

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
January 8, 2026

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, January 8, 2026 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, Megan Sevy, Paul Toller, Jeramy Burkinshaw, Erin Young, and David Moore

Staff in Attendance: Melinda Greenwood, Katie Ellis, Anne McNamara, and Mindi Edstrom

Public Attendees: Laurene Starkey, Val Starkey, Jill Dredge, Boyd Argyle, Matthew Mann, Shauna Mann, Athens Hunt, Abbi Hunt, Mark Oveson, Mark Tren, Thomas T. Wilding, Gary D.E Pierce Esq., Sapientia Fernandez, Tim Hirsch, Matt Loveland, Krysten Wheeler, Kory Wheeler, Dawn Hardy, Lary Hardy, Brad Crockett, Allysen Stenquist, Bryan Rue, Rick Jones, Jacquie Jones, Ike Anderson, John Russon, Alexis Larson, Kirk Nacey, Dave McSwain, Keith Halls, Cindy Jenkins, Lee Sim, Mark Tren, Brian Kartchner, Paul Belnap, Mike Jensen, J.G. (signature not legible), Janeen Evans, Matt Howes, and Terrell Rohm.

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- PUBLIC HEARING FOR A REZONE FOR APPROXIMATELY 1820 SOUTH SUNSET DRIVE (PARCELS #08-694-0005, 08-0-27-0009, AND 08-27-0008) FROM R-A AND A-1 TO R-1-6 WITH A PRUD OVERLAY

Community Development Director Melinda Greenwood presented an application submitted by Symphony Homes requesting a rezone of approximately 14.7 acres located near 1820 South Sunset Drive. The application includes three parcels currently zoned A-1 and RA (agricultural and residential agricultural) and seeks to rezone them to R-1-6 Single-Family Residential with a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) overlay to allow for a mix of public and private streets. The proposed development would consist of 46 single-family lots ranging in size from approximately 6,300 square feet to just over 22,000 square feet.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the property is currently undeveloped and that surrounding zoning includes A-1, R-1-20, and R-1-LD. She reviewed the City's 2022 General Plan, noting that the Future Land Use Map designates the subject property for single-family residential use, making the proposed R-1-6 zoning consistent with the plan. She stated that the project supports the General Plan's guiding principle of providing diverse housing options through a range of lot sizes. She also cited goals from the Land Use and Placemaking, Transportation and Connectivity, and Housing and Neighborhoods chapters that support maintaining single-family neighborhoods, improving connectivity, and providing a range of housing opportunities,

including moderate-income housing as required by state law.

Ms. Greenwood reviewed the City's water availability analysis required under the recently adopted General Plan water chapter. She stated that the City purchases water from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District and currently holds 3,186 acre-feet of culinary water with a five-year average use of just over 2,400 acre-feet. The proposed development of 46 homes is projected to require approximately 12 acre-feet of water annually, which is within the City's available capacity. She clarified that the City does not provide secondary water but confirmed that adequate culinary water is available to serve the development.

Ms. Greenwood described the proposed development agreement that would accompany the rezone and be recorded against the property. She explained that the development agreement would fix the zoning, site layout, number of lots, and other development standards, preventing any increase in density beyond the 46 lots without City Council approval. She reviewed key provisions of the agreement, including minimum frontage standards averaging 60 feet with a minimum of 50 feet, front setbacks of 20 feet, side setbacks of five feet, rear setbacks of 25 feet with limited patio encroachments, a maximum building height of 35 feet limited to two stories, fencing requirements, landscaping standards, and prohibition of on-street parking on private streets to ensure emergency access. She also noted that the agreement requires compliance with fire code standards, including limiting the number of homes to 30 until a second point of ingress and egress is constructed. All intersections, including the connection to Sunset Drive, would be designed to AASHTO safety standards.

Ms. Greenwood presented a proposed amendment to the development agreement regarding the list of trees permitted in park strips. Based on recommendations from the City's Parks and Recreation Department and certified arborists, she recommended removing three tree species from the approved list to ensure suitability for park strips, salt tolerance, and drought resistance.

Chair Mike Packer asked for clarification regarding the project's phasing. Ms. Greenwood explained that the project would be constructed in phases, with the central portion of the development proposed as Phase One because it provides the only current access point. She stated that a turnaround would be required at the end of Phase One for emergency access. Before proceeding to additional phases, Sea Biscuit Drive (550 West) would need to be improved to full right-of-way width. She noted that phasing could be adjusted based on market demand but would remain subject to the requirements in the development agreement. Ms. Greenwood reviewed the planned improvements to Sea Biscuit Drive/550 West, explaining that City Code identifies the street as a "significant local street" requiring 66 feet of right-of-way and 41 feet of asphalt, extending from Mayor Road to Angel Street. She noted that this street alignment and width have been part of City Code for many years.

Ms. Greenwood summarized public comments received to date, stating that approximately 13 emails had been received, including three in support and the remainder expressing opposition or concerns. The primary concerns included traffic safety at the proposed Sunset Drive

intersection, project density, loss of agricultural land, infrastructure capacity, and the Angel Street connection. Ms. Greenwood stated that staff and the City's engineers believe the Sunset Drive connection is important for connectivity and is supported by the General Plan. She explained that the intersection would only be allowed if it could be designed and constructed to meet AASHTO safety standards. She also stated that adequate sewer and water capacity exist or would be constructed as part of development and that the development agreement would limit density to 46 lots regardless of what the underlying R-1-6 zoning might otherwise allow. Regarding Angel Street, she noted that Symphony Homes does not own the intervening property but that discussions are underway with the Sewer District to potentially facilitate that future connection.

