

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
August 14, 2025

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, August 14, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in the Kaysville City Hall located at 23 East Center Street.

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chair Mike Packer, Commissioners Wilf Sommerkorn, Erin Young, David Moore, Rachel Lott and Paul Toller

Planning Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Paul Allred and Katie Ellis

Public Attendees: City Councilmember Abbi Hunt, Paul Stenquist, Austin Ested, Tucker Hunsaker, Gary McBride, Josh McBride, Maggie McBride, Val Starkey, J&J Clarkson, Mailyn Schenks, Jentri Williams, Jake Williams, McKenzie Randall, Andrew Lloyd, Maureen Laser, Bruce Laser, Rayne Moore, Cutler Moore, Jane Dunford, Liz Sanders Marsha Cook, Lisa Jacobsen, Cindy Woodward, Scott Woodward, Jill Dredge, Emma West, Michael Larsen, Jenny Meese, Matt Meese, Mike Bryant, John McCleary, Pam Hunsaker, Darlene Davis, Doug Dredge, Judy Ure, Tom Kerr, Cindy Kerr, Treva Hacking, Nephi Harvey, Lori Noorlander, and Max Patterson

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.

3- OATH OF OFFICE FOR PLANNING COMMISSIONER DAVID MOORE

Ms. Edstrom swore in David Moore as a Planning Commissioner Alternate.

4- ELECTION OF A NEW PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Commissioner Sommerkorn nominated Michael Packer to be the new Commission Chair and Commissioner Lott seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Lott: Yay

Due to several Commissioners not being in attendance it was decided to elect a vice-chair at the next meeting.

5- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR AN INSTRUCTIONAL HOME OCCUPATION FOR HUNSAKER SWIMMING LOCATED AT 41 SOUTH 100 EAST FOR TUCKER HUNSAKER

Ms. Edstrom presented the Conditional Use Permit for an Instructional Home Occupation for

Tucker Hunsaker. Mr. Hunsaker just purchased the home at 41 South 100 East and is putting in a swimming pool in the back yard so that he can teach swim lessons. Hunsaker Swimming has five pools within the community, and they are adding one more due to the demand throughout the community. The pool is in the construction phase, and they have a building permit with the city.

Swim instruction will be scheduled between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., with intermittent breaks throughout the day. Daily instruction is expected to range between 2 and 8 hours per day. All lessons are conducted one-on-one, lasting 20 minutes each. During the 10 peak weeks of summer, up to five students may be scheduled daily, and 1 to 4 instructors may be present on-site.

Patron parking will be available along Center Street and in front of Kaysville Elementary. Although adjacent neighbors have offered the use of curbside parking along the applicant's property, that space will be reserved primarily for short-term drop-offs to limit neighborhood impact.

In keeping with the practices at other Hunsaker Swim School locations, employee parking will be designated in more remote or out-of-the-way areas to preserve closer parking for clients. This allows clients, who are typically on-site for shorter durations, easier access and helps maintain orderly traffic flow and minimize disruption.

Ms. Edstrom stated a Public Notice Sign was placed on the property the previous Friday and that no comments had been received.

Mr. Hunsaker said he communicated with all adjacent property owners and those potentially affected by parking. According to the applicant, neighbors have expressed their awareness and support of the proposed business.

The Commissioners asked about the pool having a fence for safety and Mr. Hunsaker said that he is removing the existing chain link fence and putting in a vinyl fence. He also said that a fence is required by the city code for swimming pools.

Commissioner Lott made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for an Instructional Home Occupation for Tucker Hunsaker located at 41 South 100 East for Hunsaker Swimming. Commissioner Young seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Lott: Yay

6- PUBLIC HEARING FOR A REZONE REQUEST FOR 80 EAST CENTER STREET FROM A-1 LIGHT AGRICULTURAL TO CC CENTRAL COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED-USE OVERLAY

Anne McNamara presented a proposed rezone application, explaining its consistency with the 2022 General Plan. As part of the standard review process, she assessed the application against the five guiding principles outlined in the General Plan. Of these, two were found to be applicable. The first guiding principle, “Enriching the City Center and Downtown,” is supported by the project’s location in the city center and its proposed mixed-use format, which includes both commercial storefronts and new housing types. Ms. McNamara determined this combination supports the city’s vision of a vibrant and integrated downtown area. The second applicable principle, “Provide Diverse Housing Options,” is addressed by the inclusion of live-work town homes in the project. These units offer an alternative housing type to the area’s prevailing single-family homes. If approved, the proposed development would facilitate the preservation of a historic church on the property, further aligning with the city’s goals.

Ms. McNamara then reviewed the application in the context of three specific chapters of the General Plan. Chapter One, “Land Use and Placemaking,” contains two goals relevant to the project. Goal 2 encourages making the Kaysville city center distinct and identifiable from surrounding areas. Supporting objectives include the creation of a distinct city center that expands beyond the historic core (Objective 2.2), and the careful integration of new development with existing uses and neighborhoods (Objective 2.3). The latter includes an implementation measure calling for the protection of historic structures to maintain the character of the city center. Additionally, Goal 8 under this chapter promotes providing a range of housing options and price points to ensure that Kaysville remains an affordable place to live.

Chapter Three, “Housing and Neighborhoods,” was also discussed, with Ms. McNamara emphasizing its increased relevance due to the 2022 General Plan update, which incorporated state mandates for moderate-income housing. She indicated this chapter should be weighted more heavily when evaluating applicable projects because the State evaluates a city’s compliance based on annual reports they are required to submit. Under this chapter, Goal 1 calls for a full range of housing opportunities that meet the economic, lifestyle, and lifecycle needs of residents. Objective 1.1 supports rezoning to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing, while Objective 1.4 advocates for zoning or rezoning to allow higher-density or moderate-income residential development within Commercial or Mixed-Use zones. Both objectives were found to align with the proposed project.

Finally, Ms. McNamara addressed Chapter Five, “Economic Development and Prosperity.” Goal 1 in this chapter calls for promoting the redevelopment of the Kaysville city center to strengthen commercial areas. Relevant objectives include encouraging greater residential density in the city center to improve economic capture rates and prioritizing small-scale, locally oriented services to meet public needs and stimulate local economic growth. The proposed project’s inclusion of both housing and commercial components was seen as supportive of these objectives.

In addition to reviewing the application's alignment with the General Plan, Ms. McNamara discussed the applicant's request for a Mixed-Use Zoning District Overlay. This overlay requires a Development Agreement at the time of application and sets out base project standards while allowing for variations to accommodate unique characteristics. The applicant is requesting two such variations. First, while the code requires that 30% of the combined square footage of all buildings be allocated to commercial uses (per Section 17-27-3), the applicant is requesting a reduction to 15% commercial square footage. Second, the code limits building height to 30 feet for structures located within 50 feet of a residential dwelling unless separated by a public road. Two of the proposed townhome units would exceed this height limitation and are close enough to an adjacent residential parcel that the standard would not be met unless changes are made to the design. Ms. McNamara noted this height variation as a potential topic for further discussion among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Toller raised a question regarding building height limitations within the Mixed-Use Zone. He sought clarification on whether a parapet wall, used to screen rooftop mechanical equipment, would be considered within the height limit. In response, Ms. McNamara explained that the base building height limit in the Mixed-Use zone is 35 feet; however, variations are allowed for architectural features such as roof peaks. It was confirmed that while most buildings in the proposed project will be approximately 34 feet in height, only two specific units exceed the 30 foot height threshold in a way that may conflict with code due to their proximity to adjacent residential parcels.

Ms. McNamara clarified that the issue arises from these two southernmost units, which are near a neighboring twin home or duplex. These two units would surpass the allowable height by approximately four feet and would not qualify for the general exception provisions related to parapet walls because the concern is based on proximity to an adjacent dwelling. The other units on the site do not pose this issue because they are not located close enough to other residential parcels to trigger the height restriction.

