

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
June 12, 2025

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, June 12, 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 Erin Young, Wilf Sommerkorn, Rachel Lott, Paul Allred, and Megan Sevy

Mayor and City Council Members in Attendance: Mayor Tamra Tran, Council Members John Adams, Mike Blackham, Abbi Hunt, and Nate Jackson

Planning Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Katie Ellis

Staff Present: Melinda Greenwood, Anne McNamara, and Mindi Edstrom. Staff from GSBS Liz Jackson, Shawn Hill, and Praviz Faiz

Public Attendees: Laurene Starkey, Val Starkey, Josh McBride, Rich Shaw, Ethan Hipwell, Jill Dredge, and Numon Pacmures

1- WELCOME AND MEETING ORDER

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

2- DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest, however Commissioner Lott made a motion to approve the minutes from May 22, 2025 before item three. Commissioner Allred seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

3- CONDITONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MAJOR B HOME OCCUPATION FOR HIPWELL CONSTRUCTION AND LANDSCAPING LOCATED AT 276 WEST GREENBELT CIRCLE

Mindi Edstrom presented the Conditional Use Permit for a Major B Home Occupation located at 273 West Greenbelt Circle. The application was submitted by Ethan Hipwell for his business, Hipwell Construction and Landscaping.

Mr. Hipwell recently moved back to the area and promptly submitted both his business license application and Conditional Use Permit request. The business involves general landscaping work and, in accordance with city code, requires a Conditional Use Permit due to its classification as a construction-related home occupation within a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Edstrom shared that the residence would serve solely as the base of operations; there will be no employees reporting to the home; no customers will visit the site; and all materials will be delivered directly to off-site job locations. Mr. Hipwell does not own heavy equipment, and only hand tools will be stored at the residence.

Ms. Edstrom reported that the business is expected to have no adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

A public notice sign was posted at the property as required. The only inquiry received regarding the sign came from the applicant and his spouse, who were unaware of its purpose after returning from out of

town. No other public comment or concern was recorded.

Based on the information provided, staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit. The applicant was present at the meeting and available to respond to questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Allred made a motion. Commissioner Lott seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Lott: Yay
Commissioner Allred: Yay

4- PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE INITIAL FINDINGS FOR THE KAYSVILLE CITY CENTER SMALL AREA PLAN

At a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council, Liz Jackson of GSBS Consulting presented an extensive update on the Kaysville City Center Small Area Plan. She emphasized that the purpose of the meeting was to transition from the learning phase of the project into the visioning phase, following the completion of initial data collection and analysis.

The Small Area Plan initiative stems from the 2022 General Plan update, which identified the city center as a planning priority. Funded by a grant from the Wasatch Front Regional Council, the plan aims to define a vision and implementation strategy for the city center through community input, existing conditions analysis, and stakeholder collaboration. The planning area includes specific focus zones: Historic Main Street, Main Street North, Mutton Hollow, Flint Street, and Deseret Drive.

Ms. Jackson summarized the first phase of the project, which involved community engagement through an open house, event tabling, stakeholder interviews, and a project website. Notably, the survey yielded 520 responses, a strong showing by comparison to typical engagement metrics. Public input revealed key community values such as preserving Kaysville's historic character, improving pedestrian safety, and enhancing the local business environment, while also expressing concerns about traffic, high-density development, and poor walkability in certain areas.

Detailed findings by neighborhood were also presented:

- Historic Main Street: Widely visited and valued for its charm and dining options but lacking in walkability and safety. Residents supported preservation efforts and expressed concern over limited regulatory protections for historic structures.
- Main Street North: Seen as a priority for revitalization, with calls for streetscape enhancements, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and better integration with Historic Main Street.
- Mutton Hollow: Perceived as functional and less visited. Concerns centered on traffic and development pressure. While there were some calls for gathering spaces and trails, there was caution against overdevelopment.
- Flint Street Area: Praised for existing recreational amenities and community uses but marked by connectivity issues and traffic challenges. Suggestions included bike lanes, improved crossings, and more event-oriented community spaces.

- Deseret Drive: Characterized by low visitation and perceived as unsafe and visually unappealing. Primary concerns included traffic speed, aesthetics, and lack of amenities, although there was notable interest in preserving the Deseret Mill and Pasta facility.

The consulting team proposed narrowing the plan’s focus to three core sub-areas—Historic Main Street, Main Street North, and Mutton Hollow—due to their stronger potential as cultural, economic, and housing centers. They also identified six primary planning priorities moving forward:

- Support a broader mix of housing options, balanced with the need to preserve agricultural land and manage density concerns.
- Enhance historic preservation, cultural identity, and support for small businesses.
- Improve streetscape conditions and pedestrian accessibility, particularly on Main Street and 200 North.
- Address infrastructure needs, including aging stormwater and utility systems.
- Create redevelopment scenarios that balance community input with market feasibility.
- Evaluate and address safety and traffic concerns in ways that do not compromise the area’s character.