Ms. Greenwood stated that staff recommends approval of the rezone based on consistency with the General Plan. She requested that if the Planning Commission chooses to recommend approval, staff and legal counsel be allowed to make minor non-substantive edits to the development agreement prior to City Council consideration, including possible clarification regarding the Angel Street connection and updating the tree list.

Chair Packer asked for clarification regarding the nature of potential edits. Ms. Greenwood stated that they would be limited to minor items such as the tree list and possible language related to the Angel Street connection and would not be substantive. Chair Packer reminded the Commission and the public that the Planning Commission's role is to make a recommendation to the City Council, which will make the final decision on the rezone. Ms. Greenwood added that any changes to the development agreement would be shown as redlined revisions in the City Council packet for full transparency.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked whether City plans contemplate the Angel Street connection. Ms. Greenwood stated that City Code in Title 8 identifies Sea Biscuit Drive as a significant local street extending from Mayor Road to Angel Street with a 66-foot right-of-way, confirming that the connection has long been part of the City's adopted street framework.

Chair Mike Packer invited the applicant to present following staff's report.

Matt Loveland, representing Symphony Homes, provided his business address at 111 South Frontage Road in Centerville, Utah. Mr. Loveland explained that the project has evolved significantly since its original application. He stated that in January of the prior year Symphony hosted a neighborhood open house to gather community feedback before beginning formal design. In May of that year, Symphony submitted an application for 297 homes across a larger area, which was heard by the Planning Commission in August. Following that process, Symphony divided the overall property into eastern and western portions, noting that Symphony owns the entirety of the eastern portion but not all of the western area. The current application is limited to the eastern portion of the original site.

Mr. Loveland explained that under the prior application, the east side included 99 homes, including 13 traditional front-loading homes and 86 rear-load smaller units. Under the revised

proposal now before the Commission, the east side has been reduced to 46 traditional front-loading single-family homes on R-1-6 zoning. He stated that Symphony Homes intentionally scaled back density and adjusted the design based on prior feedback and analysis.

Mr. Loveland addressed concerns regarding R-1-6 zoning allowances, noting that although R-1-6 could allow higher density, the development agreement would restrict the site to exactly 46 homes. He presented renderings and examples of the types of homes Symphony intends to build, explaining that the yellow-coded lots would be larger and the brown-coded lots medium sized, with all lots allowing either two-car or three-car garages. He stated the overall density would be just over three units per acre. He reviewed the proposed setbacks of 20 feet in front, 25 feet in the rear, five feet on each side, and 15 feet on street corners, noting that covered patios could extend into the rear setback while remaining at least ten feet from the rear property line, allowing for 1,000 to 1,500 square feet of outdoor living space.

Mr. Loveland discussed the proposed building height of 35 feet, compared to the 32-foot limit in code, explaining that the increase would allow Symphony to use European-inspired roof designs with steeper roof pitches. He stated that all homes would remain limited to two stories and that the height increase was solely to accommodate architectural rooflines, not additional floors.

Mr. Loveland then addressed traffic and access. He explained that Symphony's traffic engineer, Hales Engineering, prepared a traffic study in August 2025 for the prior 297-unit plan. That study assumed two access points—one at Sunset Drive and one at Angel Street—and further assumed that 25 percent of traffic from the adjacent Sunset Equestrian Estates would route through the project to be conservative. It also assumed Angel Street would not connect beyond the project, forcing all traffic to exit via Sunset Drive. Based on those conservative assumptions, all Sunset Drive intersections were determined to operate at Level of Service A, including both proposed access points.

Mr. Loveland further explained the AASHTO standards for intersection design and site distance. He stated that although Sunset Drive is posted at 30 miles per hour, the engineering analysis assumed 35 miles per hour for safety. Based on AASHTO tables, minimum site distance requirements of 335 feet to the north and 390 feet to the south would apply. He stated that Symphony's engineer and the City's public works and engineering staff concluded the proposed intersection at Sunset Drive could be designed to meet those AASHTO requirements.

Mr. Loveland addressed neighborhood concerns and stated that fencing along Sunset Drive had been added to the plan to provide buffering between the proposed homes and existing residences. He also discussed the Sewer District remnant parcel between the project and Angel Street, stating that Symphony would like to include it if possible but respects that it is owned by the Sewer District. He stated Symphony is willing to assist the City in any discussions related to that property but intends to proceed with the portion of the project that Symphony controls. Mr. Loveland concluded by stating that Symphony is confident the proposed development would add value and character to the community and requested the opportunity to answer

questions during public discussion.

Chair Mike Packer formally opened the public comment portion of the meeting. He explained that any person wishing to speak would be allowed up to three minutes and must state their name for the record. He advised that the Planning Commission would not engage in dialogue or answer questions during public comment in order to allow each speaker to use their full time. Speakers were permitted to pose questions, but responses would be addressed after the public comment period closed. The public comment portion of the hearing was then opened.

Paul Belnap addressed the Commission and stated that he had submitted a written letter dated December 1 outlining prior master planning efforts for West Kaysville. He stated that, beginning in the early 2000s, the City had directed neighborhood meetings involving approximately 15 homes, which resulted in a master plan establishing low-density development for the area encompassing more than 300 acres between Angel Street and the former railroad corridor. He asserted that this planning history remains relevant when evaluating whether the current proposal preserves the area's established character.

Mr. Belnap expressed concern that the current application covers only 14.7 acres of what was originally a 52-acre area, leaving approximately 38 acres without any documented zoning or development standards. He stated that the proposed community amenity area of approximately 6,000 square feet within a 632,000-square-foot development does not reflect the rural and low-density character historically established for West Kaysville.

