible commercial developments similar to a project he previously completed near Boondocks, which combined residential and LI-zoned uses. He noted that while the property is designated for General Commercial on the Future Land Use Map, the requested Light Industrial zoning is more adaptive to modern market demands. He clarified that General Commercial zoning tends to favor traditional retail uses, which he views as less suited to this location. Instead, he envisions "flex space" that accommodates combined retail, office, and warehouse functions. He cited a previous example where a tech company utilized such a space for a showroom, administrative offices, and warehousing under one roof.

Addressing community concerns about traffic, Mr. Holland confirmed that a traffic study had been conducted and submitted to city staff. The study concluded that 950 North, an arterial road, has the capacity to support the anticipated traffic. He emphasized that the freeway exit adjacent to the parcel represents a vital opportunity for future development in Kaysville and reiterated his commitment to pursuing uses that align with the city's needs and infrastructure.

At this point in the meeting, Chair Packer formally opened the public hearing and invited members of the public to step forward and provide comments. Chair Packer explained the standard procedure for public hearings, individuals wishing to speak must state their name and are given three minutes to present their comments. He clarified that the Commission would not engage in direct dialogue during this portion of the meeting to preserve the speaker's allotted time. However, questions posed by the public could be addressed later by staff, the applicant, or the Commission after the public comment period concluded. The floor was then opened for public statements.

Marvin Hill, a resident who lives near the proposed rezone site, spoke in opposition to the application. He introduced himself as a retired, licensed plumber with over 50 years of experience in the building industry and stated that he has a strong understanding of development processes. While acknowledging that property owners seek a return on investment, he expressed serious concerns about the appropriateness and impact of the proposed development in a residential area.

Mr. Hill's primary concern centered on traffic and safety, particularly due to the high number of children in the surrounding neighborhoods. He warned that introducing a high-density development—such as the 56 proposed condos or townhomes—would overwhelm the area's infrastructure and result in inadequate parking. Drawing comparisons to development near Station Park in Farmington, he noted similar issues with excessive on-street parking and congestion. Mr. Hill recommended that if the development were to proceed, the city should require a minimum of 130 parking spaces not including garages, to prevent traffic problems. Ultimately, he described the proposal as too dense for the location and warned it would harm the neighborhood by creating traffic and congestion issues.

Brad Christensen, a resident of 2250 South in the Parkwood subdivision, spoke during the public hearing to request clarification regarding the proposed Light Industrial zoning. He referenced the applicant's earlier remarks about a previous development near Boondocks but stated that he was unclear on what types of businesses or uses fall under the Light Industrial designation. Mr. Christensen asked for examples of permitted uses within the Light Industrial zone that could potentially be developed on the subject property. He concluded by noting that he would reserve his broader comments for another agenda item later in the meeting.

Jackie Knight, a resident of Monarch Drive, voiced strong opposition to the proposed rezone, stating that her property directly borders the subject parcel. She emphasized that her neighborhood would be the most significantly affected by the development, particularly if the proposed 56 high-density residential units are approved. Ms. Knight expressed concerns over increased noise pollution from numerous vehicles starting and idling in the mornings, as well as the frequent movement of trash containers—comparing it to the noise disturbance she already experiences once a week from trash collection at a nearby LDS church.

She also discussed her decision to purchase her home two years ago, citing the surrounding agricultural and low-density zoning as a key factor in her choice. Ms. Knight contrasted the character of her neighborhood—described as "warm and fuzzy"—with that of high-density developments like those near Station Park in Farmington, which she characterized as commercial and impersonal in appearance.

In addition to aesthetic and noise concerns, she highlighted a traffic safety issue at the top of the nearby highway off-ramp. According to her, when stopping properly at the stop sign, it is difficult to see oncoming traffic coming from the west due to the slope of the road and the bridge configuration. She warned that placing a commercial use such as a gas station at that location would further exacerbate the safety hazard. Lastly, she noted that a pedestrian path runs near the property and that the increase in traffic from an industrial or commercial development would compromise pedestrian safety and the peaceful environment she and her neighbors currently enjoy. Her concerns focused on environmental, traffic, and quality-of-life impacts.

David Stringfellow, a resident living in the Farmington area east of the proposed development

site acknowledged the broader need for expanded land use and housing in the region, he also expressed concern over the requested Light Industrial zoning designation for this parcel. He Stringfellow cautioned against transitioning directly from Agricultural Zoning to a highly flexible entitlement such as Light Industrial, emphasizing that while flexibility may increase land value, it can also introduce uncertainty for surrounding residents.

He noted that the undefined nature of Light Industrial zoning can make it difficult for the community to anticipate what types of uses might ultimately be constructed. He recommended that the city consider a Mixed-Use zoning designation instead, which could better control development outcomes and offer residents more clarity and assurance. Mr. Stringfellow encouraged a more cautious and collaborative approach, where developers work with the community to create a project that better integrates with the surrounding residential areas and complements the important West Davis Corridor intersection. He ultimately advised against approving the rezone in its current form.

Shelley Moore, a Farmington resident and school crossing guard, spoke during the public hearing to share her concerns regarding traffic and pedestrian safety near the proposed rezone site. She explained that she regularly assists children crossing at the intersection near the park, where students from the Hunter's Creek subdivision walk toward Endeavor Elementary School. Ms. Moore expressed concern that additional traffic resulting from the proposed development would worsen existing congestion in the area, which already causes cars to back up at peak times.

She highlighted issues with the current traffic signal at the intersection, describing it as confusing for both drivers and pedestrians. The signal cycles between flashing yellow, solid yellow, and flashing red, which she said often leads to uncertainty among drivers about when and how they are allowed to proceed. Ms. Moore noted that some drivers continue turning during a solid red light despite her presence in the crosswalk, creating safety risks for the children. She recommended that, should traffic increase due to new development, a more conventional traffic light—with green, yellow, and red phases—should be installed to improve clarity and safety for both drivers and pedestrians.