Commissioner Toller acknowledged the clarification and confirmed that only the two southern units were of concern. Ms. Greenwood noted that the city's existing height exception provisions specifically exclude parapet walls from being counted, reaffirming that the height concern lies solely with those two residential structures.

Ms. Greenwood continued the presentation by discussing the traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. She explained that under the requirements of the Mixed-Use Zone, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is mandatory for developments of this nature. Ms. Greenwood clarified a common public misconception, noting that a traffic study does not determine whether a project may proceed or not. Instead, the TIA evaluates changes in the Level of Service (LOS) on nearby roads and intersections. LOS is a traffic engineering measure that grades roadway efficiency on a scale from A to F, where "A" indicates free-flowing traffic conditions, like those found on rural roads with minimal congestion, and "F" represents heavily congested or gridlocked conditions.

Ms. Greenwood presented a graphic to illustrate this LOS scale and explained that LOS reflects convenience and delay time rather than road safety or legality of the project. According to the submitted traffic analysis, the intersections reviewed specifically, Center Street and Main Street and Center Street and 100 East, are currently operating at a LOS of A, and the analysis concluded they would continue to operate at LOS A after the project is fully built. Ms. Greenwood stated that both the City Engineer and the Public Works Director, who is also a licensed engineer, reviewed the findings and expressed no concerns about the project's impact on traffic.

As for mitigation measures, the only recommendation in the traffic study was to ensure that the primary ingress and egress point on 100 East be clearly signed to support proper circulation. Ms. Greenwood reiterated that there was no anticipated traffic issues based on the analysis.

Ms. Greenwood concluded her remarks with a brief educational explanation for the public regarding residential density classifications. She displayed a graphic showing low, medium, and high-density housing types. Low density typically refers to single-family residential homes. Medium density, which applies to the proposed project, includes town homes and similar dwellings. High density is associated with larger-scale developments such as multi-story apartment complexes.

Ms. McNamara resumed the presentation to introduce the visual renderings submitted by the applicant to help illustrate the design intent of the proposed project. She explained that the first two slides featured images reflecting the aesthetic inspiration for the town homes, showcasing the architectural style and design elements the applicant hopes to emulate. Subsequent slides included proposed elevations and architectural renderings, offering a more concrete depiction of the planned structures. These visual materials included a streetscape rendering, front elevations, and a black-and-white elevation drawing intended to provide a more technical perspective on the expected final appearance of the project.

Ms. McNamara then transitioned into a summary of the staff's findings and recommendation. She reiterated that the project aligns with two of the guiding principles in the General Plan and is supported by various goals, policies, objectives, and implementation measures found in Chapters One (Land Use and Placemaking), Three (Housing and Neighborhoods), and Five (Economic Development and Prosperity). The proposal includes the construction of 27 new housing units, which would contribute positively to the city's compliance with state moderate-income housing reporting requirements, specifically in the upcoming 2026 reporting period. Additionally, Ms. McNamara highlighted that the site's proximity to a bus stop on Main Street qualifies the project for a transit-based parking reduction, further supporting its alignment with the city's moderate-income housing goals. From a design standpoint, the project is not expected to negatively affect the character of the area. It introduces a diversified housing product to the city center and preserves a significant historic building; a church located on the site. The applicant plans to restore and adapt the church for continued use as a single-family residence, preserving both its form and function in a meaningful way.

Finally, Ms. McNamara determined that the project is compliant with the Mixed-Use Zoning Overlay, and that the adoption of the accompanying development agreement would ensure the project could proceed as presented. Based on these findings, staff formally recommended approval of the project, urging the Planning Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the proposed rezone of 80 East Center Street from A-1 (Light Agriculture) to CC (Central Commercial) with a Mixed-Use Overlay, citing strong consistency with the General Plan.

Chair Packer invited the applicant to come up to answer any questions the Commissioners have.

Jake Williams, the applicant for the proposed rezone and development, addressed the Planning Commission to provide personal context and insight into the project's origin, intent, and values. He began by thanking the Planning Commission and staff for their service and support throughout the process.

Mr. Williams shared that he is a longtime resident of Kaysville, born and raised in the city, and described the proposal as a "Yes In My Backyard" project, noting that his family intends to live in the development rather than act as traditional absentee developers. He explained that the idea initially made his wife nervous, as it involved town homes, but through conversations, site tours, and a detailed review of the city's General Plan, they both grew enthusiastic about how the project could contribute to the revitalization of Main Street and the broader vision for the city center.

Mr. Williams described how the couple became interested in preserving a historic church on the property and how a chance visit to the property led to a relationship with the Harvey and Parish families, who have owned the church for nearly 100 years. He explained that the families had not profited from the property, instead renting it out to various churches over the years. Mr. Williams expressed appreciation for the trust placed in him by the property owner, Rebecca, to carry out a redevelopment that would respect the site's historical legacy. He noted that while she could not attend the meeting, the project was deeply personal for her as well, especially given her current responsibilities caring for her aging father and the recent loss of her mother.

The applicant outlined two primary goals guiding the proposal: preserving the historic church and maximizing land value for the longtime owners in a way that would allow them to benefit meaningfully. He acknowledged that the project involves significant change and may not receive unanimous public support but emphasized the intention to balance competing priorities thoughtfully and responsibly.

Mr. Williams also touched on specific aspects of the project that relate to the city code and the General Plan. He noted that the request for a height exception stems from a conflict between Mixed-Use Zoning requirements: while the Commercial Zone calls for 12-foot ceilings on the main floor, this raises the overall building height, thereby complicating compliance with the 30-

foot height restriction near residential parcels. He expressed openness to potential compromises, including limiting commercial space on certain units near existing homes to lower building height in those areas. However, he advocated for retaining ground-floor commercial elements in units facing Center Street and Zions Bank, where visibility and walkability support the city's goals for the downtown area.

Mr. Williams affirmed that a third-party traffic study had been conducted and submitted with the application, and that the project would limit residential parking to on-site spaces only to reduce impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. He added that some on-street parking on Center Street could be used for daytime visitors to the small-scale commercial units, which are generally envisioned as home offices or boutique businesses, rather than large retail shops. He emphasized the walkability of the area and explained that their intention is to create a neighborhood where future residents, like his own family, can walk to nearby schools and shops, thereby limiting vehicle traffic.

Throughout his remarks, Mr. Williams reinforced that the project was designed with specific goals from the General Plan in mind, including preserving historic character, supporting small-scale commercial uses, and introducing diverse housing options. He concluded by acknowledging that not all residents would agree with the proposal but expressed hope that the Commission could recognize the effort to create a thoughtful, community-centered project that honors the past and contributes meaningfully to Kaysville's future. He offered to answer any additional questions the Commission might have.

Commissioner Sommerkorn initiated a discussion about the location and accessibility of the proposed commercial units within the development. He asked whether the commercial space would be located on the ground floor of all townhome units.

Mr. Williams confirmed that the current proposal includes commercial space on the ground floor throughout but explained that it is subject to refinement. He acknowledged that balancing the 30% commercial space requirement set by code has been a challenge, especially given that the percentage is calculated based on the total gross square footage of all buildings, including upper floors. This makes achieving the required commercial proportion difficult, particularly in a primarily residential project.

Mr. Williams stated that while all units are currently planned with ground floor commercial, he is open to excluding commercial space from the interior units and those facing 100 South, if that adjustment would be preferred by the Planning Commission and City Council. He expressed a strong preference for retaining the commercial components in units facing Center Street and Zions Bank, as these locations offer visibility and natural pedestrian flow, enhancing the integration with Main Street's commercial corridor. He also mentioned reaching out to the new owners of the Zions Bank property to explore potential future synergies in development or shared pedestrian experiences.