He further stated that the development agreement available on the City's website does not include a detailed site plan or product types and that five-foot side yard setbacks, private streets, and no-parking restrictions would not be compatible with existing neighborhood patterns and could create parking issues. He expressed concern that approval of R-1-6 zoning for this portion of the property could later be extended to the remaining acreage without a complete plan.

Mr. Belnap requested that the application be denied or, at minimum, tabled until a full development plan for all remaining property is provided. He also stated that although he had been told that issues with the equestrian center had been resolved, the development agreement contained no provisions addressing that property or its role in open space planning.

Jacquie Jones stated that she and her husband are residents of West Kaysville and developed three lots directly across from the proposed project after moving into the area in 2007. She explained that their development was required to comply with R-1-20 zoning standards, including lot size and building height limits, and that she constructed a European-style home with steep roof pitches while remaining within the City's height restrictions.

Ms. Jones stated that Symphony Homes' request for increased building height to accommodate roof pitch was unnecessary, as similar architectural designs can be achieved through engineering solutions within existing limits. She expressed concern that regulatory standards are being relaxed for the current project beyond what prior developers were required to follow.

She also discussed the Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay, stating that it allows flexibility in housing types, open space, and amenities but can significantly affect neighborhood character, density, traffic, and livability. She stated that residents should be cautious and fully informed when PRUD zoning is used. Ms. Jones indicated that she and her neighbors worked hard to preserve the established character of the area and made development decisions that prioritized compatibility with surrounding properties, even at financial cost.

During Ms. Jones's presentation, the Chair and City Attorney clarified that Planning Commission bylaws limit speakers to three minutes and do not permit yielding time, though the Chair allowed Ms. Jones limited additional time to complete her remarks.

Ms. Jones expressed concern that the traffic studies relied upon were conducted between 2019 and 2023 and do not reflect current traffic conditions following completion of the I-15 and 950 West connections. She stated that residents have experienced significantly increased traffic volumes and difficulty accessing Sunset Drive.

She presented materials showing the number of homes that could ultimately be built on the full 52-acre property and stated that approximately 300 homes could be developed, regardless of whether the zoning is R-1-6 or R-1-7. She further presented a traffic count conducted by her and her daughter, reporting approximately 100 vehicles every ten minutes during peak times, or about 600 vehicles per hour, directly in front of her home.

Ms. Jones stated that the proposed development access would be located at a blind curve on Sunset Drive where accidents, a child injury, and pet fatalities have already occurred. She requested that an independent traffic study be conducted before any approval of the project.

Ms. Jones submitted a 4 page handout showing homes to be affected by the development, the location of the 300 homes to be added, a Kaysville City Schedule of Zoning District Regulations, and a document explaining the need for a fully independent traffic study.

Keith Halls stated that he lives at 1787 South Sunset Drive at the location where the proposed road connection to Sunset Drive would be constructed. He explained that he has lived at the location for approximately 40 years and has personal experience navigating the blind curve and downhill grade at that point. He stated that entering and exiting his driveway has become increasingly difficult over time due to traffic and visibility limitations.

Mr. Halls expressed concern that the proposed development access would create a hazardous condition, particularly if fencing is installed that would further restrict sight distance. He described scenarios in which parents and school-age drivers would be required to make left-hand turns onto Sunset Drive at a blind curve, creating a high risk of serious accidents.

He stated that access through Angel Street would be significantly safer because of the existing roundabout and roadway design. He reported that in prior discussions with the applicant,

Symphony Homes indicated that if Angel Street access could be obtained, the Sunset Drive access could be eliminated. He urged the Commission to prioritize Angel Street access and consider the safety of future residents and existing neighbors when evaluating the project.

Lee Sim stated that he lives north of the proposed development and is a retired civil engineer. He raised a question regarding whether the existing culinary water infrastructure, specifically the main water lines along Sunset Drive, are adequately sized to serve an additional 46 homes without negatively affecting water pressure.

Mr. Sim noted that while the City may have sufficient overall water supply, he had not heard confirmation that the existing distribution infrastructure in the area could handle the additional demand. He asked that this issue be evaluated as part of the project review.

Terrell Rohm stated that he lives on Appaloosa Drive, a few blocks east of the proposed development. He thanked Symphony Homes for meeting with neighbors and attempting to address concerns. He stated that he and others are not opposed to new construction but are opposed to the proposed R-1-6 rezoning.

Mr. Rohm explained that the surrounding neighborhood consists primarily of larger lots, approximately 0.46 acres, and that R-1-6 zoning is not compatible with the existing aesthetic or master planning for the area. He stated that many residents present were in opposition to the rezoning and asked those who shared that view to indicate their opposition. He thanked the Commission for considering community input.

Matt Howes stated that he lives on Seabiscuit Drive within the area affected by the proposed development. He explained that residents are not opposed to development but are opposed to the density being proposed. He expressed concern that the phased application does not reflect the full buildout, which he estimated could reach approximately 500 homes and generate over 1,000 to 1,500 vehicles.

Mr. Howes stated that traffic already presents significant problems at Sunset Drive and Western Drive, as well as at 950 West and Sunset Drive, with long delays at peak times. He stated that the impact of additional traffic would affect not only intersections but neighborhood streets throughout the area.

He also stated that Seabiscuit Drive was described as a major access street, but he measured the roadway and found it to be approximately 30 to 31 feet wide, not 41 feet as previously represented. He stated that Seabiscuit Drive was originally designed as a residential street and not intended to serve as a primary traffic route for a large development. He urged the Commission to consider traffic safety and the cumulative impact of the proposed density.

Tim Hirsch stated that he lives at the corner of Sunset Drive and Shepherd Road. He explained that he moved to the area to live in a lower-density neighborhood with less traffic. He stated that traffic on Sunset Drive has increased significantly, particularly since the construction of the

roundabout and as more drivers use Sunset Drive to access the freeway from surrounding communities.