Ms. Jackson reiterated that although many residents expressed a desire to “leave things alone,” others clearly supported strategic improvements. She noted the inherent tension between preserving the existing community fabric and introducing upgrades, which would need to be carefully balanced in the visioning phase.

Looking ahead, Phase 2 of the plan will include another round of outreach—an updated website, new survey in mid-July, stakeholder meetings, a Fourth of July event booth, and a public visioning workshop. The planning team will present development scenarios with visual examples to help clarify what different forms of growth could look like.

Ms. Jackson concluded by posing several open-ended questions to the Planning Commission and City Council, seeking their input on whether the findings reflected their experiences, what might be missing from the data, and how best to navigate contradictory community feedback, especially around housing, density, traffic, and preservation. She invited Commissioners and Council Members to participate in a brainstorming session to help shape the plan’s evolving vision and goals.

Mayor Tran asked the consultants to go back to the second main takeaway about housing. She said the community has shared mixed feelings—some people want more housing options, others don’t. One big concern she’s heard is that the city might allow tall, multi-story housing along Main Street, which many residents don’t want. She clarified that this wasn’t the city’s plan and asked if the survey data showed people want that type of housing. She said it’s important to understand what residents really want, not just what they’re worried it might happen.

Ms. Jackson explained that most of the housing around the city center is single-family homes, and the city center could be a place to try different housing types. She said the idea of adding housing in the center came from the survey responses, but people are clearly concerned about too much density. To address that, they’re looking into smaller, low-scale housing options like patio or courtyard homes, not large buildings. The plan is to show these ideas to the public and get their feedback.

City Manager, Jaysen Christensen followed up on the earlier discussion by asking for clarification on one

of the key survey findings—specifically the comment about some residents wanting to "leave it alone." He asked whether that sentiment meant people were happy with how things currently are and didn't want physical changes, or if it reflected a deeper concern about government involvement or control over how properties in the area are developed or used. His question aimed to better understand the motivation behind the resistance to change.

Ms. Jackson responded by saying the City Manager's question was a good one and acknowledged that the "leave it alone" feedback seems to have multiple meanings. Some survey comments simply said, "leave it alone," while others expressed concerns about how tax dollars are spent, a desire to preserve Kaysville's small-town feel, or satisfaction with how things are now.

She noted that many of these comments came from residents who have lived in Kaysville for over 10 years and like it the way it is. At the same time, other feedback called for improvements, such as better connectivity, more local businesses, and new community options. Ms. Jackson concluded that the sentiment is mixed and could reflect either a resistance to physical changes or hesitation about government-led planning, or both.

Council Member Hunt asked several questions to better understand the planning concepts presented and how they relate to community concerns.

First, she circled back to the earlier housing discussion, asking what was meant by the comment that residents want a "mix of housing to meet different needs." Ms. Jackson clarified that this sentiment primarily referred to a desire for more housing variety, especially smaller homes like patio homes, and housing suitable for all ages. The feedback reflects concern about rising home prices in Kaysville, especially in the city center, and the desire for housing options that allow young families or older residents to remain in the community. Ms. Jackson emphasized that this desire does not translate into support for high-density apartments, but rather for smaller, detached housing types that fit within the existing neighborhood character.

Next, Council Member Hunt asked for clarification on the term "traffic calming." Ms. Jackson explained that it includes a wide range of strategies such as landscaping, bulb-outs, signage, flashing crosswalk lights, striping, and other design elements that visually or physically encourage slower driving. She noted that Main Street is a particular concern, and there is strong public feedback to maintain current traffic volumes and lane configurations. Ms. Jackson said that future engagement—like surveys—could include visual examples of these options to gather more precise feedback.

Council Member Hunt then asked if, in the next phase, residents could be presented with options that include no change or only small changes, rather than feeling forced to choose between large redevelopment scenarios. Jackson confirmed that this approach is common in their work. They typically present low, medium, and high-impact scenarios so the community can respond to a range of possibilities, rather than just drastic proposals.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the term "gentle density" means smaller housing types like twin homes, triplexes, or fourplexes that still look like regular houses. This can be a good way to offer more housing without changing the feel of Kaysville neighborhoods. She said people often misunderstand what "density" means, and many fear the city wants to build big apartment buildings—which is not the plan.

As the city moves into the next phase of planning, Ms. Greenwood said the focus will be on getting clear

feedback from residents about what kinds of homes and changes they want.

She also listed three main things to work on:

- Help people understand what “density” really means, so there’s no confusion or fear.
- Find out what type of historic preservation people care about.
- Keep working on traffic issues but be honest about what the city can and can’t do—like not being able to put speed bumps on some roads used by emergency vehicles.

She said it's important to give people real options that are possible, not ideas that might raise false hopes.