Spencer Brown addressed the Planning Commission with a combination of professional insight and personal perspective. As a developer and builder of multifamily housing, Mr. Brown noted that he understands the challenges faced by applicants like Mr. Holland and has been on the opposite side of similar public hearings. While he did not voice direct opposition to the project, he expressed several questions and reservations, particularly concerning the division of the 3.77-acre parcel between the proposed Light Industrial zone and residential uses.

Mr. Brown acknowledged that development of the property is likely and potentially workable but emphasized that specific details would be critical to the success and community integration of the project. He agreed with the traffic study's assessment that 950 North can handle additional volume but cautioned that the placement of the site entrance must be carefully considered due to high-speed traffic exiting the nearby highway. He specifically mentioned

concerns about the “sight triangle,” noting that vehicles often come off the exit ramp quickly, which could present a hazard depending on the design of the project’s access point.

Parking emerged as Mr. Brown’s most significant concern. He noted that there are already occasional issues with vehicles parking along 950 North, and it is unclear whether those instances are restricted. Given the parcel size and density of the proposed development, he questioned whether the townhomes would have sufficient parking capacity, especially if they lack two-car garages or driveways. He expressed skepticism that adequate parking could be accommodated within the site layout and suggested that incorporating a compromise to address parking deficiencies would help alleviate his concerns.

Cash Knight, a Kaysville resident from Philly Court, shared concerns regarding the proposed zone and development, particularly focusing on long-term traffic impacts and environmental risks. He began by stating that, while he shares similar views with many speakers, his focus centered on the broader implications of the project as the surrounding region continues to develop.

Mr. Knight requested a comprehensive traffic study that extends beyond the current scope. He emphasized that the nearby 30-acre parcel to the north is slated for future residential development, which will add hundreds of homes using the same 950 North exit. Combined with continued expansion of Farmington Station and future development to the east and west including the Shepherd Lane exit connecting to I-15 he projected a dramatic increase in traffic volume. He stressed that the current analysis may not adequately reflect what traffic conditions will look like four to five years into the future and urged the Commission to demand a study that projects long-term traffic patterns, not just short-term impacts.

On environmental concerns, Mr. Knight pointed to a nearby creek that drains into a federally protected bird refuge. He warned that placing a gas station near this drainage corridor presents a risk of contamination particularly in the event of a fuel leak that could escalate into a federal environmental issue. He recommended that the city conduct a full environmental impact study in partnership with federal agencies to ensure protection of the nearby refuge.

In closing, Mr. Knight praised Kaysville’s existing zoning strategy, highlighting its clear separation of commercial and residential areas and the positive effect it has had on property values in neighborhoods like Sunset Equestrian. He cautioned that the proposed development could reverse that trend, especially for properties located to the south of the site and urged the Commission to consider the long-term consequences before deciding.

Liz Child addressed the Planning Commission to express her concerns about traffic related to the proposed development. She explained that turning left from Devi Drive onto 950 North is already difficult due to the high volume of traffic, and she suggested that a traffic signal may already be warranted at that intersection even without additional development.

While Ms. Child stated that she supports growth and development in general, she expressed

reservations about the proposed residential density, describing it as too high for the area. She indicated she would be more comfortable with homes or apartments at a lower density that better fits the surrounding neighborhood. Her primary concern remained the traffic generated by vehicles exiting the West Davis Corridor, which she acknowledged is a valuable addition to the area but has significantly increased traffic volume on local roads. She concluded by reiterating her hope that the area could be developed thoughtfully, with attention given to existing traffic challenges and neighborhood compatibility.

Kim Anderson, a resident of Farmington, spoke briefly during the public hearing to express her opposition to the proposed development. She acknowledged that her reasons were more personal and emotional than technical, emphasizing her desire to preserve the quiet character of her neighborhood. Ms. Anderson noted that she had not originally planned to speak but felt compelled to voice her concerns, particularly regarding the impact of the project on nearby families and children. Echoing earlier comments, she referenced the school crossing used by children attending Endeavor Elementary and stated that the increased traffic from the proposed development made her nervous about safety in that area. She concluded by simply asking that her opinion be heard and considered.

Michael Baker, a resident of Farmington and a retired law enforcement officer, shared multiple concerns about the proposed rezone and associated development. Having lived in his home east of the nearby Latter-day Saint chapel for 16 years, Mr. Baker described noticeable changes in traffic patterns since the completion of the West Davis Corridor. He explained that the area around Fox Hunter has experienced a dramatic increase in vehicle traffic, which he believes is being used as an unofficial off-ramp or shortcut, further congesting local roads.

He expressed particular concern for pedestrian safety, especially for children in the area, and referenced earlier commitments from planning authorities to ensure safe school crossings. Mr. Baker stated that the crossing near Endeavor Elementary is already barely sufficient and warned that additional traffic from the proposed development would render it unsafe. He echoed earlier public comments about the inadequacy of the current traffic control measures, particularly in areas heavily used by families and schoolchildren.

In addition to safety issues, Mr. Baker emphasized the potential environmental and quality-of-life impacts of increased traffic and development. He cited the importance of preserving Kaysville's and Farmington's environmental character, including walking trails, quiet spaces, and low noise levels, which he believes would be compromised by the proposed project. He referenced earlier comments regarding the need for a thorough environmental impact study and expressed disappointment that such a study did not appear to have been conducted in this case.

