

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
June 26, 2025

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, June 26, 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 Wilf Sommerkorn, Megan Sevy, Debora Shepard and Katie Ellis

Planning Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Paul Allred and Erin Young

Staff Present: Melinda Greenwood and Anne McNamara

Public Attendees: City Councilmember Abbi Hunt, Jill Dredge, Randi Beckstrom, Reese Kearney, Dave Williams, Cindy Garlick, Joanne Williams, and Tim and Anna Crabb.

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 Chair Packer made a motion to move agenda item number three and place it after agenda item number five to wait for the applicant to arrive. There was no second to the motion and the motion failed.

3- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MAJOR B HOME OCCUPATION LOCATED AT 789 EAST 80 NORTH FOR OASIS CONSTRUCTION AND JAKE BURTON

Melinda Greenwood presented a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a Major Home Occupation B at 789 East 80 North. The application was submitted on behalf of Oasis Construction, a business specializing in prefabricated pool installations and general construction/renovation services.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the applicant, Mr. Burton, was not in attendance, but a business partner named Todd Merrill was present to represent the application and answer any questions. She clarified that Mr. Burton is the property owner and that all construction activities will occur off-site, with no clients or employees visiting the residence.

According to the application and staff report, materials will be delivered directly to job sites, not to the home. Equipment associated with the business includes a truck, a skid steer, a mini excavator, and two trailers, with some of it used out of state during the winter months. When stored on-site, the equipment will be kept in the backyard behind a gated fence, hidden from public view.

Ms. Greenwood added that Mr. Burton is in the process of obtaining his Division of Professional Licensing (DOPL) certification, and the city will not issue the business license until that licensure is confirmed. She concluded by stating that while the Commission has the discretion to delay

action due to the property owner's absence, the representative is available to address any concerns. If the Commission feels those concerns are satisfactorily addressed, they may proceed with a motion to approve.

Commissioner Shepard asked if staff had any concerns or comments from residents.

Ms. Greenwood said a public notice sign was placed on the property the previous Friday and no calls or public comments regarding the application had been received.

Commissioner Ellis made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a Major B Home Occupation for Oasis Construction, located at 789 East 80 North, submitted on behalf of Jake Burton. Commissioner Sevy seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Ellis: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Shepard: Yay

4- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR FARM ANIMALS LOCATED AT 336 SOUTH MARIE CIRCLE FOR RANDI BECKSTROM

Anne McNamara presented a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application submitted by Randi Backstrom for the keeping of farm animals (goats) on a residential property located in an R-1-20 zoning district, with a total area of 20,168 square feet. The permit request followed a code enforcement complaint received on May 20, 2025 which required the applicant to formally apply for the CUP, which was received on June 6.

Under city regulations, the lot size allows for up to three goats, with each goat requiring a minimum of 5,445 square feet. Ms. McNamara explained that the applicant's mitigation plan—addressing noise, odor, dust, and other potential nuisances—was submitted as required by city code and was deemed satisfactory by staff.

Additionally, city code requires that animal-related structures be placed at least 50 feet from neighboring dwellings. Following a site visit and discussion with the applicant, it was determined that existing fencing would need to be modified to meet this requirement. The applicant acknowledged this and intends to make the necessary adjustments.

Ms. McNamara noted that the current site conditions included three adult goats and seven baby goats, which are currently nursing, and clarified that baby goats are not counted toward the maximum number allowed because of the nursing. A public notice sign was placed on the property on June 20, 2025. Subsequently, two phone calls and three written comments from neighbors had been received, raising concerns largely related to past code violations and the potential for odor and noise.

Ms. McNamara referenced a prior code enforcement case in December 2023, when the property had a higher number of goats. Those animals were subsequently removed before the new complaint in May 2025. During a staff site visit earlier that day, no odor issues were detected, and the property appeared to be clean and well maintained.

Ms. McNamara concluded that the application meets all current code requirements, and while the Planning Commission may suggest additional mitigation measures, staff recommended approval of the CUP based on current findings and site conditions.

Ms. Greenwood provided additional context regarding CUPs to help clarify their purpose and legal framework, particularly for members of the public attending the meeting. She explained that under Utah law, conditional uses are considered permitted within the applicable zoning districts, such as residential zones in Kaysville. However, these uses may require reasonable conditions to mitigate potential negative impacts on surrounding properties or neighborhoods.

Ms. Greenwood emphasized that CUPs are not typically subject to outright denial unless specific legal grounds exist. The role of the Planning Commission is to determine whether reasonable mitigation can be applied, not to approve or reject the use itself based on subjective preference. For example, in this case, keeping farm animals is allowed if the property meets the minimum lot size required by city code.