In addressing other development-related challenges, Mr. Williams noted that burying existing

overhead power lines on the site would incur significant costs estimated in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Additionally, restoring the historic brick church has proven to be as expensive as constructing new buildings of equivalent square footage. He highlighted these costs as part of the broader balancing act required to develop the project responsibly, noting that despite common public perceptions of developers, this is not a high-profit venture but rather a project intended to minimize neighborhood disruption while contributing positively to Main Street.

Commissioner Sommerkorn focused on access to the interior commercial units. Mr. Williams explained that these units would front onto a landscaped interior courtyard. The design includes a tree-lined pedestrian pathway, patios for each unit, and a walkable connection extending from Center Street through the site. He described plans for incorporating twinkle lights, a mural on a rear-facing barn, and other aesthetic elements to create a courtyard atmosphere that is urban yet inviting, allowing both visual and physical access from multiple directions, including 100 South.

Commissioner Sommerkorn confirmed that the applicant was requesting a reduction in the required commercial space from 30% to 15% and asked if the primary reason was the calculation method. Mr. Williams agreed, explaining that since the 30% is calculated using the total gross square footage of all floors, not just the ground floor, it creates an obstacle for projects like his that incorporate both residential and small-scale commercial spaces. He noted that in other municipalities, the calculation is often based on a percentage of the ground floor only, which is more feasible for mixed-use residential developments. Mr. Williams stated that this approach would better align with the intent of the General Plan, even if the numerical threshold is not met, and emphasized the desire to still deliver a walkable, vibrant, mixed-use project.

Mr. Williams continued by describing additional site amenities and design features incorporated into the proposed development to enhance livability and integration with the surrounding neighborhood. He explained that along one side of the project, the plan includes recreational elements such as a bocce ball court and a dog run, as well as a hammocking area. These elements are intended to promote community interaction and create usable outdoor space for residents.

Regarding the preservation and adaptive reuse of the historic church, Mr. Williams elaborated on his design approach. The residential living space for his family would be constructed above a garage, with a glass walkway connecting it to the church structure. This design preserves the visual prominence and standalone appearance of the church on the corner lot, respecting its historic character and ensuring it remains a focal point of the property. Mr. Williams emphasized that the goal is for the church to continue to feel like a distinct and iconic structure, rather than being visually consumed by the new development.

He also addressed landscaping and tree preservation, stating that efforts are being made to retain as many of the existing mature trees as possible, particularly along the rear of the site. In

one case, Mr. Williams noted that they plan to bridge over the root system of a tree near the edge of the proposed construction to avoid damaging it, reflecting a thoughtful effort to maintain the existing natural buffer.

Regarding neighborhood compatibility, Mr. Williams explained that the historic church and existing mature trees on the site would help to create a buffer between the new development and the more traditional residential properties located to the east. He stated the new structures directly fronting 100 East would be a three-unit townhome, which he felt would blend well given the existing residential density in the immediate area. He noted that across the street from the site is a four-plex, with additional duplexes and other multi-family dwellings surrounding the area, suggesting that the proposed development would be contextually appropriate and not significantly different from what is already present along the corridor.

Mr. Williams responded by confirming that the first several feet of the connection between the new structure and the historic church would be made of glass, specifically to maintain the appearance that the church stands alone. He clarified that this design choice is intentional to avoid the perception of simply adding onto the church. The church will remain visually distinct, preserving its historic character. He explained that the new structure would include a garage and mudroom on the ground floor, along with two small commercial spaces, one of which his wife envisions using for art classes or creative activities. The bedrooms and living space for their family would be located upstairs, fully detached from the church interior.

Commissioner Toller continued asking questions to clarify details of the project layout. He referred to the area south of the planned glass hallway connection and asked whether the section beneath the trees was existing or new construction.

Mr. Williams explained that it was not a building, but rather a deck they planned to add behind the house. He confirmed that the only existing structure is the original church building, and the only connection would be a small opening where one of the rear windows is located to link it to the new structure.

Commissioner Toller asked whether all 26 proposed town home units include 12-foot ceilings on the first floor, and Mr. Williams confirmed they do under the current design, though they are open to adjusting that, if necessary, based on Commission feedback. Commissioner Toller also asked about parking, and Mr. Williams explained that each unit would have 2.5 parking stalls, a two-car garage plus an additional half-stall allocated for guest parking. The discussion continued with questions about unit size. Mr. Williams stated that each unit is approximately 1,700 square feet of living space, and when including the commercial portion, the total is about 2,000 square feet. The commercial component on the ground floor of each unit is relatively small, around 200 square feet.

Commissioner Toller's final question was whether the units would be for sale or for rent. Mr. Williams confirmed that the town homes are intended to be for sale, and this is reflected in the development agreement. He noted that this aligns with their vision for the project and

referenced a recent townhome project discussed in a prior meeting.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that the Development Agreement for the proposed project includes a provision requiring that at least 60% of the townhome units be owner-occupied. She explained that this language is the same as what was used in a prior project developed by Mr. Holland, referencing a recent townhome development in west Kaysville. Commissioner Toller confirmed that the same percentage applied, and Ms. Greenwood affirmed that the 60% requirement is consistent across both projects.

Regarding parking requirements, Ms. Greenwood explained that most zones allowing for town homes typically require only two parking stalls per unit. However, for this proposed development, the applicant has included 2.5 stalls per unit to go beyond the minimum standard and address one of the community's primary concerns adequate parking.

Chair Packer opened the Public Hearing.

Paul Stenquist asked two questions about the proposed project. First, he raised a concern about access, noting that with the number of housing units being proposed, he believed there should be two access points for vehicles to enter and exit the site, but he only observed one. Second, out of curiosity, he asked if anyone knew the anticipated sale price of the units once completed.

Aaron West, began by addressing the applicant directly, stating that while he is not convinced the proposed development is a good fit for the neighborhood, he appreciates the applicant's thoughtful approach and emphasized that his comments were not meant to be against the applicant or the property owners.

Mr. West took issue with a staff statement that the neighborhood is "dominated by single-family dwellings." He pointed out that there are at least 60 moderate-income, medium-density multifamily units within a few blocks of the proposed site. While those may be older and less modern, he emphasized that the area already accommodates a range of housing types. He then posed a general question about the state requirements that have been mentioned throughout the meeting. Mr. West expressed interest in learning more about what the state requires from cities regarding moderate-income housing, as well as what incentives might be tied to those requirements. He acknowledged that staff likely couldn't answer immediately but encouraged that the information be addressed at a later point for the public's understanding.

Larry Jensen, a property owner which directly borders the south side of the proposed development, shared several concerns. First, he noted that the multi-story design of the town homes with many stairs would not be suitable for senior citizens, who he believed would not live in the units but might instead purchase them as investment rentals. Second, he raised concerns about increased traffic, estimating the addition of 52 cars in a small area near both a grade school and a senior center, which he believed could create safety and congestion issues.

Third, Mr. Jensen argued that there is insufficient parking for the proposed commercial spaces. He claimed that visitors would have to park a block or more away and noted that Kaysville's Main Street is not currently a retail destination, but rather a place where people come for single purpose errands and leave quickly. In his view, the project would not change that pattern.

Fourth, he expressed concern about the lack of play space for children in the development. He suggested that the units would likely be rented by young families or couples, but there would be nowhere for children to play, since the nearby school property isn't fully accessible to the public. As a result, he predicted high turnover rates and eventual vacancies, which he felt could lead to safety concerns associated with unoccupied units.