Mr. Baker concluded by urging the Commission not to "rubber stamp" the rezone request, warning that both Kaysville and Farmington could face long-term regret if the proposal proceeds without sufficient consideration of safety, environmental, and quality-of-life impacts.

Noting no other commentors from the public, Chair Packer concluded the public hearing portion of the agenda item regarding the proposed rezone at approximately 13 West 950 North.

Commissioner Allred expressed several concerns regarding the proposed rezone. He noted that the proposed gas station use had shifted from a previously discussed location on 200 North to 950 North, and while he acknowledged the need for such a use due to increasing traffic, he emphasized it must be carefully designed to avoid creating significant negative impacts on nearby residential areas.

Commissioner Allred voiced reservations about the Light Industrial zoning designation, particularly because it allows light manufacturing, which may not align with the area's character and offers limited tax benefits compared to retail uses. He noted that while Light Industrial zoning provides flexibility, that flexibility can also introduce uncertainty about future site uses.

He also raised procedural concerns about the lack of a Development Agreement for the Light Industrial portion of the site. While one was prepared for the Residential Multi Family portion due to anticipated opposition, none had been created for the Commercial area. He suggested the Planning Commission or City Council could use a Development Agreement to restrict certain undesirable uses otherwise permitted in the Light Industrial zone, providing a safeguard for adjacent neighborhoods.

Commissioner Allred emphasized the need for a detailed site plan before making a recommendation on the rezone. Without a visual layout showing how the proposed gas station and commercial elements would be integrated with the residential portion, he found it difficult to evaluate compatibility. He underscored that key design elements—such as buffers, lighting, landscaping, and site circulation—should be considered before making any zoning decision. He urged the Commission to delay action until a complete site plan is submitted and to explore a Development Agreement to address use limitations.

Phil Holland, the applicant, responded to the Planning Commission's concerns by clarifying his intentions and explaining why a site plan was not provided with the rezone application. He acknowledged that terms like "Light Industrial" often raise concerns, particularly regarding manufacturing, but emphasized that he does not intend to introduce heavy manufacturing to the site. Instead, he explained that the requested Light Industrial zoning reflects the kind of modern, flexible commercial uses that are currently in demand—such as light retail, office, recreation, and warehouse hybrids—not traditional industrial operations.

Mr. Holland explained that every Commercial zone in Kaysville is quite similar in terms of use allowances, and that convenience stores, for example, could fit within either Light Industrial or General Commercial zoning. While a gas station is a possibility for a portion of the site, he has not committed to that use and therefore cannot provide a definitive layout. He explained that specifying a detailed plan at this stage would prematurely lock in a use that may not materialize, which could hinder flexibility as the market evolves—particularly with the recent

opening of the West Davis Corridor, which is still shaping demand in the area.

Referring to another property he owns behind Taco Bell, Mr. Holland said he had experienced delays when zoning had been secured in advance of clear market demand, and he hopes to avoid a similar situation with the current parcel. He reiterated that the market, not speculative planning, will ultimately determine the most appropriate use for the site. He also noted that potential tenants like Walmart have looked at the site, further indicating a wide range of commercial interest.

Commissioner Allred responded by expressing understanding of the applicant's position, having worked with developers for decades. However, from the perspective of both a planner and a resident, he emphasized the need for a conceptual layout—even a generic site diagram—that could help the Commission and the public better visualize how the proposed Light Industrial and Residential areas would integrate. He noted that while the Commission isn't expecting a finalized plan or named tenants, seeing general building placements, traffic flow, and buffering strategies would provide greater confidence in evaluating the project's suitability.

Mr. Holland concluded by stating that the commercial real estate market has shifted significantly in recent years. Many modern businesses that fall under Light Industrial—such as fitness centers, sports training facilities, office-retail hybrids, and recreational uses like pickleball or children's play spaces—are becoming standard commercial tenants. He clarified that while Light Industrial zoning may sound industrial, it more accurately accommodates this new category of mixed-use, flexible tenants that are increasingly common and appropriate for the area.

Commissioner Allred shared several concerns about the proposed rezone, focusing mainly on traffic, safety, and the lack of a clear site plan. He said that while a gas station at the site might make sense due to traffic levels, it must be carefully designed to avoid causing problems for nearby neighborhoods. He also noted that Light Industrial zoning allows for flexible uses, but that flexibility creates uncertainty for residents who want to know what might be built.

Commissioner Allred emphasized the importance of having at least a basic site plan to understand how the commercial and residential areas would fit together. He stressed that key details—like lighting, buffers, and landscaping—make a big difference in how the development affects neighbors, especially over time.

Commissioner Allred raised concerns about increased traffic on 950 North, which he expects to become much worse with surrounding developments. He asked who owns and manages the road and traffic signals, and staff confirmed that much of it falls under Farmington City's control. This includes the traffic signal and crossing signal mentioned during public comments.

Commissioner Allred was especially worried about kids walking to school from nearby neighborhoods. He said 950 North already feels unsafe and that new development will only make things worse. He also noted that a new traffic light at Devi Drive probably isn't possible

due to how close it is to the freeway.

Phil Holland responded to Commissioner Allred's traffic concerns by emphasizing that traffic was a key consideration from the outset of the project. He stated that upon purchasing the property, he immediately involved a traffic engineer to conduct a thorough analysis. The study, which was submitted to city staff, includes projections for current, 5-year, and 10-year traffic patterns based on development of the site. Holland acknowledged that traffic is a mental and emotional concern for many residents but emphasized the importance of relying on data and scientific traffic modeling.

Mr. Holland confirmed that the traffic study had been reviewed by Kaysville's Public Works and Engineering departments, who asked detailed questions and received clear responses from the traffic engineer, Jason Watson of Focus Engineering. Holland clarified that the analysis concluded that the development would not cause the road to fail or exceed its designed capacity, as 950 North is an arterial road meant to handle high traffic volumes.