Mr. Hirsch expressed that while residents value the low-density character of the area, development is being driven by financial investment rather than community preference. He stated that Symphony Homes has invested heavily in the property and is seeking to maximize its return, while the existing residents are opposed to the proposed zoning and density. He noted that the future residents of the development are not present in the discussion, as the homes have not yet been built or sold.

Dave McSwain stated that he lives directly across from the proposed development on Sunset Drive. He expressed that no portion of the project should be approved until the full development plan for the entire property is known. He stated that the zoning was in place when Symphony Homes purchased the property and that ongoing changes have created prolonged uncertainty for residents.

Mr. McSwain stated that Symphony Homes produces a high-quality product and that if the development resembled the Preserve subdivision, which is built on approximately one-third acre lots, he would not object to the zoning. He expressed concern that smaller lot sizes could negatively affect surrounding property values.

He also stated that traffic studies can be interpreted in different ways and do not reflect the current conditions on Sunset Drive. He described significant congestion and delays for left turns, including a recent instance where 13 vehicles were backed up behind a turning vehicle. He noted that there are no left-turn lanes and that traffic has increased since the opening of new regional connections. He stated that Angel Street and the roundabout were intended to reduce pressure on Sunset Drive and urged that the project be tabled until access through Angel Street can be secured.

Allyson Stenquist stated that she lives in the existing development adjacent to the proposed project and that she and her husband's family owned portions of the property that were sold to Symphony Homes during earlier phases of development. She stated that Symphony had previously committed to developing the area with lot sizes of one-half acre, one-third acre, or possibly one-quarter acre, and that those commitments were shared with neighboring residents at that time. She stated that those earlier plans did not generate neighborhood opposition.

Ms. Stenquist stated that she opposes the R-1-6 zoning because it is not compatible with the surrounding RA, A-1, and A-5 zoning districts and represents a significant reduction in lot size. She further stated that the proposal does not provide meaningful accommodation for agricultural uses or open space and that Kaysville is losing opportunities to preserve those community assets. She expressed concern that the proposal lacks sufficient engineering detail and roadway planning and described it as incomplete. She stated her opposition to the R-1-6 zoning request.

Jill Dredge, a Kaysville resident who does not live in the immediate project area, addressed the Commission. She asked whether the proposed Symphony Homes development would be a Public Infrastructure District (PID) and requested clarification from the applicant on that point.

Mike Jensen, representing Bridal up Hope Davis County, an equine-assisted learning facility located directly across from the proposed development, addressed the Commission. He stated that in conversations with both nearby residents and Symphony Homes, there was broad agreement that the project would function better if access were routed through Angel Street rather than Sunset Drive. He noted that discussions are already occurring between the City and the Sewer District regarding potential access solutions and that community members have expressed a willingness to participate in those discussions.

Mr. Jensen emphasized the importance of preserving the equestrian character of the area, particularly along 550 West, where multiple horse owners and facilities are located. He described the horses currently in the area and stated that how the development interfaces with the equestrian uses are an important community consideration. He concluded by urging the City to pause the current proposal and pursue a more comprehensive and mutually agreeable solution, particularly one centered on Angel Street access.

Mark Treu, who lives immediately east of the project area, stated that while he supports the property being developed for housing, his primary concern is traffic and roadway safety. He explained that Sunset Drive, Western Drive, and nearby intersections already experience significant congestion and dangerous turning movements, particularly for families with children traveling to local schools. He stated that adding a new access point onto Sunset Drive would worsen these safety issues.

Mr. Treu strongly supported resolving access through Angel Street before approving any new development, stating that if that connection were completed, he would be willing to support a residential project in the area. He also opposed the proposed R-1-6 zoning, stating that he would prefer larger-lot zoning such as R-1-8 or R-1-10, and expressed skepticism that the plans presented would ultimately reflect what is built. He concluded by emphasizing the need for a comprehensive traffic management plan along Sunset Drive before proceeding.

Kirk Assay, whose home and front yard are located at the blind corner where the proposed Sunset Drive access would occur and whose backyard would border Lot 5 of the project, expressed concerns regarding building height, zoning certainty, and density. He stated that he had previously been denied approval for a small architectural feature on a shed due to height limits and questioned why the development should be allowed increased height beyond existing city standards. He argued that homes should be designed to comply with current height regulations rather than modifying those standards.

Mr. Assay also objected to zoning the entire property R-1-6, stating that it creates uncertainty for future phases and allows future density increases. He requested that any commitments

regarding lot sizes or zoning be placed in binding written form rather than relying on verbal agreements, noting that prior verbal agreements had changed over time. He further stated that smaller lots in the southern portion of the project would not be affordable despite being characterized as such, and that Kaysville is not a first-time homebuyer market.

Finally, he expressed concern that the proposed density is incompatible with the surrounding area, which is characterized by one-acre and large-lot properties and ongoing equestrian and agricultural uses, and stated that reducing lot sizes below approximately one-third of an acre was not appropriate for this area.

Sapienta Fernandez spoke about the emotional and safety impacts of increased density and traffic in the neighborhood. He stated that while traffic data and studies can be quantified, the daily stress of backing out of a driveway and worrying about children traveling to and from school cannot be measured in the same way. He explained that his family moved to Kaysville for its open, low-density character and sense of space and safety, which he contrasted with high-density living environments he had previously experienced.

Mr. Fernandez emphasized that the expansiveness of the neighborhood provides a sense of security and quality of life for families and children, and he expressed concern that the proposed development would change that character. He questioned whether future residents would be fully informed about existing traffic and safety conditions on Sunset Drive and concluded by urging the Commission to consider the lived experience of residents in addition to technical analyses.