Ms. Greenwood reiterated that baby animals (suckling offspring) are not counted toward the allowed number of animals. However, once weaned, they must be re-homed if their presence would cause the property to exceed the permitted animal count.

Lastly, Ms. Greenwood addressed the topic of public comment, noting that this matter is considered an administrative item, meaning it involves application of code rather than discretionary decision-making. Therefore, under the Planning Commission's bylaws, public comment is not typically allowed for such items. Nonetheless, due to the concerns raised by neighbors, she had encouraged written comments to be submitted through the city's contact form. These written comments were shared with the Planning Commission in advance and provided to the applicant.

Chair Mike Packer expressed appreciation to city staff for their work on the application and acknowledged the mitigation plan submitted by the applicant. He also thanked the neighbors who submitted written comments, stating that these communications are helpful and appreciated by the Commission. Chair Packer confirmed that all Commissioners had likely reviewed the submitted letters. He then asked whether it would be appropriate at this point in the meeting to hear directly from the applicant.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked staff whether the complaint was specifically about goats or if other animals were involved.

Ms. McNamara responded that while the original complaint may have mentioned other animals such as chickens or swine, staff observed only goats and chickens on the property during their recent site visit. She confirmed that the six chickens present are permitted under current city code without a CUP.

Ms. Greenwood added that chickens and other birds do not require a CUP, whereas farm animals like goats do.

Chair Packer clarified that there are limits for fowl, and Ms. McNamara explained that the code requires 500 square feet of yard space per chicken, which this property meets.

Ms. Greenwood explained that during a site visit earlier that day, staff measured the distance between the animal enclosure and the neighboring dwelling and found it to be approximately 17 feet. However, city code requires a minimum setback of 50 feet between any structure housing farm animals and adjacent dwellings. Staff advised the applicant, Ms. Beckstrom, that the fencing and animal pens would need to be moved an additional 33 feet to meet the setback requirement. Ms. Greenwood noted that due to the angled layout of the property, the fencing could be repositioned at an angle to achieve compliance on all sides. Ms. Beckstrom agreed to make the adjustments, and staff allowed her a few weeks to complete the relocation.

Commissioner Shepard asked whether the site would be re-inspected after the changes were made.

Ms. Greenwood responded that staff could either have the applicant submit photos showing that the fence had been relocated to meet the setback requirement or conduct another site visit to verify the changes in person.

Chair Packer invited the applicant to come to the podium to answer some questions. Randi Beckstrom identified herself as the applicant. Chair Packer then asked how long baby goats typically nurse (suckle) before being weaned, referencing the city's rule that only weaned animals count toward the total number of allowed animals under a conditional use permit.

Applicant Randi Beckstrom explained that she typically allows baby goats to nurse for about six months. To stay within the city's limit of three adult goats, she either sells adult goats and raises a baby to adulthood or sells the baby goats once they are weaned.

She addressed concerns raised by neighbors, particularly about a rodent problem, stating that the issue appears to stem from a neighboring shed that houses chickens and stores feed, which she believes attracts rats. Ms. Beckstrom emphasized that all grain on her property is stored in sealed trash bins inaccessible to rodents. She acknowledged the rats might be traveling between her hay shelter and the neighbor's chicken coop.

Additionally, she offered to submit letters of support from two adjacent neighbors who back her property. She also referenced her mitigation plan, noting her yard is graveled to control

dust, and while flies were initially an issue in her first year of keeping goats, she has remained in regular contact with neighbors to address any concerns. Ms. Beckstrom stated she has not recently received complaints from immediate neighbors.

Commissioner Sevy asked Randi Beckstrom about her experience with goats, to which Ms. Beckstrom responded that she began raising goats in 2020. When asked about a prior complaint, Ms. Beckstrom confirmed that after receiving it, she sold her goats due to a personal situation. There were no goats on the property for approximately six to eight months.

Ms. Beckstrom explained that her process of breeding and raising goats follows a typical cycle: dairy goats must be bred annually to produce milk, with breeding taking place in the fall and births occurring between February and April. The baby goats are usually weaned at six months.

Following Beckstrom's remarks, Chair Mike Packer addressed the Planning Commission, noting that public comment letters had been received and asking whether the Commission wished to open additional public comment or consider the submitted correspondence sufficient.