Commissioner Allred acknowledged the value of the traffic study but stressed that the real concern is not whether the road can technically support more vehicles, but how people will safely and effectively interact with that road, especially with new development nearby. He emphasized the importance of human impacts, including pedestrian safety and traffic flow, and thanked Holland for his responses.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that both Kaysville's Public Works Director and City Engineer, though not traffic engineers—had reviewed the traffic study and then forwarded it to Hales Engineering, a third-party traffic engineering firm, for specialized analysis. The applicant had submitted a second version of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) addressing earlier questions and Hales is currently reviewing that updated version. While their final review is still pending, Ms. Greenwood stated that no mitigation measures were identified in the original report, and staff does not anticipate significant changes in the updated review. If any mitigation is ultimately recommended, it would be addressed in the Development Agreement before going to City Council.

Ms. Greenwood also explained the complexity of coordinating traffic planning in an area involving three jurisdictions: Kaysville City, Farmington City, and UDOT. She noted that UDOT has restricted ingress and egress near the Sunset Drive alignment due to its proximity to the West Davis Corridor interchange, which limits where entrances can be placed. As a result, access to the site would be aligned with Devi Drive for safety and traffic flow. She added that Hales Engineering would also be evaluating the possibility of too many conflicting left turns if multiple access points are placed close together. It's possible that traffic flow might be restricted to right-in, right-out movements at certain entrances, depending on their final analysis.

Ms. Greenwood concluded by stating that while the final review was not complete at the time of the Planning Commission meeting, it would be finalized before the City Council considers the

rezone, and any required changes could be incorporated into the Development Agreement at that stage.

Chair Packer then added that most of his questions had been addressed throughout the discussion. He acknowledged that many public comments expressed concern over the industrial zoning designation. While he appreciated Mr. Holland's explanation that the Light Industrial zone would be used for modern, flexible commercial purposes rather than heavy manufacturing, he still had some reservations. Nonetheless, Packer noted that traffic impacts—while real—are inevitable regardless of what is developed on the site, and he did not see them as a deciding factor for the rezone recommendation itself.

Commissioner Allred offered a different perspective on parking and road safety in response to public concerns about congestion and insufficient parking. Drawing on his professional experience and past work in city planning, he explained that wider, straighter roads encourage faster driving and are often more dangerous. He shared an example from a former colleague—a well-known traffic engineer—who demonstrated that cars naturally slow down when roads are narrower or when cars are parked along the street.

Commissioner Allred argued that on-street parking can serve as a traffic-calming tool, helping to reduce speeding and improve safety for pedestrians. He emphasized that the public owns city streets, and encouraging residents to use street parking—rather than discouraging it—can help create safer, slower-moving neighborhoods.

Commissioner Allred also challenged the idea that developments need to include large amounts of off-street parking. In his view, residents adjust their behavior to available parking over time, and oversupplying stalls leads to underused, costly, and environmentally harmful parking lots. He concluded by urging the Commission to think differently about parking: fewer stalls can mean safer streets, and modern planning should balance environmental impact, cost, and behavioral adaptation rather than defaulting to excessive parking standards.

Commissioner Allred made a motion to continue the rezone item at the next available Planning Commission meeting. He explained that he was uncomfortable moving forward without more Planning Commissioners present and wanted to hear their perspectives. He also noted the value of the public input received during the meeting and suggested that the developer return with a conceptual sketch of the proposed layout to help inform further discussion.

Commissioner Allred expressed interest in allowing both the Commission and residents more time to consider possible limitations on uses within the proposed Light Industrial zone. He emphasized the need for a clearer picture of what could be developed on the site and encouraged more community dialogue to build consensus. His motion called for the item to be brought back for additional review and discussion, rather than a final recommendation at this time.

Chair Packer asked for a second and the motion failed.

Commissioner Toller responded to Commissioner Allred's failed motion to continue the item by offering a summary of the discussion for the benefit of the public, emphasizing that their comments had been heard and considered. He acknowledged community concerns about parking, traffic, and pedestrian safety, particularly around the crossing near the park and the growing impact of the Shepherd Lane interchange—noting that these issues largely fall under Farmington City's jurisdiction, not Kaysville's.

Regarding the Light Industrial zoning, Commissioner Toller noted the uncertainty expressed by the applicant about future users of the site, such as whether it might become a gas station or a flex commercial space. He observed that the developer seeks entitlements now, with the flexibility to finalize buyers and uses later. However, he pointed out the lack of a site layout or visual plan for the commercial portion as a key issue for the Commission—especially when compared to the residential section, which had clear documentation and design details.

Commissioner Toller also reiterated the importance of public safety, especially for pedestrians, and acknowledged that although the final traffic study review is not yet complete, staff have already conducted substantial analysis. He suggested that if the developer were able to secure a specific commercial user, it might allow for a clearer site plan and help address many of the current uncertainties.

Commissioner Toller concluded by stating that although he seconded the motion to continue, he was also open to moving forward with the rezone if proper controls and conditions were placed on what could be developed within the LI or GC zone—particularly on the portion of the site that borders 950 North.