Mark Oveson, who lives directly across from the proposed Sunset Drive access, described the daily difficulty of entering and exiting his driveway with a truck and trailer for his tree care business. He stated that he already waits up to two minutes for a safe opening in traffic and that even short delays feel significant when traffic is constant.

Mr. Oveson expressed concern that traffic conditions would worsen if a new development access were added to that location. He urged the Commission to take a more deliberate, long-term approach by waiting until access options to the south are resolved so the project can be planned in a more coordinated and safe manner.

Cindy Jenkins spoke briefly after lending most of her allotted time to another speaker. She explained that in September, during the start of the school year, traffic at the Sunset Drive and Western Drive intersection was extremely heavy and unsafe. At the City's request, she conducted a manual traffic count between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and recorded 865 vehicles crossing the intersection during that single hour, while also witnessing multiple near-accidents involving vehicles attempting to cross.

She stated that the subsequent traffic study showed approximately 30,000 vehicles passing through that intersection in a one-week period. While she said she was not opposed to new homes being built, she emphasized that Sunset Drive has become significantly busier since 950

West was opened and that the high volume of traffic, including many teenage drivers, makes the proposed new access point onto Sunset Drive feel unsafe.

Matthew Mann, a resident of 1795 South Sunset Drive who lives directly across from the proposed development entrance, stated that while he supports responsible and well-planned development, he formally opposed the Symphony Homes proposal as presented, including both the rezoning request and the proposed access onto Sunset Drive.

He explained that the requested change from agricultural zoning to R-1-6 represents a major and abrupt increase in residential density that is inconsistent with the Kaysville General Plan for West Kaysville, which calls for lower-density residential development with gradual transitions that align with roadway and infrastructure capacity. He said the proposal skips multiple intermediate zoning categories and introduces a level of intensity that was not planned for this area.

Mr. Mann emphasized that zoning and infrastructure cannot be separated, stating that approving the higher-density zoning would grant development entitlements that assume traffic and access issues can be resolved later, even though those issues have not yet been demonstrated to be safe or workable. He warned that once zoning is approved, the City's ability to address these constraints is significantly reduced.

He also focused on safety concerns related to the proposed access onto Sunset Drive, noting that Sunset Drive is a collector roadway that already carries heavy traffic. He cited a traffic-calming study conducted by Kaysville City Police Officer Logan Nichols in December 2025 near his home, which showed operating speeds between 33 and 38 miles per hour in a 30-mile-per-hour zone, or 10 to 27 percent over the posted speed limit. He said this occurs on a downhill, blind corner, where sight distance and stopping distance are already compromised.

Mr. Mann concluded that adding a development access at this location would introduce turning and stopping vehicles in a setting that is already unsafe and that these conditions cannot be adequately mitigated by signage, striping, or minor design changes. He urged the Planning Commission to deny the rezoning request and remove any access onto Sunset Drive and recommended that any future consideration of the property be deferred until a safe alternative access, such as the Shepherd–Angel Street connection, is completed and available.

Boyd Argyle, a resident who lives on 550 West near Seabiscuit, Mare Drive, and Castration Circle and who keeps horses in the area, stated that he is one of the few remaining residents living directly in that portion of the project area. He expressed concern that the development will further impact his access and the rural character of the area, which is currently used by hikers, horseback riders, and residents.

Mr. Argyle emphasized that 550 West needs to be better managed, particularly in terms of traffic speed and safety, because it is used by both vehicles and people with horses. He said this is the primary road he uses to access his property and that it must be handled carefully if

development proceeds.

He also raised concerns about communication from Symphony Homes. He stated that although the developer had previously approached him and said they would keep him informed, he has not heard directly from them and has instead relied on others, including Mike, for updates. He further stated that his dirt road access has not been properly maintained, particularly after prior construction activity, and that he remains concerned about how future development will affect that road.

Mr. Argyle concluded by stating that the City should not make decisions based on only a small portion of the development area. He urged the Planning Commission to require a full picture of the entire project area before acting, rather than considering only a limited “postage stamp” portion of the overall development.

Chair Mike Packer formally closed the public comment portion of the meeting after confirming that no additional speakers wished to address the Commission. He then explained the next step in the process, stating that it is standard procedure for the applicant to return to the podium to respond to issues raised during public comment before the Planning Commission begins its deliberation.

Mr. Loveland addressed the Planning Commission following the close of public comment. He clarified that the project is not a Public Improvement District (PID) and that a PID is not being proposed or contemplated for this development.

Regarding traffic, he stated that Symphony has relied on the findings of its traffic studies but acknowledged the emotional concerns and lived experiences expressed by residents. He noted that there are also opportunities for traffic enforcement to help address some of the issues raised.

On the question of east-versus-west access, Mr. Loveland explained that both sides present unique challenges, and Symphony is actively working to mitigate and resolve those challenges so the project can proceed responsibly. He emphasized that splitting the project into two phases is not ideal for Symphony and does not make development easier, but he believes the project can be adequately served by existing and planned infrastructure based on what is currently being proposed.

He concluded by stating that he remained open to dialogue and discussion with the Commission.

Chair Packer thanked residents for their written and in-person comments and explained that the Commission considers all feedback, even if not every issue can be directly addressed. He acknowledged concerns about the project being split into phases but clarified that the applicant has the right to bring forward only the portion currently proposed. Any future phases would require their own full review process, including public comment, Planning Commission review,

and City Council approval. He stated that the Commission would focus primarily on the proposal currently before them while still considering the broader concerns raised.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that the dominant concern raised by the public related to traffic, circulation, and street layout, and asked Ms. Greenwood to clarify the status of the planned connection between 550 West (Seabiscuit) and Angel Street, noting that such a connection could significantly relieve pressure on Sunset Drive.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that Seabiscuit between Mayor Drive and Angel Street is planned to be a 66-foot-wide street, even though the existing street in the neighborhood is currently much narrower. She acknowledged there had been confusion about this earlier.