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to allow public comment regarding the conditional use permit application for the goats on Randi Beckstrom's property. Commissioner Shepard seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Reese Gurney, a neighbor who has lived in the area for 31 years, addressed the Planning Commission to express concern about being blamed for a rat issue related to the goat-keeping conditional use permit under consideration. He stated that the shed alleged to be attracting rats belongs to him and houses four bantam chickens. Their feed is stored in a locked container. Gurney said he had never seen rats in the area until recently, noting he had seen multiple rats running along the fence line and into the neighboring yard where hay is stored. He emphasized that he should not be held responsible for the rat problem. While acknowledging the odor and noise from the goats, especially the constant crying of baby goats—he stated he can tolerate those issues, but not rats, which he views as a serious health concern.

Dave Williams, the neighbor living directly adjacent to the applicant's property with only 17 feet separating their homes, voiced his support for the concerns previously raised by Reese Gurney.

Mr. Williams confirmed that, in the past, including when goats were previously on the property, there were no rat issues, only occasional mice. However, in the last three weeks, he and his household have encountered a significant rat problem, including finding two large rats and observing their family cat killing rats nightly. He emphasized the health concerns this poses, especially with grandchildren and dogs regularly present at his home. While he appreciates the applicant's effort to move fencing and plant trees for mitigation, he noted that trees will take years to have any effect and will not address the immediate rat issue.

Cindy Garlick, who operates a large dairy goat herd, addressed the Planning Commission to share her perspective and experience. She explained that in her case, rat problems began after

construction activity near her property disrupted the environment and pushed rodents into residential areas. She noted that chickens tend to produce a stronger odor than goats and spoke positively of Randi Beckstrom's efforts to maintain a clean and hygienic property and foster good relationships with neighbors. Ms. Garlick emphasized that Ms. Beckstrom's goat operation provides a valuable educational opportunity for her children and potentially for neighbors, teaching them about the origins of food and agricultural practices. She described similar outreach efforts on her own farm and encouraged the commission to allow Ms. Beckstrom to continue raising goats, while also working with neighbors to address and mitigate the rat issue, which she acknowledged as a legitimate and ongoing challenge.

Joy Burch, a resident living on the corner of Marie Circle and Lauder Drive, addressed the Planning Commission to express her concerns regarding the goat operation and disputed the claim that the applicant had maintained communication with neighbors, stating that general posts on Instagram do not constitute meaningful dialogue.

Ms. Burch voiced two main concerns: the persistent smell from the animals and the risk posed to her two small dogs by poisoned rats that had reportedly been found dead in nearby yards, including one that had entered her yard. She emphasized the potential danger of her pets encountering either bait or the poisoned rodents. Burch confirmed that the smell and crying of the animals are ongoing issues and noted that even from a distance, the noise can be heard through open windows. She also pointed out that the property houses more than just goats and chickens, including cats, rabbits, and at times, a turkey—essentially creating a small farm. Ms. Burch suggested that relocating the animal pens to another area of the yard, farther from neighboring homes, might alleviate many of the concerns being raised.

Joanne Williams, who lives 17 feet from the goat enclosure, spoke to the Planning Commission expressing strong concerns about the impact the animals have had on her home and quality of life. She stated there has been no meaningful communication from the applicant despite claims to the contrary. Ms. Williams said she eventually told the applicant directly that the situation had become too much. She described ongoing issues with persistent noise and odor, which prevent her and her family from opening windows or enjoying their backyard. Ms. Williams noted that it took her 31 years to make her backyard a comfortable, family-friendly space, but now her grandchildren comment on how bad it smells. She also emphasized that the presence of rats on the property poses a serious health and safety concern, especially for her young grandchildren who play outside.

Chair Packer reopened the Planning Commission discussion following the public comment period. He acknowledged the complexity of the issue, noting that it reflects a longstanding balance between individual property rights and the broader expectations of the community. Chair Packer reiterated that a CUP is legally allowed under city code, and while it comes with limitations, it is generally difficult for the city to deny outright.

Chair Packer emphasized that the CUP allows for the keeping of up to three goats (excluding suckling offspring) and requires compliance with mitigation standards related to odor, noise,

dust, pests, and rodents. While he recognized that such standards can be subjective and difficult to quantify, he underscored that granting the permit obligates the applicant to adhere to all outlined requirements. Chair Packer expressed sympathy for the concerns of the neighbors and noted the challenge in identifying specific sources for problems like rodents, which do not recognize property boundaries. Nonetheless, he concluded by saying the expectation would be full compliance with all city regulations if the permit were approved.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked staff to clarify what mitigation plan the applicant submitted to satisfy the conditional use permit requirements, specifically for controlling odor, dust, noise, pests (flies and rodents), and drainage.