Commissioner Allred, following his earlier motion to continue the item, clarified that his intent was not to delay unnecessarily but to ensure certain key issues were addressed before the Planning Commission made a recommendation. He suggested the continuation be used to gather more information, and outlined a list of specific follow-up items he hoped staff could return with at the next meeting:

1. Clarification on Development Agreement tools – Specifically, what types of uses could be restricted or negotiated through a Development Agreement, especially for the Light Industrial (LI) portion of the site.
2. Clearer staff recommendation – He asked for staff to give a more definitive opinion regarding the compatibility of the Light Industrial zoning with the General Plan and Future Land Use Map, and whether they have any reservations based on community feedback or zoning intent.
3. Jurisdictional clarification – He requested detailed information on who controls the key sections of 950 North, particularly near Devi Drive and at pedestrian crossings, to better understand who is responsible for implementing potential safety improvements.
4. Status update from Hales Engineering – He asked that Hales complete their review of the traffic study and provide any final recommendations or concerns, particularly related to turning movements, ingress/egress, and traffic flow.

5. Clarification on secondary access – He wanted confirmation of whether a second ingress/egress is planned for the residential area, noting that while cities typically try to limit access points, a second connection here might improve safety and circulation.
6. Conceptual site layout – He encouraged the applicant to return with a basic visual sketch or bubble diagram showing proposed land use divisions, access points, and relationships between the residential and commercial areas to help the Commission and public better understand the proposal.

Commissioner Allred also asked whether the public hearing could be reopened at a future meeting to allow additional comments, but staff confirmed that because the hearing had already been closed, further public input would need to come in the form of written comments submitted ahead of the next meeting.

Chair Packer acknowledged Commissioner Allred's points and indicated he was somewhat undecided—open to continuing the item for further review but also comfortable moving forward, recognizing that the Commission's decision would ultimately be a recommendation to the City Council rather than final approval.

Commissioner Shepard expressed initial hesitation about allowing Light Industrial zoning at the proposed location but said she understood Mr. Holland's position that flexibility is important due to the uncertainty of future tenants. However, she also raised a critical point: once the land is rezoned, if it's sold, the new owner could pursue any allowed Light Industrial use unless a Development Agreement is in place to restrict it. For that reason, she supported gathering additional information before making a final recommendation and even suggested considering a different zoning designation if necessary.

Following this discussion, Chair Packer confirmed that there was an active motion to continue the item to a future meeting and called for a vote.

Commissioner Allred's motion was amended to state that the item would be continued to the next appropriately available meeting, which could be as early as May 8, depending on scheduling between the applicant and staff and Commissioner Toller seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously approved in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Shepard: Yay
Commissioner Allred: Yay

5- PUBLIC HEARING FOR A REZONE FOR 16 EAST 950 NORTH (PARCEL #08-065-0080) FROM R-A- TO R-M WITH A PRUD ZONE OVERLAY

Melinda Greenwood presented a request to rezone 3.77 acres of property located at 16 East 950 North from Residential Agricultural to Multiple Family Residential with a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) overlay.

The property, which shares the same ownership as the adjacent parcel discussed in the previous agenda item, is situated on the south side of 950 North just east of the West Davis Corridor interchange. While the city's Future Land Use Map designates the area for General Commercial use, Ms. Greenwood explained that the proposal aligns with Kaysville's 2022 General Plan objectives to provide more diverse and affordable housing options, particularly moderate-income housing. She noted that the city is required to report annually to the state on its compliance with moderate-income housing goals, and failure to do so could risk loss of state funding.

Ms. Greenwood emphasized that although a Development Agreement is not required at the rezone stage, the applicant voluntarily provided a site plan and agreed to a Development Agreement to give clarity and structure to the proposed townhome project. The plan includes 56 townhome units, each with a two-car garage and additional driveway parking, along with 12 guest stalls, bringing the total parking count to 236 stalls—well above the city's requirement of 96. The layout includes private internal roads, which necessitate the PRUD overlay, and a public road accessing the development from 950 North. The site features generous open space, exceeding the required 32,000 square feet with a proposed total of 42,000 square feet. Planned amenities include a playground, pergola with seating, grilling and fire pit areas, a dog run, asphalt walking trail, cornhole and bocce ball areas, a chalk wall, and a hammock area.

The applicant is requesting a slight increase in building height from the standard 30 feet to 33 feet to accommodate three-story townhomes. Ms. Greenwood clarified that under the city's zoning code, height is measured from the average grade to the midpoint of the roof peak, and the requested height remains reasonable within that standard. Visual renderings of the building exteriors and common areas were shared with the Commission.

Ms. Greenwood concluded by recommending approval of the rezone request, noting that while the proposal does not match the Future Land Use Map, it is consistent with the city's Moderate Income Housing Plan and broader goals to provide a range of housing types and price points.

Phil Holland, the applicant, addressed the Planning Commission to offer additional context and support for his request to rezone 3.77 acres on 950 North to Multiple Family Residential with a PRUD overlay. Mr. Holland began by reflecting on his 25 years of experience developing in both Kaysville and Farmington, stating that he has been directly involved in multiple projects throughout the area. He emphasized the rapid growth Davis County is experiencing—particularly north of Bountiful—and the increasing difficulty residents face in finding affordable housing. He noted that Utah leads the nation in average household size, and demand for housing continues to climb while land availability shrinks.

Mr. Holland explained that while the RM zoning would allow up to 16 units per acre, this project proposes only 14 units per acre, demonstrating his intent not to overbuild the site. He highlighted that the development offers 20% more open space than the city requires and includes a rich amenity package—featuring a playground, cornhole and bocce ball courts, walking trails, a dog run, hammock zone, and gathering areas with pergolas and fire pits. He

stated he's unaware of another local townhome development in Kaysville or Farmington offering this level of community amenities.

In terms of parking, Mr. Holland pointed out that each of the 56 townhomes would include a two-car garage with room for two additional vehicles in the driveway—totaling four stalls per unit. He compared this to Farmington's requirement of only 1.82 stalls per unit, asserting that his proposal exceeds expectations and anticipates resident needs. He stressed that the project is not high density and is designed to be well-maintained, with a homeowner's association managing all common areas and amenities.