John McClurg Jr., a lifelong Kaysville resident and property owner, spoke in opposition to the proposed development. He noted that he owns a duplex adjacent to the project, placing him within the 50-foot proximity affected by the proposed height variance. Mr. McClurg began by quoting Kaysville's official slogan "*Preserving our historic past, progressing into the future*" and expressed concern that this project does not reflect those values. He emphasized Kaysville's traditional, community-oriented character, and said that despite the applicant's impressive presentation and visuals, the real-life impacts were being overlooked.

Mr. McClurg questioned the practicality of parking for the development, especially given the presence of 26 commercial units and the nearby elementary school. Drawing on his experience as a commercial property owner with nine tenants and hundreds of parking stalls (which are often full), he argued that the proposed project does not realistically accommodate parking needs. He estimated that, based on what was presented, the site could generate over 100 vehicle trips per day, creating congestion and safety hazards especially for children walking to and from school. He emphasized that there is no convenient or safe access in or out of the area without passing by the school, raising serious safety concerns.

Mr. McClurg also argued that it is unrealistic to assume residents and visitors will only park on site. He stated that people will inevitably have guests and multiple vehicles, and that without adequate off-street parking, the overflow would impact surrounding neighborhoods. He stressed that this project is not about opposing growth, but about ensuring development is responsible and well-fitted to the area. While he acknowledged that the Parish family had already sold the property and been compensated, he said the current proposal tries to fit too much density both residential and commercial onto 1.6 acres, which he believes is inappropriate for the community.

He suggested that a smaller scale proposal, such as an 8-plex or a standalone commercial development, might be more reasonable. Mr. McClurg also challenged the claim that the development contributes to affordable housing, stating that nothing in Kaysville is affordable, and that the proposed 1,700 square foot units are unlikely to qualify as affordable options. While he acknowledged that the higher price point might alleviate concerns about transient renters, he believes the project's size, density, and parking limitations make it a poor fit. He

concluded by urging the Commission to “do the right thing” for the neighborhood.

Braeden Hess spoke in support of the proposed project and encouraged the Planning Commission to give it a favorable recommendation to the City Council. He shared his personal experience of facing limited housing options and noted that many in his generation have been forced to move further south or out of state due to a lack of affordable housing in Kaysville. While he was fortunate to find a single family home, he stated that many of his peers were not as lucky.

Mr. Hess described the proposal as a well-thought-out plan that would add value to the community. He responded to earlier concerns about children having nowhere to play, pointing out that there are multiple recreational options nearby, including the elementary school, the city park, and areas near the library. He also addressed concerns about stairs and senior living, stating that whether a unit suits a senior is ultimately a personal decision, not a flaw in the development.

He closed by emphasizing the importance of expanding housing options in Kaysville so more people, especially those who grew up in the city can afford to stay and contribute to the community. Mr. Hess stated that Kaysville is defined by its people, not just its land or open space, and that increasing housing availability helps preserve that character.

Doug Dredge, a Kaysville resident, shared his concern about the timing of the proposed development. He pointed out that the city is currently in the process of creating a comprehensive plan for the downtown and Main Street areas, but that plan has not yet been finalized. Mr. Dredge cautioned that approving a project like this before the plan is complete may be premature, as it's unclear whether the proposed 26 units would ultimately align with the city's long-term vision for the area. He suggested that the city might be “putting the cart before the horse” by moving forward without first confirming how this development fits into the broader downtown strategy.

Cindy Woodward, a resident who lives just a few houses away from the proposed development on Center Street, expressed appreciation for the applicant’s presentation but shared several concerns based on her firsthand experience living in the area. She questioned where snow removal would be handled, noting there is no visible space on the site for snow storage. She also raised safety concerns, given the project's proximity to the police and fire stations and said the narrow drive lanes in the proposal appear too small for two-way traffic, let alone access for emergency vehicles. She stated that, as a resident, she has already had trouble navigating the area, particularly since one of the nearby streets was recently converted to one-way traffic.

Ms. Woodward also voiced skepticism about the results of the third-party traffic study, stating that, it is already difficult to get onto Main Street, especially during school drop-off and pick-up hours, when Center Street becomes heavily congested. She described repeated instances of people blocking her driveway, making it difficult to come and go from her home.

In addition, she raised concern about the impact on local schools, especially the high school, which she believes is already overcrowded. Adding new families through this development, she argued, would increase pressure on school infrastructure and teachers an issue that has not yet been fully evaluated. Ms. Woodward urged the Planning Commission to consider the needs of existing residents and the strain on city services and infrastructure, concluding that the project, as currently proposed, is too dense and would worsen already difficult conditions in the neighborhood.

Tucker Hunsaker, a nearby resident, spoke against the project and shared concerns from neighbors who couldn't attend. He questioned the accuracy of the traffic study, noting it was done after schools were out for summer and doesn't reflect the heavy traffic during school drop-off and pick-up. He also worried that the study may not account for future downtown revitalization plans, which could further increase congestion.

Mr. Hunsaker raised parking concerns, explaining that in many townhome communities, garages are often used for storage, meaning more cars end up parked on the street. He also questioned where employees of the commercial units would park and noted that limited enforcement of overnight parking on Center Street and 100 East could worsen the issue, especially with children in the area.

He pointed out that the project appears to have only one vehicle entrance, forcing all traffic onto 100 East, which could become overcrowded. To show community opposition, Mr. Hunsaker shared that he started a petition just 36 hours earlier and had already collected 493 signatures from residents concerned about the project's impact. He concluded by saying the proposal doesn't align with Kaysville's small-town character and urged the Commission to consider the concerns of existing families.

Casey Quaid, a Kaysville resident, spoke in support of the proposed project. She acknowledged the parking concerns raised by others but said the development appears designed to promote walkability rather than relying heavily on cars. Ms. Quaid shared that she drives past Old Main Street daily with her young family and often wishes there were more destinations and shops to make it worth visiting. She felt this project would help create a walkable, vibrant area where families could gather and enjoy local businesses.

Regarding school capacity, Ms. Quaid noted that Kaysville Elementary currently hosts the district's gifted program because it has the space to accommodate more students, suggesting that school overcrowding may not be as significant an issue as some fear.

She also cited language from the city's General Plan, which highlights goals such as fostering social connection, supporting economic growth, strengthening Kaysville's identity, and balancing historic preservation with appropriately scaled development. Ms. Quaid said she believes the project aligns with these goals by preserving the historic church, supporting small businesses, and creating opportunities for residents to connect and engage. She concluded by stating that the proposal would enhance Kaysville's charm, benefit nearby Main Street

businesses, and create a stronger sense of community.

Maggie McBride, a Kaysville resident, real estate broker, and property owner, shared a mixed perspective on the proposed development. While she praised the renderings and overall presentation and acknowledged there are positives to the plan, she raised several significant concerns based on her professional experience.

Her primary concern was parking, noting that similar developments she has worked with often face serious parking shortages. She referenced a nearby project with a similar number of units where residents regularly park off-site due to insufficient parking, creating ongoing challenges for the neighborhood. Ms. McBride also expressed concern about the lack of green space in the proposal, explaining that developments with little or no shared outdoor areas tend to experience high turnover rates, especially among families.

She also highlighted challenges related to small commercial units in Kaysville, stating that the city already struggles to retain small businesses. With the proposed 300-square-foot commercial spaces, she worried many units could remain vacant and become eyesores if demand doesn't match the supply. Additionally, she raised financial concerns, noting that small mixed-use units typically appreciate more slowly and, in the event of an economic downturn, are among the first to depreciate or face foreclosure.

Ms. McBride pointed out that traffic and parking issues are already significant in the area, especially at the nearby elementary school, where she volunteers and often must park up the street due to overcrowding. She also referenced parking problems at her own rental properties nearby, where enforcement has been inconsistent despite repeated requests to the city. She concluded by urging the Planning Commission to conduct more due diligence before making any decision, stressing that these issues should be carefully addressed to avoid long-term problems for the neighborhood.