Ms. McNamara responded that the applicant had included those details in their application. She confirmed that each required category was addressed and directed commissioners to page eight of the meeting packet, where the full plan could be reviewed.

Chair Packer acknowledged that health concerns raised by neighbors—particularly regarding children, pets, and rodent control—are valid, but emphasized that the Planning Commission is limited to evaluating whether the applicant is following the city's code and has submitted an adequate mitigation plan.

Commissioner Ellis explained that public comment is usually not part of administrative items like this one because it may suggest the Commission has broader authority than it does. If a use meets code, there is little room to deny it. She added that changing the code itself is the only real way to alter what is allowed.

Commissioner Sommerkorn agreed, stating that unless a use is completely impossible to mitigate, the Commission is obligated to approve it if a mitigation plan is submitted and deemed sufficient. In this case, the applicant did submit such a plan.

Chair Packer then asked what the consequences would be if the applicant—or any city resident—was found to be in violation of the code or not in compliance with the conditions of a conditional use permit.

Ms. Greenwood responded to Chair Packer's question about enforcement procedures when a property is found to be in violation of city code or conditional use permit conditions. She explained that code enforcement is one of the more difficult responsibilities the city manages. Typically, complaints come from neighbors who have reached a point of frustration after enduring an issue for some time. In many cases, the person in violation is unaware and may be upset, especially if the issue wasn't discussed directly by neighbors beforehand.

Regarding the process, Ms. Greenwood stated that city staff first conducts a site visit to verify the issue. For complaints involving odor, noise, or dust—which may not be detectable at the time of inspection—the city does its best but may not always observe the problem directly. In the case of the goat permit, she noted that staff spent approximately 20–25 minutes at the

property earlier that day and did not detect any odor, though she acknowledged that conditions may vary on other days.

If a violation is found, the city's first approach is to seek voluntary compliance, typically giving the property owner two weeks to make necessary corrections. These are tracked in the city's system, with a follow-up visit scheduled. If compliance is achieved, the case is closed. If not, another opportunity to comply is usually granted. If noncompliance persists, the matter may be escalated to the city attorney, potentially resulting in the revocation of the conditional use permit or even legal citation.

Ms. Greenwood emphasized that the city does not have the resources to conduct surveillance or monitor properties for extended periods, but it strives to address issues fairly and reasonably, using the legal system when necessary to enforce compliance.

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to approve the conditional use permit for Randi Beckstrom at 336 South Murray Circle to keep farm animals, based on findings that the applicant submitted a mitigation plan as required by city code and will be held accountable for compliance. He also recommended that city staff periodically monitor the property to ensure the mitigation measures are effective and adjust if necessary. Commissioner Deborah Shepard seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Ellis: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Shepard: Yay

5-STONEYBROOK COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARKING DETERMINATION AT 579 SOUTH MAIN STREET FOR ANNA CRABB

Ms. McNamara presented a unique item to the Planning Commission regarding a business license application submitted by Anna Crabb to operate a preschool and micro-education entity at 579 South Main Street in Kaysville. Since Kaysville City Code does not specify a required number of parking spaces for schools, it defers to the Planning Commission for determination. In response, staff conducted a comparative analysis of nearby municipalities' standards and found a general norm: one parking space per employee and one additional space per 5–6 children.

Based on this standard and given the applicant's proposal of a maximum of four employees and 26 students on site at any one time, staff suggested eight parking spaces as a reasonable requirement. The property currently offers approximately 11 designated parking spaces, along with a pull-through driveway that could accommodate 2–3 more vehicles, confirming adequate parking availability.

Staff also acknowledged a recent amendment to Utah State Code that prohibits municipalities

from requiring excessive parking for micro-education facilities. While Kaysville's code lacks a specific metric to define "excessive," staff believes the proposed parking requirement aligns with state standards and does not represent an overreach.

The applicant also submitted details about staggered student drop-off and pickup schedules to reduce traffic congestion. The site is zoned Professional Business, which normally requires a 20-foot setback from residential uses. However, the applicant qualifies for an exception in the code by providing landscaped buffering between the business and adjacent homes. A site plan has been submitted demonstrating that vehicle and pedestrian traffic will not be impeded.

Ms. McNamara concluded that the existing conditions and proposed operations are sufficient to meet zoning and safety requirements, and they recommend that the Planning Commission approve the proposed parking allocation. The applicant was present to answer any questions.