Commissioner Lott added to the discussion by emphasizing the importance of educating the public during the next phase of the planning process. She pointed out that while gathering input is essential, the city also needs to share key information—especially about issues like “gentle density” and state requirements tied to UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) funding.

She explained that many residents oppose high-density housing without realizing that if the city doesn’t meet certain state criteria, it could lose UDOT funding. When she explains this to her neighbors, they’re often surprised. Commissioner Lott stressed that the city can either make informed decisions now, or risk having those decisions made for them later by outside agencies.

Ms. Jackson agreed and said that the upcoming visioning phase will allow for more of this kind of two-way communication. In addition to gathering feedback, the team will work on clearly explaining what different terms mean, what the city is considering, and why certain choices are necessary, especially when influenced by outside requirements.

Commissioner Allred shared that Kaysville needs to be more open to change, especially in the city center. He said if the city keeps doing things the same way, it will miss the chance to grow in smart, helpful ways.

He explained that to make downtown more active and successful, more people need to live nearby—which means allowing more types of housing, not just large single-family homes. He gave examples from other cities where more housing helped support local businesses.

Commissioner Allred also talked about parking. He said having too much parking can ruin the charm of an area but having too little causes problems too. The key is finding a good balance.

Council Member Jackson said some residents are worried the city might tear down buildings on Historic Main Street and build high-rise apartments, but he made it clear that this is not the city’s plan and that this message needs to be communicated better.

He mentioned that there are old, run-down apartments behind Main Street that could be good for redevelopment. He suggested involving the property owners in conversations about the city’s vision and seeing if there’s interest in rebuilding—but in a way that respects the historic character and keeps building height reasonable due to parking limits.

He also said he’s not sure what tools or resources the City Council or Planning Commission can use to share this vision effectively and asked for help with that.

Finally, he agreed with Council Member Adams that the Mutton Hollow area is likely better suited for commercial or mixed-use development rather than housing.

Planning Commission Chair Packer shared his support for the work done so far on the City Center Small Area Plan and the direction the project is heading. He said he feels confident because the final decisions will be made by the people of Kaysville, not by outside groups. He noted that many residents seem to worry that outsiders will decide what happens in the city, but he wants the public to understand that local leaders who live in the community—will be making those decisions.

Chair Packer emphasized the importance of clear communication, especially about what is and isn't allowed under current city code. He pointed out that many of the things people are concerned about aren't even possible right now because of existing height limits and zoning restrictions.

He also mentioned the need to clarify terms like “traffic calming,” since that could mean many different things—some of which people might support, and others they might not. Chair Packer said he sees the planning process as a gentle guide rather than a forceful push, and he appreciates the thoughtful, collaborative approach being taken.

He ended by expressing his love for Kaysville and support for the comments made by others during the meeting.

Ms. Jackson asked the Planning Commission, City Council, and Mayor if they were comfortable focusing the City Center Small Area Plan on just three neighborhoods moving forward: Historic Main Street, Main Street North, and Mutton Hollow. She explained this was a key decision point—whether to narrow the focus or continue including Flint Street and Deseret Drive in the study.

Chair Packer said he was comfortable with focusing on the three eastern neighborhoods, noting that it doesn't mean the other areas are being ignored, it just means the consultants will concentrate their efforts where there's the most opportunity and feedback. The city can still address Flint and Deseret separately in the future.

Commissioner Sevy then asked a question about business and retail space, wondering if the plan includes office space or if it's just focused on shops and restaurants. Ms. Jackson responded that most of the public feedback so far has leaned toward local retail and dining experiences, but she agreed that office space should be considered as well.

Commissioner Sevy mentioned that she knew of a business that had looked for office space in Kaysville but had to move to Farmington instead, noting that the Mutton Hollow area might be a good location for that type of development.

Ms. Jackson agreed and added that their market analysis includes some baseline data for office demand. She said they plan to look more closely at what types of spaces are actually available in Kaysville, since the city is largely built out, and to include office space as part of their future analysis.

Ms. Jackson closed the discussion by thanking everyone for their feedback and guidance, saying it had brought valuable clarity to the planning team. She outlined the next steps in the City Center Small Area Plan process:

- The project website will be updated with information from this meeting and a summary of

Phase One findings, so the public stays informed.

- The team will now move into Phase Two, which focuses on visioning and creating draft recommendations based on what has been learned.

Ms. Jackson emphasized that the planning team will continue to lean on the City Council, Planning Commission, and Mayor to help share accurate information with the community and encourage continued input. She said they would also work on creating clear messaging tools to explain:

- What the city is and isn't planning
- What options are being suggested
- What certain terms (like "density" or "traffic calming") really mean

She said they'll reach out to gather input on how best to communicate these ideas and thanked everyone again for their support and involvement.

5- ADJOURNMENT

Chair Packer adjourned the meeting at 8:14 pm.