Darlene Carter, a Kaysville resident and longtime real estate professional, spoke in support of the proposed project. She shared her personal connection with the community, explaining that her husband grew up in Kaysville and that raising their family here has been an important part of their lives. Ms. Carter emphasized the broader housing shortage in Utah, noting that the state is currently the ninth most expensive in the country. She argued that the only way to address the issue is to build more housing, and that medium-density town homes are among the most attainable options for families right now.

Ms. Carter also supported the applicant's request to reduce the required commercial space, addressing concerns about traffic and parking. She pointed out that under the city's code, the 300-square-foot commercial spaces could be used as home offices rather than customer-facing businesses, meaning they may not generate significant additional traffic. Examples included accountants, real estate agents, or other professionals working from home, which she believes aligns with modern work trends.

Responding to earlier claims that developments like this tend to depreciate or create financial risk, Ms. Carter disagreed based on her 20 years of experience in real estate. She argued that providing flexible-use spaces that allow residents to both live and work increases property value and makes the homes more desirable. She concluded by expressing her strong support for the project and emphasized the need for more housing options in both Kaysville and across Utah to help future generations remain close to their families.

Joyce Clarkson, a resident living near the proposed development at 100 South and 100 East, shared her perspective as someone who has lived in her home for over 35 years. She explained that her home, built in the 1870s, predates the historic church on the property and has witnessed significant changes in the area over time. Ms. Clarkson emphasized that she is not opposed to development in general and has met the applicants, whom she described as a “great couple.”

However, she expressed concern about the scale of the project, stating that placing what feels like “three blocks’ worth of homes” on such a small corner lot is overwhelming for the neighborhood. Ms. Clarkson encouraged the Commission to consider the perspective of nearby residents and ask themselves whether they would want a project of this size directly in their backyard. While acknowledging that the property has been an empty field she has enjoyed, she stressed the importance of maintaining a sense of security and livability for existing homeowners.

Pam Hunsaker, a Kaysville resident, expressed opposition to the proposed development, focusing on density, precedent, and traffic impacts. She warned that approving a project of this size could set a precedent, allowing other property owners to pursue similarly dense developments with mixed residential and commercial uses, potentially changing the character of Kaysville over time.

Ms. Hunsaker also raised concerns about traffic and parking, arguing that while the project is intended to be walkable, people will still drive to the area and need somewhere to park. If the development is successful in attracting visitors, she cautioned, the resulting increase in vehicle traffic could strain existing infrastructure and worsen congestion.

Additionally, she questioned the scale of the project, noting that 26 three-story town homes on approximately 1.6 acres feel too dense for the neighborhood. She also asked whether the planned green space would be available to the public or just residents, as this had not been clarified.

Ms. Hunsaker expressed concerns about the commercial component, questioning how the city would regulate the types of businesses permitted. She worried about high-turnover uses, such as nail salons, massage therapists, or other businesses generating frequent visitors, which could increase traffic further. Finally, she argued that residents who want a home office do not necessarily need designated commercial space to achieve that purpose, suggesting that the mixed-use requirement may be unnecessary.

Gary McBride, a longtime Kaysville resident, said he is not opposed to downtown development but raised concerns about the scale and infrastructure demands of the proposed project. He questioned whether the city has the infrastructure to support 26 new town homes in this location and whether installing the necessary utilities would require tearing up roads in the area, potentially causing further disruption.

Mr. McBride also asked whether the impact fees collected by the city would be assessed per townhome and, if so, whether they would adequately cover the strain on city services and infrastructure. Finally, he challenged the claim that the project would provide affordable housing, estimating that each unit would likely cost over \$500,000, which he argued does not meet affordability standards for Kaysville residents.

Austin Ested, a resident living at 5 South, directly next to the historic church and the proposed development site, spoke in opposition to the project. He clarified that he has nothing against the applicant or their family but expressed significant concerns about safety and traffic.

Mr. Ested explained that he has two young children who attend the nearby school and described how congested the area already becomes during school drop-off and pick-up times. He said cars frequently block his driveway, and he often must walk through traffic just to reach his own front door. Mr. Ested warned that adding 26 or 27 new town homes plus additional vehicles from residents, visitors, and family members would worsen congestion and create serious safety risks for children walking in the area.

He concluded by emphasizing that, from his perspective as the closest neighbor to the site, the proposal would make an already overcrowded area unsafe.

Matt Meese, a resident living one block east of the proposed development, shared a balanced perspective. He began by praising the applicant's creativity and expressed enthusiasm about the plan to restore and maintain the historic chapel, which he said adds to the charm of Kaysville's older neighborhoods. However, he raised several concerns about the scale and viability of the project.

Mr. Meese questioned the economic sustainability of the proposed small commercial spaces, pointing out that there is already vacant commercial property next to the nearby Kaysville Creamery, as well as additional unused space above it. He suggested that if there was significant demand for commercial uses, the city should focus on investing in and revitalizing existing Main Street properties rather than adding more small units nearby.

Regarding housing density, Mr. Meese said he might support a smaller-scale proposal around 12 units instead of 26 which he felt would be more compatible with the neighborhood. He also challenged the argument that this project addresses affordable housing needs, noting that there are already at least 60 rental units in the surrounding 10-block area and several modest single-family homes nearby that can be purchased for prices comparable to the proposed town homes.

Finally, Mr. Meese expressed concerns about the precedent this development could set. Allowing such a high-density, mixed-use project could encourage other nearby homeowners to redevelop their properties in a similar way, which he feared could erode the neighborhood's character over time. While he welcomed the applicant's creative vision, he concluded that the current proposal feels too dense and suggested scaling it back to 12 units or fewer.

Jenny Meese, a nearby resident, raised concerns about the layout and functionality of the proposed development. Referring to the site renderings, she questioned how vehicles would maneuver within the property, particularly around the T-shaped intersection shown in the plans. Ms. Meese worried that cars might need to reverse long distances past other homes just to exit, calling the internal traffic flow "chaotic."

She also expressed doubt about the viability of small commercial spaces, noting that Main Street businesses already struggle due to limited parking. Using the example of the Kaysville Creamery, she explained that the city had to create additional parking nearby just to support one small business, raising questions about how this project would handle its commercial component.

Ms. Meese concluded by saying that the project feels too dense and poorly designed for the area but indicated she and other residents might be more open to the development if the number of units were reduced.

Michael Larsen spoke in support of the proposed development. He acknowledged that his opinion might be less popular but emphasized the importance of property rights, stating that landowners should have the ability to make reasonable decisions about how their property is used, within the limits of zoning laws.

Mr. Larsen noted that Kaysville is no longer a farming community but rather a suburban area within a growing metropolitan region along the Wasatch Front. Given Utah's limited available land and severe housing shortage, he argued that higher-density housing like this project is becoming necessary to meet demand.

He also highlighted the benefits of the project, including the renovation of the historic church, which he felt would preserve local character while revitalizing the area. Additionally, Mr. Larsen pointed out the potential for economic benefits, as the development could support nearby Main Street businesses and create momentum to activate currently vacant property.

He concluded by stating that while some nearby residents oppose the project, others in the community would welcome it and see it as a positive contribution to Kaysville's growth.

Emma West, a resident living near 200 South and 200 East, expressed opposition to the proposed development. She began by agreeing on the importance of preserving historic properties and thoughtfully planning the city's future growth but said she believes this project

is premature. Since the downtown and retail plans are still being developed, she argued it's too early to approve a project of this scale without knowing how it fits into the city's long-term vision.