She explained that Symphony Homes attempted late last year to purchase a portion of land owned by the Sewer District to complete the 550-to-Angel Street connection, but the Sewer District declined to sell at that time. The City has since been in ongoing discussions with the Sewer District and believes that the connection is critically important for the community and future development.

Ms. Greenwood stated that the Angel Street connection has been in the City's code and long-range planning for many years, and while the City does have the authority to obtain property through condemnation (eminent domain), that process requires political will and time. The City is currently attempting to resolve the issue cooperatively, and while holiday schedules delayed meetings, staff is working to schedule further discussions.

She emphasized that dealing with another public entity such as the Sewer District is inherently slow because their staff must work through their governing board. While she believes the Sewer District may be open to selling the necessary right-of-way, no final agreement has yet been reached.

Ms. Greenwood also explained that the City cannot require Symphony Homes to build a road across property it does not own, and that development agreements can only require actions that a developer has the ability to control. Past proposals raised concerns about showing street connections through property that was not owned by the applicant, which residents had objected to. The Sewer District owns the land needed for the Angel Street connection, and it remains their decision whether to sell.

She concluded by stating that she believes the Sewer District will ultimately recognize the importance of the connection for both the community and future development, but the process has not yet been finalized.

Commissioner Young asked staff to show the location of the Sewer District parcels that are preventing the connection between 550 West (Seabiscuit) and Angel Street.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the map being shown identifies the three parcels owned by

Symphony Homes. When the Angel Street extension was built in a previous year, it effectively split two of those Symphony parcels into north and south portions. Between those parcels lie two parcels owned by the Sewer District, including a triangular piece of land that extends toward 550 West. This triangular Sewer District parcel is the key piece of property needed to complete the road connection from 550 West down to Angel Street.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that the 550-to-Angel Street connection cannot occur without acquiring this triangular Sewer District property.

Commissioner Young asked whether the area where 550 would connect to Angel Street was not owned by the Sewer District, and Ms. Greenwood corrected that understanding, stating that the triangular area is indeed owned by the Sewer District and blocks the connection.

Ms. Greenwood further explained that while the parcel is relatively small—approximately 13 feet wide at its narrowest point, the full 66-foot roadway width required for the planned street would have to be obtained. Although the amount of land is small, the City cannot force the Sewer District to sell it to Symphony Homes, and she confirmed that Symphony had attempted to purchase the land, but the Sewer District declined to sell.

Commissioner Sommerkorn addressed the broader issue of traffic on Sunset Drive, noting that in rapidly growing areas, existing streets often become overwhelmed as development occurs. He explained that communities are generally left with only two options: construct additional streets or widen existing ones, and sometimes a combination of both. While additional street connections such as Angel Street are being pursued, he stated that Sunset Drive will continue to face increasing traffic pressure as growth continues both within and outside Kaysville. He noted that widening Sunset Drive would be highly disruptive, as it would require taking property from many existing homeowners, creating a difficult trade-off regardless of which option is pursued.

Ms. Greenwood reported that since the Commission last reviewed this project in August, the City has made progress on Angel Street. She stated that Kaysville has secured a county grant to fund construction of the remaining portion of Angel Street, extending from the roundabout northward past the Sunset Equestrian Estates. However, she cautioned that the City does not yet own all the land needed to build the road, as a portion of the required right-of-way crosses property owned by the Equestrian Center. While funding for construction is in place, the City must still acquire that property before the road can be completed.

Commissioner Sevy asked staff to clarify how the proposed Angel Street connection interacts with the existing Equestrian Center property and the funding that has been secured for roadway construction. Ms. Greenwood explained that the planned Angel Street extension would pass through portions of the Equestrian Center property that the City does not currently own. While the City has received county grant funding to construct the Angel Street roadway from the roundabout northward past Sunset Equestrian Estates, construction cannot proceed until the necessary private property is acquired. Ms. Greenwood stated that UDOT owns some adjacent remnant parcels from the West Davis Corridor and will convey those to the City, but a

portion of the equestrian property still remains a critical obstacle.

Ms. Greenwood further clarified that Symphony is proposing one connection to Sunset Drive as part of this phase, while the City strongly desires a second connection from 550 West (Seabiscuit) down to Angel Street. That second connection requires approximately a 66-foot-wide right-of-way, including a narrow triangular strip—about 13 feet wide—that is currently owned by the Sewer District. Symphony attempted to purchase that property, but the Sewer District declined to sell it. Ms. Greenwood stated that the City is continuing discussions with the Sewer District and believes they may be willing to sell the right-of-way needed for the 550-to-Angel connection, although the Sewer District is not currently interested in selling its remaining land. She noted that if negotiations fail, the City does have the authority to pursue eminent domain, though that would require political will.

Commissioner Young asked whether, if the Angel Street connection were completed, the City would still want a connection to Sunset Drive. Ms. Greenwood responded that the City's preference is to have both a Sunset connection and a 550/Seabiscuit connection to provide sufficient circulation and redundancy for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked whether the development would retain the Sunset connection even if Angel Street were completed, and Ms. Greenwood confirmed that it would. Young also asked about the purpose of several small street stubs and hammerhead turnarounds shown on the site plan near certain lots. Ms. Greenwood explained that those features relate to negotiations with the Sewer District, which has requested certain development concessions if it is to convey the needed right-of-way. Those stubs are designed to preserve future connectivity options should those negotiations succeed.