Mr. Holland also discussed the importance of providing housing options for younger families and noted that developments like this typically generate fewer school-age children than single-family homes. He cited data indicating a 25% drop in enrollment at nearby Endeavor Elementary, a trend he attributed to a lack of diverse and affordable housing options in the area.

He concluded by praising Kaysville's updated 2022 General Plan, calling it a major step forward in thoughtful city planning. He emphasized that this site is ideally located for higher-density housing, as it sits directly on an arterial road, reducing the need for future residents to drive through existing neighborhoods. Mr. Holland stated this location meets both city planning goals and practical transportation needs. He closed by reaffirming his long-term commitment to the area and his desire to develop something the city can be proud of for decades to come.

Commissioner Shepard asked the applicant whether storm drainage had been considered in the planning process. She acknowledged that this might still be an early-stage consideration but noted that while the project includes excellent open space, there was no visible indication of where stormwater would be managed. She inquired if Mr. Holland had any thoughts or plans on how storm drainage would be addressed within the development.

In response to Commissioner Shepard's question about storm drainage, Mr. Holland confirmed that preliminary engineering has been conducted and identified the lowest point of the site—located near the area bordering the proposed commercial parcel. He explained that much of the stormwater will likely be handled through underground detention systems, rather than traditional above-ground basins commonly placed within the community. Holland stated that two large outfalls from Farmington City run beneath the area, and any runoff would be managed in compliance with environmental regulations, including the installation of an orifice plate to control discharge rates.

Mr. Holland emphasized that care was taken to tuck the stormwater system into a less visible corner of the property to maintain the overall aesthetic and functionality of the community. Commissioner Shepard responded that this information was helpful and reiterated the need for a larger conceptual site plan, even in a simplified format like a bubble diagram, to better understand how elements like storm drainage and internal traffic circulation will integrate into the overall design. Mr. Holland agreed, adding that for the commercial portion—although not

yet fully planned—he could return with diagrams showing possible layout options, acknowledging that different configurations might be required depending on future commercial tenants.

Commissioner Toller asked Mr. Holland whether the slight extension of "Road A" on the site plan was designed to align with Devi Drive.

Mr. Holland confirmed that it was. He explained that the main access road will be a dedicated city street and is intentionally planned to line up directly with Devi Drive on the opposite side of 950 North. This alignment is meant to support safe and efficient traffic flow by preventing offset intersections.

Chair Packer announced the start of the public hearing portion for the agenda item concerning the rezone request at 16 East 950 North. He invited members of the public to come forward to share any comments, questions, or concerns, following the same format as the previous hearing.

Spencer Brown spoke in favor of the rezone request. He stated that he appreciated the density, layout, and ample parking provided in the proposed development. Referring to his property on the map, he noted its proximity to the site and joked about inviting others over to use his pool. Mr. Brown expressed support for the project, saying it was a great use of the space and that realistically, any future development in the area would need to combine residential and commercial elements. While he acknowledged traffic is a concern, he emphasized that 950 North will be busy regardless of what is built and that this project won't significantly change that. He concluded by complimenting the developer for thoughtfully including driveways with the townhomes and for presenting a well-planned proposal.

David Stringfellow, a Farmington resident, offered feedback on the proposed rezone. While expressing general appreciation for the plan, unit count, and the overall presentation, he acknowledged the broader development context of the area, noting that approximately 4,000 housing units are being contemplated nearby along the DNRG Trail and Burke Lane corridor. He explained that in working with Farmington City on previous projects, one key strategy used to address neighborhood concerns was to ease transitions in housing density and building height, particularly near existing single-family homes.

Mr. Stringfellow suggested that the Planning Commission and developer consider a similar approach in this project lowering building heights near the northeastern corner of the site, where townhomes would be adjacent to existing residential properties. He recommended possibly segmenting or tiering the development to reduce visual impact on neighbors, as had been done in Farmington by limiting building height near trails and then allowing increased height further away from sensitive edges.

Mr. Stringfellow expressed support for the idea of townhomes as starter homes for young adults, noting that his own daughter, a junior studying engineering, could be an ideal resident. However, he cautioned that the scale and design of the townhomes as proposed might feel out

of character with the surrounding neighborhood. He also questioned why the site had been strictly divided into residential and industrial zones, rather than pursuing a true mixed-use approach, such as integrating storefronts around the edges with housing inside a pattern commonly found in European developments. He concluded by encouraging the Commission to think creatively and contextually about how the site could better blend with its surroundings.

Bart Peterson voiced strong opposition to the proposed townhome development. He expressed concern that the 33-foot-tall buildings would have a direct and negative impact on his privacy and property value, stating that such height would allow neighbors to look directly into his backyard. He emphasized that when he purchased his home, he reviewed the zoning and land use plans and saw no indication that such a high-density project was expected in the area.

He criticized what he described as a "cherry-picking" approach to planning selectively applying city policies to justify development in areas not originally intended for it. He also challenged the idea that this development qualifies as affordable housing, noting that similar townhomes in the area are selling for \$600,000 to \$700,000, making them inaccessible to young adults or college students, contrary to the developer's suggestion.

Mr. Peterson urged the Planning Commission to consider the surrounding neighborhood's character and explore alternatives such as single-family homes, which he believes could still be built at that price point by the right developer. He concluded by asking the Commission to seriously consider the voices of residents, both those speaking in person and those who submitted comments online, and to empathize with the position of nearby homeowners who would be directly impacted.

Michael Baker spoke in opposition to the proposed rezone and townhome development. He acknowledged the developer's stated connection to the community but pointed out that the project is not being built near the developer's own neighborhood, and therefore the impacts such as loss of peace, privacy, and neighborhood character would not be felt by him personally.