Ms. West suggested that retail uses would be better suited farther west, closer to existing commercial properties such as Zions Bank, the gas station, and other city-owned parcels, rather than pushing them deeper into residential neighborhoods. While she said she supports higher-density housing in general, she felt that the proposed level of density is excessive for this location.

She also raised concerns about infrastructure limitations, snow removal, and traffic flow, as well as the potential for high turnover among residents. Citing her experience living near a rental property that was intended to be owner-occupied but has not been for some time, Ms. West questioned the long-term stability of the neighborhood if projects like this move forward. She concluded by urging the city to take more time before approving projects of this scale, warning that introducing dense mixed-use development into primarily residential areas could have unintended consequences.

Andrew Lloyd expressed support for the proposed development. Recently returning to Kaysville, he reflected on how many people he grew up with now live in West Kaysville and questioned where the next generation will be able to afford to live.

As a loan officer and realtor who works from home, Mr. Lloyd highlighted the benefit of the project's small commercial spaces, explaining that for professionals like him, they could function as home offices with minimal foot traffic. He said this flexibility is ideal for many modern workers and aligns with current housing trends.

Mr. Lloyd described the proposed town homes as an affordable, future-focused housing option, arguing that medium-density housing is necessary to meet Utah's growing demand. He concluded by stating that he fully supports the project and sees it as a positive step forward for Kaysville.

No other speakers came forward, so Chair Packer closed the Public Hearing.

Before moving into Commission discussion, Commissioner Wilf Sommerkorn requested that the applicant, Jake Williams, return to answer a few additional questions.

Commissioner Sommerkorn first confirmed that the commercial spaces within the town homes would not be centrally leased but rather sold with each unit, meaning the homeowner would also own the commercial space. Mr. Williams confirmed this, clarifying that the units are not structured as condominiums.

Commissioner Sommerkorn then asked about the anticipated price range of the units. Mr. Williams estimated they would likely be priced around \$500,000 or higher, acknowledging that

this is not affordable by traditional standards but reflects current market conditions. He added that the inclusion of small commercial spaces could provide homeowners an opportunity to generate supplemental income by using the space for a home business or leasing it out potentially offsetting some mortgage costs and making the units slightly more attainable.

Commissioner Sommerkorn also inquired whether there would be a deed restriction preventing the ground-floor commercial spaces from being converted into residential use. Mr. Williams explained that the current development agreement does not include such a restriction, meaning homeowners would have flexibility to use the space as light retail, a home office, or even an additional bedroom. Ms. Greenwood confirmed that this topic is not addressed in the current agreement but could be added if the Planning Commission recommends it.

Commissioner Toller asked the applicant, Jake Williams, additional questions regarding the project design, access, and common space. Commissioner Toller first clarified Mr. Williams' earlier comments about being "malleable" and asked whether the project truly required 12-foot commercial ceilings on the ground floor to be financially viable. Mr. Williams responded that taller ceilings are not necessary and make construction more expensive. He explained that the amount of commercial space proposed was primarily an effort to comply with zoning requirements and align with the city's General Plan. Mr. Williams also noted that Center Street frontage is ideal for commercial uses and expressed hope that the project could help revitalize Main Street by attracting more activity and encouraging turnover of nearby vacant spaces.

Commissioner Toller next addressed access concerns raised during public comment. Using the site plan, Mr. Williams explained that the single vehicle entrance is located on 100 East, where fire truck access and staging would also occur. He clarified that the design meets building code requirements by ensuring every unit is within 150 feet of fire access. Internal circulation is designed so that driveways are accessed from rear alleyways, while pedestrian access is focused on the front-facing landscaped areas and walkways, separating foot traffic from cars. Regarding common areas, Mr. Williams explained that the project includes a south-side yard with plans for amenities like a playground, hammock area, or bocce ball court. He noted that since the school playground and city park are nearby, the open space design focuses more on landscaping and tree preservation rather than creating large play areas. The space around the historic church would remain private, serving as a buffer between the new development and neighboring properties.

Mr. Williams confirmed that the homes would be alley loaded, meaning driveways and garages are accessed from behind, which allows the front of the homes to maintain a pedestrian-friendly streetscape.

Ms. Greenwood addressed several questions raised during the public hearing. First, she clarified that under fire code, a secondary access point is not required for this development because the threshold is 30 units. With 26 proposed units, the project meets code by providing only one entrance and exit.

Ms. Greenwood then explained the relationship between the city and the state's moderate-income housing requirements, calling it a complex but important issue. She noted that because cities are political subdivisions of the state, the state legislature has the authority to impose requirements, including those related to land use and housing policy. Over the last decade, the state has increasingly mandated cities to plan for and report on moderate-income housing.

Kaysville's General Plan includes a moderate-income housing section based on a state-mandated "menu" of strategies cities can choose from. Some options on the list, like those tied to fixed transit systems, don't apply to Kaysville because the city lacks those resources. However, Kaysville has selected strategies such as rezoning near commercial and employment centers and allowing for densities that may produce moderate-income housing criteria this proposed project satisfies.

Ms. Greenwood stated that the city is required to submit an annual report to the state outlining its actions to support moderate-income housing goals. For example, outcomes on this rezone application would be included in next year's report, which she will submit by August 1, 2026. She also warned that noncompliance carries serious consequences, including daily fines, potential loss of state funding (such as road funds from the gas tax), and restrictions on applying for certain grants.

She concluded by emphasizing that Kaysville is one of 92 Utah cities required to comply with these state reporting requirements and that decisions like this project directly affect the city's ability to remain in good standing with the state.

Commissioner Lott asked how noncompliance with state moderate-income housing requirements would affect Kaysville. Ms. Greenwood explained that the state distributes gas tax funding for road maintenance using a formula based on population and road miles. If Kaysville fails to comply, the state could withhold road funding, meaning either projects wouldn't happen, or the costs would fall directly to Kaysville taxpayers. The city could also lose eligibility for grants and could face daily fines of \$500 for violations.

Chair Packer clarified that the city does not actively seek development or pressure property owners to propose certain projects or densities. Instead, the city processes applications as they are submitted and evaluates them individually against existing zoning and planning requirements. Ms. Greenwood added that the city does not generally initiate rezoning on properties unless it owns the land.

Ms. Greenwood stated that there is sufficient capacity for water, sewer, and power to support the proposed project, based on conversations with the Sewer District and other utility providers. She also clarified a misconception raised during public comments about parking near the Kaysville Creamery: the additional parking on Center Street was created as part of a collaborative effort between the city, UDOT, and local businesses to support all Main Street businesses, and was not specifically done for one single business.

Ms. Greenwood also addressed concerns about school capacity, explaining that the Davis School District uses a formula to estimate the number of students generated by new housing. Under that formula, townhome units produce an average of 0.25 students per unit, meaning this 26-unit project would likely add about seven or eight elementary-aged students. She further noted school enrollment numbers are declining in several areas of the City because housing prices are too high for many young families.

Chair Packer asked Ms. Greenwood about the occupancy rate for commercial spaces in Kaysville, expressing concern about the amount of commercial space included in the project and whether there would be sufficient demand to fill it.

Ms. Greenwood explained that, as part of the City Center Small Area Plan project, a market analysis was conducted by the consultant team. The study found that Kaysville's commercial vacancy rate is extremely low, indicating a high demand for retail and commercial space. She noted that many of the proposed units would likely function as live-work spaces, where residents use the lower-level commercial areas as private offices, meaning they would not generate significant customer traffic or place a heavy demand on parking.

Commissioner Toller asked staff for clarification regarding the zoning designation of the property and the process for considering a rezone request. Ms. McNamara explained that the current application seeks to rezone the property from Agricultural (A-1) to Central Commercial (CC) with a Mixed-Use Overlay.