Ms. Greenwood cautioned that while the City is actively working toward securing Angel Street and 550 connections, the City cannot require Symphony to build through land it does not own, and any commitments in the development agreement must be limited to property Symphony controls.

Commissioner Sommerkorn summarized that the Sewer District's interest in protecting the development potential of its remaining land appears to be a key factor in its negotiations, as any right-of-way dedication would need to preserve the viability of that property for future use.

Ms. Greenwood deferred to the applicant to explain the purpose of the hammerhead street layouts. Mr. Loveland explained that the hammerheads primarily function as turnarounds but also serve a dual purpose by preserving the ability to connect into Sewer District property in the future, particularly near Lot 40. He stated that Symphony intends to act as a good neighbor and pursue future connectivity where possible, but that they can only commit to what is currently within their control.

Commissioner Toller asked for clarification regarding access requirements. Ms. Greenwood confirmed that under fire code, any development exceeding 30 units must have at least two

points of ingress and egress. She stated that the development could build up to 30 units with only one access point, but a second connection would be required to exceed that number. Commissioner Toller referenced the Hales Engineering traffic study, which recommended deceleration lanes on both Sunset Drive and Angel Street. He asked whether deceleration lanes were part of AASHTO standards. Ms. Greenwood confirmed that AASHTO does include standards for acceleration and deceleration lanes but stated she could not specify the exact requirements.

Commissioner Toller stated that although deceleration lanes do not currently exist on Sunset Drive, the engineering study identified them as best practice. He emphasized that any approval should account for the opportunity to implement such improvements while land is still available.

Commissioner Toller also noted that while many residents opposed any access to Sunset Drive, even if traffic were routed to Angel Street or Seabiscuit, most trips would still ultimately use Sunset Drive for southbound travel. He stated that Seabiscuit is narrower than other neighborhood streets and expressed concern about existing barriers and circulation at Mare Drive. He argued that pushing traffic onto dirt roads and through neighborhood streets toward Western Drive was not viable. He noted that the traffic study accounted for traffic draining through Kentucky Derby Drive to Western Drive and that this routing had already been analyzed.

Commissioner Toller further emphasized that the current application covers only 14.7 acres and that future development will occur regardless. He stated that adequate street connectivity and safety must be ensured now. He clarified that the approved development agreement would legally bind Symphony to the lot configuration and product types shown, and the City would retain enforcement authority. He explained that the proposal includes approximately 22 larger lots and 23 smaller lots.

Commissioner Toller stated that Symphony's proposed 0.14-acre lots were unfamiliar to him and that he would like to see an example of what that product looks like before supporting a recommendation to City Council. He concluded that he was not prepared at this time to forward the proposal for approval but was open to further evaluation.

Mr. Loveland responded to questions regarding the feasibility and precedent of the proposed smaller lots. He stated that Symphony currently builds on lots smaller than one-half acre in other communities, including projects in Lehi where lots are approximately 0.14 acres or smaller, with 50-foot frontages and 90-foot depths. He stated that the proposed Kaysville lots would be larger, with widths of approximately 60 to 70 feet and depths ranging from approximately 110 to over 160 feet. He also noted that Symphony has a comparable development in Saratoga Springs near the temple with similar lot sizes, and he offered to coordinate a field visit for commissioners to see those projects.

Commissioner Toller asked for an estimated price range for the smaller lots, specifically

referencing Lots 43, 32, and 31. Mr. Loveland stated that the southern “brown” lots were anticipated to sell for approximately \$1 million, depending on home plan, square footage, and garage configuration. Commissioner Toller expressed concern that a 0.14-acre lot adjacent to the sewer plant would command that price.

Commissioner Young stated that there is precedent in Kaysville for similar-sized cottage lots, citing the Hill Farms neighborhood, where lots are approximately 6,000 square feet. She stated that those lots initially faced opposition but have since become a desirable neighborhood. She further stated that although these homes would not be affordable, increasing lot sizes would result in even larger, more expensive homes, and that increasing housing inventory on smaller lots is one of the few mechanisms available to help address housing costs.

Commissioner Sommerkorn agreed and stated that while the homes would still be expensive, increasing the supply of housing through smaller lot sizes can help moderate price pressures because land cost is a major driver of housing prices. He stated that it is not the lot size alone that determines affordability, as even homes on small lots can be very expensive. He also stated that communities across the state are being asked to take responsibility for contributing to housing supply, rather than relying only on low-density development patterns. He further noted that while the zoning proposed is R-1-6, only about 10 of the 46 lots would be at the minimum 6,000-square-foot size, with the remainder being larger, and that the development agreement would ultimately control what is built.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that the average lot size in the proposed development is over 10,000 square feet across the 46 lots. She also identified existing Kaysville developments with smaller lots that could serve as visual references, including a subdivision just south of the Pickler on Deseret Drive with lots around 5,000 square feet and Talbot Estates east of Highway 89 with lots generally between 6,000 and 8,000 square feet.

Mr. Loveland added that Symphony’s development packet included exterior elevations showing home types that would fit on the smaller lots, and Ms. Greenwood displayed those examples to the Commission.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that lot size alone was not persuasive as a measure of neighborhood character, noting that while smaller lots do result in more homes and therefore more traffic, that condition exists throughout many growing communities. He stated that while traffic impacts should not be ignored, widening Sunset Drive would be extremely difficult, and that a connection to Angel Street would provide meaningful relief by giving traffic additional routing options.

Chair Packer stated that he had reached similar conclusions. He explained that he could not find any legitimate planning reason why different zoning districts and lot sizes cannot exist adjacent to one another, noting that this condition already exists throughout Kaysville without degrading neighborhoods. He stated that smaller lot zoning does not inherently ruin neighborhoods and that, although residents may prefer larger lots, personal preference is not a sufficient planning

basis to deny zoning. He further stated that one of Kaysville's goals is to provide a variety of housing options and that the city currently lacks diversity in housing types.