Mr. Baker emphasized that the scale and nature of the project does not fit with the existing single-family residential homes in the immediate area, calling it aesthetic and functional mismatch. He noted that when he and his neighbors chose to build in the area, they were fully aware of the nearby West Davis Corridor and accepted the associated traffic. However, he and others did not anticipate that three-story townhomes would be introduced next to their quiet residential streets.

Mr. Baker challenged the claim that the townhomes would meet affordable housing goals, questioning whether this location is truly the only viable site for such zoning within Kaysville. Mr. Baker also noted that the proposed rezone appears to be carved out in a way that feels inconsistent with the surrounding area, further highlighting its disconnection from the broader neighborhood context.

Mr. Baker urged the Planning Commission to consider single-family homes as an alternative

that could still support the city's goals—such as tax revenue or state compliance—without imposing the high density and vertical scale proposed. He asked the city not to follow the same high-density path as Farmington and to protect the established character of the area.

Marvin Hill, a nearby resident who lives directly across the street from the proposed development, expressed concerns about the impact of the townhome project on the existing neighborhood. He stated that the height and density of the planned three-story buildings would detract from the character of the surrounding area and create visual and spatial disruption. While acknowledging the developer's efforts to include extra parking and driveways, Hill voiced skepticism about claims that on-street parking would help calm traffic. Instead, he worried about logistical challenges, particularly snow removal and safe access to the adjacent bike and pedestrian trail, which he already finds difficult to use due to the lack of traffic controls.

Mr. Hill emphasized that without a traffic light or other control measures, adding 56 new homes would significantly increase the congestion and danger along the roadway, particularly given the rising volume of traffic coming from Farmington's ongoing developments uphill. He argued that the area is already experiencing congestion and that adding a high-density, vertical housing project would exacerbate an already unsafe traffic environment. Mr. Hill concluded by stating his belief that the proposal is not an appropriate use of the land and would negatively impact the neighborhood's safety and livability.

David Jensen, a Farmington resident living near David Stringfellow, shared his perspective during the public hearing and echoed the concerns previously expressed by others regarding the proposed townhome development. He encouraged the Planning Commission to consider whether the placement of a 56-unit, 33-foot-tall residential project in a corner surrounded by single-family homes would genuinely appear to be the result of thoughtful and intentional planning.

Mr. Jensen posed a rhetorical question to the Commission: When this development is completed, and people drive past it, will it look like it was part of a well-integrated city plan or simply the result of a developer acting on a profit-driven opportunity without regard to neighborhood fit? He questioned whether such a project would align with the broader goals of Kaysville's moderate-income housing strategy or whether it would appear out of place—an isolated high-density project in a predominantly low-density area.

Mr. Jensen also suggested that there may be other areas in the city better suited to absorb higher-density housing and still meet state housing requirements, rather than placing such a development at a gateway location near the freeway and within immediate view of long-standing residential neighborhoods. Jensen closed by urging the Commission to consider how this decision would be viewed decades from now, cautioning against making a move that might not reflect sound urban planning or the community's best long-term interests.

Kim Anderson voiced her opposition to the proposed townhome development, stating that it does not reflect the character or "vibe" of the neighborhood she chose to live in. While she

acknowledged that she did not have new arguments to add, she wanted her stance officially noted for the record.

Ms. Anderson expressed a preference for single-family homes, saying that extending the existing pattern of development would better preserve property values and the community's established character. Although she recognized the state's affordable housing mandates, she shared skepticism that the proposed townhomes would fulfill that goal, especially if they are built to the high standards shown in the applicant's presentation. In her view, the pricing of such units would likely place them out of reach for many, and therefore not meet the intended purpose of moderate-income housing. She concluded by reaffirming her hope that single-family housing could be pursued instead.

Brady Birt expressed opposition to the proposed townhome development. He said while he would love to live in Malibu or Hawaii, he lives where it is affordable and consistent with his values, and he believes that the proposed development does not reflect the character or vision of the existing neighborhood. He noted that the project would border his neighborhood and its HOA-managed properties, and he views the proposed townhomes as a deterrent to the surrounding area.

Mr. Birt emphasized that the current zoning—which allows for limited residential growth while protecting agricultural land—has helped maintain the community's integrity and open space. He pointed to Farmington's efforts to preserve open areas, including within his neighborhood, where parks and natural buffers were integrated into the layout. In his view, the proposed development would erode those efforts, placing something incompatible into a setting that has been deliberately designed to maintain a certain standard and appearance.

Mr. Birt urged the Planning Commission to consider whether the proposal truly matches or mirrors the existing environment, and to place greater weight on the perspectives and safety concerns of the residents living nearby, particularly children who use the area frequently. Mr. Birt concluded by asking that the city focus on creating a positive, harmonious impact on the neighborhood, rather than focusing solely on the proposed parcel in isolation.

Amy Birt voiced her opposition to the proposed townhome development, specifically taking issue with the 33-foot building height, which she described as excessive for the area. While she clarified that she is not against development or growth, she emphasized the need for it to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Birt suggested that two-story townhomes or, preferably, single-family homes would be a much better fit for the character of the area. She concluded by encouraging the developer to rethink the design to ensure that it better aligns with the existing residential environment and community expectations.

Chair Packer formally closed the public hearing portion of the meeting after seeing no additional comments from attendees. He then invited members of the Planning Commission to

begin their discussion and deliberation on the proposed rezone request for the property at 16 East 950 North.