Commissioner Toller pointed out that the Future Land Use Map shows the site categorized as "religious" because of the existing church. Ms. McNamara clarified that Kaysville does not have a specific zoning designation for religious uses in the city code. Instead, the religious category on the Future Land Use Map reflects historical usage.

Commissioner Toller then asked whether the property must be rezoned to central commercial or if other zoning categories, such as Mixed-Use Commercial, could be considered. Ms. McNamara explained that staff evaluates rezones based on the Future Land Use Map, which provides a high-level vision of expected land uses and the city's General Plan, which outlines the long-term goals and guiding principles for development.

Ms. McNamara emphasized that in Utah General Plans are advisory, not mandatory, meaning the city is not legally required to rezone properties exactly according to the Future Land Use Map or any other portion of the General Plan. If a proposal aligns strongly with the General Plan's objectives, staff can recommend approval even if the map's designation differs from the proposed zoning.

Mr. Williams explained the reasoning behind the zoning request, the unit count, and the project's financial considerations. He stated that he and his team worked closely with city staff to determine the best zoning fit based on surrounding properties and the General Plan. Since the area north of the site including Zions Bank and most of Main Street is already zoned Central

Commercial (CC), they determined that pairing a CC designation with a Mixed-Use overlay would align with nearby land uses and the city's long-term vision.

Mr. Williams addressed concerns about the number of proposed units, explaining that it was not arbitrarily selected. He currently has the property is currently under contract with the Parish family, and the unit count was calculated backwards from the sale price to determine how many dwellings would be necessary to make the project financially viable. He stressed that reducing the number of units would reduce the land value, making it unlikely that the Parish family would proceed with the sale.

Regarding the commercial space requirement, Mr. Williams noted they are flexible. While the proposal includes 15% commercial space, they are open to reducing it if the City Council feels strongly, if it still meets financing and zoning needs.

Mr. Williams emphasized that this project is personal, as his family plans to live on the site. He described it as a "dream project," not one designed for maximum profit, but said the financing and contract terms ultimately require a certain unit density to make the project feasible. He concluded by noting that some form of rezoning is necessary regardless of the proposal, since the current agricultural designation limits the property's future use.

Commissioner Sommerkorn added that the "religious" designation likely reflects the fact that a church existed there historically, not an intent to limit future development. Since circumstances have changed, alternative land uses can be considered appropriate.

Commissioner Wilf Sommerkorn opened the Commission's deliberation by reflecting on his 40-year career as an Urban Planner and providing context on growth and change in cities. He noted that new development proposals are often met with community resistance but emphasized that cities are not static and must adapt to demand and growth. Commissioner Sommerkorn stressed that Kaysville, like many communities, needs to accommodate future generations while balancing thoughtful planning.

Turning to the proposed project, Commissioner Sommerkorn acknowledged its proximity to Main Street, Zions Bank, Center Street, and City Hall, stating that the location makes higher density housing reasonable. He pointed out that multi-family and medium-density developments already exist nearby, meaning the character of the area would not drastically change. However, he raised several concerns, primarily related to the Mixed-Use overlay and ground-level commercial spaces.

Commissioner Sommerkorn explained that mandatory commercial requirements in mixed-use projects can lead to vacant storefronts if there isn't sufficient market demand. While this proposal differs because the commercial spaces would be sold with the residential units, making them live-work opportunities, he questioned whether buyers would ultimately convert them into residential use. Since the Development Agreement does not prohibit that conversion, he worried the project may function as a residential development than a true Mixed-Use zone.

Commissioner Sommerkorn also discussed density considerations. Kaysville's highest existing residential zone allows approximately 15.5 units per acre, while this project proposes 16.8 units per acre, placing it above the city's typical thresholds. He suggested it may be more appropriate to treat the site as high-density residential rather than forcing a Mixed-Use designation that might not be fully utilized as intended.

Commissioner Sommerkorn noted concerns about the limited green space within the project. While nearby parks and schools could provide recreational options, the on-site open space appeared minimal, which he viewed as less desirable for long-term livability.

Commissioner Toller questioned whether the proposed zoning designation and density are appropriate for the site, expressing concern that the current plan may not balance practicality with intended land use goals.

He noted that the proposal appears to include seven to ten commercial units along the project's perimeter, which might be feasible given their visibility and accessibility. However, he raised doubts about the viability of commercial spaces located within the interior portions of the development, referring to them as being effectively on "alley-like" access points.

Drawing on his professional experience as a commercial lender, Commissioner Toller explained that he would struggle to justify the financial feasibility of these interior commercial units. He suggested that the Commission should carefully consider whether the Mixed-Use overlay is the best fit for this site or whether a different approach to zoning and density would make the development more functional and marketable.

Commissioner Young expressed support for the Mixed-Use zoning designation, emphasizing its flexibility and potential benefits to the community. She stated that there is no guarantee that all proposed commercial spaces would be filled with active businesses, providing the opportunity for viable commercial uses near Center Street and Main Street could strengthen the area's walkability and create charming, boutique-style destinations.

Commissioner Young acknowledged that many of the commercial spaces would likely function as home offices, but she viewed that flexibility as a positive feature rather than a drawback. By allowing a mix of residential, office, and potential retail, the project could adapt to market demand while still enhancing the architectural character of the downtown area. She concluded by noting that this location is well-suited for slightly higher density and varied housing options. In her view, the project's design quality and integration with surrounding development make it a thoughtful plan, and she expressed that she would welcome it as a neighbor.

Chair Packer shared his perspective on the proposal, agreeing with several points raised by other Commissioners while highlighting key considerations. He supported the idea of having commercial uses along Center Street, noting that Mixed-Use zoning can provide a softer transition between fully commercial areas like Main Street and surrounding residential

neighborhoods.

Chair Packer acknowledged concerns about the interior commercial spaces, questioning their long-term viability and whether they would realistically function as active retail or become home offices. He stressed the importance of maintaining some level of commercial frontage, particularly along Center Street, to support walkability and strengthen nearby business activity. He also addressed density concerns, recognizing that the proposal's 16.8 units per acre exceeds Kaysville's current highest residential density zone (RM), which allows 15.5 units per acre, but only slightly. Chair Packer explained that similar levels of density already exist elsewhere in Kaysville, often without noticeable impact on surrounding neighborhoods. He argued that higher density near Main Street is beneficial for sustaining local businesses, as it places residents within walking distance of shops and services.

Regarding traffic and school safety, Chair Packer said he reviewed other elementary schools in the area and found that several are located on busier streets and surrounded by higher-density housing than what is proposed here, yet they continue to operate successfully. While he acknowledged the community's concerns, he suggested that the practical impact might be less dramatic than many fear it will be.

Chair Packer expressed support for limiting the height of the two southernmost units near adjacent single-family homes to ease the transition into the surrounding neighborhood. He also noted that the proposed 26-unit count is comparable to nearby blocks, which already have 23–24 units, indicating that the project would not dramatically alter the overall density of the area.

Commissioner Sommerkorn highlighted the state's housing crisis and noted that the Utah Legislature has been pressuring cities to increase housing supply to address affordability concerns. While he acknowledged that this specific project may not provide truly affordable housing, he stressed that adding more housing options overall could help ease pricing pressures in the long term.

Commissioner Sommerkorn clarified that he would not support this level of density everywhere in Kaysville, but he felt this location was appropriate because of its proximity to Main Street, its adjacency to existing commercial properties, and its connection to major roads. In his view, these characteristics make the site a logical place for higher density development.

However, he raised several design-related concerns. He stated that he would like to see revised architectural renderings to ensure the buildings—particularly those fronting the street—are designed to blend with the surrounding neighborhood and maintain visual harmony.