Chair Packer commended Ms. McNamara for her thorough and well-prepared staff report regarding the parking requirements for the proposed preschool and micro-education entity at 579 South Main Street. He noted that her research and clarity made it difficult to raise any questions, as she had already addressed relevant points, including code interpretation and comparisons with neighboring cities.

Commissioner Sommerkorn echoed the praise and highlighted how this situation illustrated the strengths of the city's zoning code, despite its occasional need for clarification in unique cases.

Ms. Greenwood acknowledged that situations like this underscore the importance of continually refining the city's land use code and explained that she had discussed with the applicant the need to research reasonable benchmarks since the code leaves the parking requirement for schools up to Planning Commission discretion.

Commissioner Shepard asked whether street parking is allowed on Main Street near the proposed preschool and micro-education entity.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that parking is generally permitted on the public right-of-way along Main Street, with no specific restrictions aside from standard city regulations. She noted that large vehicles, like semis, are technically not supposed to park there, but this occasionally occurs, especially near the assisted living facility further south. Parking enforcement, she clarified, falls under the police department, as city staff are not authorized to enforce parking regulations. Greenwood also mentioned that vehicles can park on public streets for up to 48 hours before needing to be moved.

Ms. Greenwood then commended the applicant, Anna Crabb, for her exceptional thoroughness and responsiveness, noting how quickly she provided detailed exhibits, including diagrams showing vehicle flow. She explained that the property has had difficulty finding a suitable user due to its small size and unique location. Ms. Greenwood stated that a preschool and micro-education use seems like an ideal fit, as it is compatible with the property's layout and less

intense than other commercial uses.

Commissioner Ellis made the motion to approve the Stoneybrook Community School Parking determination at 579 South Main Street and Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Ellis: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Shepard: Yay

6- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 12, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to approve the minutes and Commissioner Ellis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

7- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood provided several important updates to the Planning Commission:

1. **City Center Visioning Project:** The consultant team will host another public engagement event during the Kaysville City Fourth of July breakfast. Social media will promote this effort. A follow-up survey is expected in August, with another public open house in August or September. Ms. Greenwood noted that the process is shifting from gathering baseline data (like utilities and market analysis) to the more complex phase of crafting a vision for the city center based on community input. She praised the performance of GSB and their sub-consultants.
2. **July Planning Commission Schedule:** Only one meeting will be held in July, on the 10th, due to the state holiday on July 24th.
3. **Upcoming Rezone Application – Presbyterian Church Site:** An application has been submitted to rezone the former Presbyterian Church property to Mixed Use. Developer Jake Williams plans to preserve the existing church building and develop live/work townhomes with potential ground-floor commercial space. Staff anticipates a public hearing at the August 14 Planning Commission meeting.
4. **General Plan Amendment – Water Conservation Element:** A state mandate requires municipalities to include a water conservation component in their general plans by the end of the year. Kaysville will contract again with GSB for this addition, given their ongoing work with the city. The update is expected to come before the Planning Commission in the fall.
5. **Subdivision Code Amendments Approved:** The City Council has adopted the Planning Commission's recommended amendments to subdivision regulations, including renaming "lot line adjustments" to "boundary line adjustments" per state direction. Updates to stormwater standards were also approved.
6. **Upcoming Development – Symphony and Ivory Homes:** A large rezone application has been submitted by Symphony Homes and Ivory Homes for approximately 52 acres just

south of Sunset Equestrian Estates. Not all adjacent properties are participating—10 to 12 acres will remain excluded—but the applicants propose a total of 300 residential units, including:

- Large single-family homes on the northern portion.
- Smaller single-family lots (6,000–8,000 sq ft).
- Approximately 100 townhomes.

A development agreement will be required. Staff and utility providers recently held a coordination meeting, and further vetting is needed before bringing the proposal to the Commission, likely in August.

7. **July 10 Meeting Agenda – Election of a New Chair:** As required in Article III, Paragraph 1 of the Commission’s rules, a new Planning Commission chair will be elected at the first July meeting. Commissioners were humorously reminded that if absent, they risk being nominated by default.

8. **Planning Commission Membership Updates:**

- Paul Toler, formerly an alternate, has been moved to a full commissioner seat.
- Interviews were recently conducted for a new alternate to fill Toler’s vacancy. The mayor has not yet finalized the appointment.
- Deborah Shepard has expressed a willingness to serve again but is unable to due to personal scheduling.
- Ms. Greenwood noted the high interest from the community in serving on the Planning Commission, with 9–10 applicants and even a last-minute call from a hopeful candidate after the deadline.

8- ADJOURNMENT

Chair Packer adjourned the meeting at 8:12 pm.