Planning Commissioner Allred offered a response supporting the rezone request for the proposed 56-unit, 33-foot-tall townhome development at 16 East 950 North. Commissioner Allred shared personal experiences of watching Kaysville evolve, noting that although he had initially opposed development impacts—such as the West Davis Corridor—his concerns often did not materialize. In his professional view, he stated that anticipated negative outcomes like overcrowded schools, traffic hazards, and falling property values rarely occur at the scale people fear. He argued that residential development typically generates fewer traffic impacts than adjacent commercial uses and that similar housing projects elsewhere had not produced the harmful effects often expected.

He strongly emphasized the statewide housing crisis, referencing his work on a Governor's Housing Committee and explaining that Utah's housing affordability challenges are severe, with many residents priced out of the market. He stated that the proposed townhome development would not only help meet state mandates for moderate-income housing but was also appropriately located near a freeway and arterial road, aligning with the city's General Plan and long-range planning goals.

While Commissioner Allred acknowledged that the units may not be deeply affordable, he said they would still offer more accessible options than the surrounding single-family homes. He further defended the proposed building height, pointing out that single-family homes in the same area are allowed to be just as tall, and that a three-story structure is both practical and economically necessary to achieve needed density and unit quality.

Commissioner Allred concluded by reiterating that while the concerns of nearby residents are valid, city planning must prioritize long-term, regional needs, including housing supply and affordability. He announced his intent to recommend approval of the rezone based on its compliance with the General Plan, its thoughtful design, and the broader responsibility the city holds in addressing housing challenges.

Chair Packer shared his reflections on the proposed rezone and townhome development, emphasizing that, as a long-time Kaysville resident and active community member, he frequently considers how various properties throughout the city might be used or developed. While the project in question does not directly affect his own property, he acknowledged that the same kinds of concerns—about density, compatibility, and height—cross his mind with each development proposal, especially those close to residential neighborhoods.

Chair Packer addressed the concerns about building height, noting that the proposed 33-foot townhomes are consistent with what's already allowed in most residential zones in Kaysville. He observed that most two-story homes reach similar heights, much of which is due to steep rooflines. He also pointed out that three-story townhomes already exist in at least 14 locations throughout the city, and they generally do not stand out as jarring when placed near single-

family homes. Based on his observations, these kinds of developments tend to blend in more than anticipated.

Initially, Packer expressed some hesitation about losing commercial space, given Kaysville's limited supply. However, after reviewing the proposal and considering the project's proximity to two freeway interchanges and its placement along an arterial road, he acknowledged that this location makes sense for a medium-density residential development. He emphasized that 950 North is a short, direct connector between major transportation routes and would minimize the impact on existing residential neighborhoods, since traffic would not be routed through smaller local streets.

Ultimately, Chair Packer expressed support for the proposal, stating that while no development site is ever a "perfect fit," this one checks many important planning boxes. He said his position aligns closely with that of Commissioner Allred and that he was inclined to recommend approval based on the project's compatibility with planning principles, transportation infrastructure, and citywide housing needs.

Commissioner Shepard began by confirming with Ms. Greenwood that Kaysville's current height limit for residential buildings is 30 feet, while Commercial Zones allow up to 35 feet. Commissioner Shepard noted that even within the city's standard zoning, two-story homes often approach or reach the 30-foot height limit, especially when built with basements that elevate the first story several feet above ground. She referenced her own experience living in an older part of Kaysville where a flag lot home was built behind her, resulting in a two-story structure overlooking her backyard, something allowable under current code.

Commissioner Shepard explained that the proposed 33-foot townhomes in the Residential Multi Family development wouldn't necessarily appear taller than many modern single-family homes and could have reached similar heights even without the height exception—particularly if built with flat rather than pitched roofs. Commissioner Shepard pointed out that setbacks for this project were comparable to those allowed in traditional residential zones, meaning the spatial relationship to neighboring homes wouldn't differ drastically even if the development were single-family homes on smaller lots.

Commissioner Shepard acknowledged the public concern over height and density but said she didn't see the height as out of character, given city standards. She also emphasized that the location along the West Davis Corridor makes this parcel particularly suited for commercial or mixed-use development, and while the General Plan had designated it as commercial, the proposed townhome project still makes planning sense in the context of future growth and land use patterns.

Commissioner Shepard concluded by leaning in favor of the rezone, adding that traffic from the corridor will inevitably bring more development interest, and residential use may be a better fit than intense commercial.

Chair Mike Packer followed Commissioner Shepard's comments by reminding everyone that the Planning Commission only makes recommendations, and the final decision lies with the City Council, which takes a careful and thoughtful approach to all development proposals.

Commissioner Toller motioned to recommend approval of the rezone application for the property located at 16 east 950 North from Residential Agricultural to R-M Multiple Family Residential with a Planned Residential Unit Development overlay. Commissioner Allred seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay

Commissioner Toller: Yay

Commissioner Shepard: Yay

Commissioner Allred: Yay

The Planning Commission will revisit the LI (light industrial) zone request at their May 8, 2025 meeting, and if recommended for approval, both items will be scheduled for City Council consideration on June 5 to streamline the process and minimize repeat appearances for the applicant, Mr. Holland.

6- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM MARCH 13, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Allred made a motion to move the minutes to the May 8, 2025 agenda.

7- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 27, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Allred made a motion to move the minutes to the May 8, 2025 agenda.

8- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood provided an update on the Small Area Plan Open House held earlier in the week. She estimated that 50–60 people attended and noted the presence of a few younger families, which was encouraging. At the time of the report, 124 survey responses had been submitted online, which she described as excellent. Ms. Greenwood mentioned that the survey will remain open through mid-May, and outreach will continue through the city newsletter and internal staff channels to encourage more feedback. She also described the interactive project website, which allows users to leave comments and digital “sticky notes” directly on a map.

9- ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Allred motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:57 pm.