Additionally, Commissioner Sommerkorn emphasized the need for more green space within the project to improve livability. He suggested that this could require reducing the total number of units, even though that might affect the project's density goals.

Finally, Commissioner Sommerkorn reminded the Commission that because the project

involves a Development Agreement, the city has the ability to negotiate conditions before granting the rezone request. He recommended using this process to address concerns related to design, green space, and overall integration with the neighborhood.

Chair Packer emphasized that the location of the proposed project makes it suitable for higher density development. He noted that the site is immediately adjacent to commercial areas, with no residential housing to the north, and is close to public transportation options. He also highlighted that, thanks to the historic Bamberger rail line, the surrounding streets are exceptionally wide compared to typical city streets, which helps create a smoother transition between higher density uses and surrounding residential areas.

Chair Packer also discussed parking considerations, pointing out that the block to the north successfully accommodates angled parking on both sides of the street while still maintaining a wider driving lane than what is typical on streets with parallel parking. He suggested that the existing street layout could help mitigate traffic and parking concerns associated with the project.

Commissioner Lott spoke in favor of addressing the city's need for denser housing, citing regional growth pressures. She highlighted that Kaysville is geographically situated between Salt Lake City and Ogden—two of Utah's largest cities—and is also larger in population than nearby Farmington. Given Kaysville's location and size, Commissioner Lott said it is unrealistic to believe the city can remain a "sleepy town" without facing financial and other challenges.

Commissioner Lott acknowledged having some concerns about the number of proposed units but emphasized that the city must confront the inevitability of growth. She urged the Commission to consider where higher-density projects should be located if not here, stressing that this site is a strong candidate due to its proximity to Main Street, public transportation, and other commercial areas.

Chair Packer reflected on the challenges of balancing growth with community concerns and property rights. He noted that, as Commissioners and Kaysville residents, they often consider how each proposal would impact their own neighborhoods, acknowledging that development is inevitable in many areas.

Chair Packer emphasized the need to respect the rights of private property owners to develop their land while ensuring that projects comply with city zoning standards. He pointed out that the proposed building heights are consistent with surrounding zoning—most nearby areas allow up to 30 feet, while the Main Street Commercial District allows 35 feet.

Chair Packer said the project offers two-car garages for each unit, which is more than many nearby town homes and duplexes, where single-car garages are common. He also addressed concerns about affordability, noting that it would be unrealistic to expect developers to propose units priced at \$200,000–\$300,000, as such price points are simply not feasible in today's housing market.

Commissioner Sommerkorn raised concerns about whether granting the Mixed-Use overlay in its proposed form would undermine the original intent of the city's Mixed-Use zoning regulations. He explained that the overlay was created to encourage developments that integrate residential and commercial uses, supporting a more walkable, vibrant city center. However, the applicant is requesting to reduce the required commercial space from the 30% minimum to 15%. Commissioner Sommerkorn cautioned that if the city does not impose restrictions preventing these ground-level spaces from being converted into residential uses, the actual commercial component could end up being significantly lower than 15%.

While he acknowledged there may be some benefit to maintaining commercial options especially for the units fronting Center Street he questioned whether the project, as proposed, would truly fulfill the purpose of the Mixed-Use zone. He expressed concern that the development could effectively function as a high-density residential project rather than a true Mixed-Use development, potentially falling short of the city's long-term goals for commercial activation in the area.

Chairman Packer agreed with Commissioner Sommerkorn's concerns about the 15% commercial space proposal, noting that while the reduction might make the project more compatible with surrounding neighborhoods, it could also undermine the purpose of the Mixed-Use overlay.

Commissioner Lott asked whether it might make more sense to zone the property RM (high-density residential) instead of Mixed-Use. Commissioner Sommerkorn explained that RM zoning would better reflect the likely use of the property if most of the ground-level spaces ultimately become residential. However, he expressed hesitation about that approach, noting that it would eliminate flexibility for owners who might want to use their ground-level spaces commercially.

Chair Packer added that part of the appeal of the project lies in its flexibility and creativity, which could be lost under RM zoning. Commissioner Lott then questioned whether RM zoning would reduce traffic impacts compared to Mixed-Use. Commissioner Sommerkorn clarified that, in general, commercial uses tend to generate more traffic than residential, but the small size of the proposed commercial spaces makes their overall impact likely minimal.

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to continue the application rather than making an immediate recommendation. He explained that additional time was needed to address two main concerns:

1. Green Space – Commissioner Sommerkorn emphasized the need for more open and shared green space within the project, noting that this would likely require reducing the number of proposed units to create a better balance between density and livability.
2. Commercial Space Considerations – He also called for further review of how the commercial component should be handled. This includes evaluating whether the proposed Mixed-Use (MU) zoning is appropriate or whether high-density residential (RM) zoning would better align with the project's actual intended use, given the limited

size of the commercial spaces and the possibility that many could become residential or home office spaces.

Commissioner Toller seconded the motion.

Commissioner Sommerkorn amended his motion to continue the application to a specific date so the public would know when to return for further discussion. After input from Ms. Greenwood, it was agreed that the item would be continued to the September 11 meeting rather than the next scheduled meeting.

Commissioner Paul Toller confirmed his second on the motion with the updated date. This continuation allows time for staff and the applicant to address the Commission's primary concerns of adding more green space and potentially reducing unit count and reevaluating the commercial space requirements and whether Mixed-Use zoning or high-density residential zoning is more appropriate. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Lott: Yay

7- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 25, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION

At the close of the meeting, Commissioner Lott made a motion to approve the June 26, 2025, Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented.

However, several Commissioners, including Commissioner Toller, Commissioner Young, and Commissioner Sommerkorn, indicated they had not attended that meeting and either abstained or were reluctant to vote. With only three Commissioners comfortable voting, the Commission did not have a sufficient majority to approve the minutes.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that, in accordance with Commission bylaws, a majority of the quorum present is required for approval. Since that threshold was not met, the Commission agreed to defer approval of the June 26 minutes to the August 28, 2025, meeting.

8- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood provided several updates regarding upcoming planning matters and ongoing projects:

- Upcoming Planning Commission Meeting (August 28, 2025):
 - The agenda will include the Symphony Homes and the Ivory Homes property rezone, affecting 52 acres west of Sunset Drive. Ms. Greenwood anticipated significant public input due to the size and impact of these proposals.
 - A smaller rezone request from Phil Holland will also be on the agenda. This

request involves adjusting property lines near the new LDS Stake Center at 200 North and Angel Street and converting part of a deep commercial parcel into a four-lot residential subdivision. Ms. Greenwood noted this item is expected to be less controversial.

- Small Area Plan:
 - Ms. Greenwood confirmed that a second open house is tentatively scheduled for September 9 or 10 to gather additional public input.
 - The public survey on the small area plan remains open until August 17, with approximately 130–140 responses submitted so far. The city hopes to gather more engagement via newsletters, social media, and outreach to local businesses.
 - She expressed disappointment at the low participation from stakeholder groups, particularly from business owners along Historic Main Street and North Main Street, despite targeted invitations. Ms. Greenwood indicated the city will continue moving forward using data from the surveys, open houses, and tabling events.
 - The goal remains to adopt the small area plan by November or December 2025.
- General Plan Water Element:
 - Ms. Greenwood announced that the city must incorporate a water element into the General Plan by the end of the year, as required by state code.
 - Given the technical nature of water planning and the city's reliance on purchased water from providers such as Weber Basin, the city will work primarily with consultants, engineers, and irrigation providers.
 - Public involvement will likely be limited to a Planning Commission hearing before adoption.
 - Ms. Greenwood secured a \$15,000 state grant to support this work, which will be completed using the same consultant managing the small area plan to streamline coordination.

9- ADJOURNMENT

Chair Packer adjourned the meeting at 9:58pm.