Chair Packer acknowledged traffic as a valid concern but noted that traffic impacts exist citywide and are not unique to this area. He stated that while Sunset Drive has grown busier over time, it still serves one of the least dense areas in Kaysville, and that traffic alone should not preclude development. He concluded that, taken as a whole, the proposal could fit within Kaysville and function appropriately with mitigation measures.

Commissioner Sommerkorn added that, in lieu of widening Sunset Drive, traffic control measures such as signals, stop signs, or other traffic management tools could be considered, even though such measures may not be popular with residents.

Commissioner Birkenshaw thanked the applicant for participating in the public process and acknowledged the difficulty of receiving strong community opposition. He also thanked residents for attending and participating. He stated that although Symphony was not required to present plans for the full 52-acre site, he believed doing so would better serve both the Commission and the community. He noted that unresolved development on the remaining acreage was creating uncertainty and concern.

Commissioner Birkenshaw expressed concern about the lack of trail connectivity and the limited amount of open space proposed, particularly given the density being requested. He stated that the level of open space was not comparable to surrounding developments in the area and did not sufficiently support the character of West Kaysville. He reiterated his support for pursuing the Angel Street connection and encouraged staff to continue efforts to make that connection possible.

He further stated that the density was being pushed to a level that required the use of private streets because the street widths could not meet city standards, and he questioned whether emergency services could be adequately provided under those conditions. He noted that while the private streets technically met fire code, he believed the Fire Department would likely have concerns about emergency access and response. He also cited concerns with the proposed setbacks, particularly the five-foot side yard setbacks and reduced rear setbacks, which he stated did not preserve the open-space character residents expect in West Kaysville.

Commissioner Birkenshaw stated that public comments, emails, and community surveys consistently reflected a desire to preserve Kaysville's rural, low-density, small-town atmosphere. He concluded that the density and setbacks proposed were not consistent with those expectations and that he could not support the proposal as presented.

Chair Packer asked whether the five-foot side yard setback was an exception or was allowed under city code. Ms. Greenwood clarified that the five-foot side setback is the standard for the R-1-6 zone. Commissioner Birkenshaw stated that the reduced setback was therefore a result of the zoning being requested.

Ms. Greenwood further explained that in all other single-family residential zones the minimum side yard setback is eight feet, and in some zones, it increases to ten feet, meaning that R-1-6 allows a total separation of ten feet between homes compared to sixteen feet in other zones. Commissioner Birkenshaw asked about rear setbacks. Ms. Greenwood initially misstated the figures and then corrected the record, explaining that R-1-6 and R-1-8 have 25-foot front yard setbacks, while R-1-10 and larger zones require 30 feet. Rear yard setbacks are 15 feet for R-1-20 and R-1-14 zones and increase to 30 feet for agricultural zones.

Commissioner Young stated that she did not have concerns with the proposed density but felt that the project lacked sufficient open space. She also expressed uncertainty about the proposed roof heights, noting that she generally preferred to let architecture dictate design but suggested that roof pitch could be adjusted to comply with standards if it became a concern. Commissioner Sommerkorn asked Ms. Greenwood whether the City's Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) ordinance included any standards or trade-off requirements, such as increased open space, in exchange for flexibility from zoning standards. Ms. Greenwood explained that the PRUD ordinance is largely based on flexibility and does not include specific requirements for trade-offs such as open space. She noted, however, that such conditions could be imposed through a development agreement.

Commissioner Moore stated for the record that he agreed with Commissioner Birkenshaw's concerns. He described having a "heavy" feeling about the proposal and said that he believed significant information was still missing. He stated that it would be helpful for both the Commission and the public to better understand the overall direction of the project. He expressed that the uncertainty surrounding the remainder of the property created doubt and said he was inclined toward tabling the request until a clearer and more actionable plan was presented.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked whether Commissioner Moore's concerns related to the remainder of the property or to the overall rezone request. Commissioner Moore clarified that while the applicant had submitted a plan for the 14-acre portion, uncertainty about the remaining acreage was still hanging over the proposal and affecting public confidence. Commissioner Young responded that no approvals were being granted for the remaining property and that any future proposals for the rest of the acreage would still be subject to full review, public comment, and Commission and City Council action. She stated that no commitments were being made beyond the current application.

Commissioner Toller agreed that phasing itself was not the primary concern. However, he stated that if the Commission were to recommend approval as presented, it would allow 46 units to be developed even though the site plan showed only one access, when two would ultimately be required. He said that moving forward under those circumstances did not feel appropriate.

Mr. Loveland stated that secondary access could and would be resolved, explaining that Symphony owns the property needed to create a second connection, although it was not

included in the current planning scope. He said the project was being phased to first establish single-family zoning that would apply across the full 50 acres. He noted that this portion of the site was the only area suitable for basements, which is why this phase was being prioritized. He also clarified that three separate property owners are involved in the broader area: Ivory Homes, Symphony Homes, and the Hansons, who own the equestrian center. Commissioner Toller asked whether the Sewer District was also involved.

Mr. Loveland confirmed that the Sewer District also controls land relevant to access but reiterated that Symphony owns the land required for the second access being referenced. Commissioner Sommerkorn clarified that the second access referenced in the traffic study was the one located west of the equestrian center and was some distance from the current phase. Commissioner Young confirmed that the 550 West connection was planned and not dependent on the Sewer District, meaning the project would ultimately have both Sunset Drive and 550 West for access, with Angel Street being the remaining unresolved portion.

Mr. Loveland stated that Symphony owns a portion of Angel Street and the City owns the remaining portion, and that the connection could and would be completed, though timing was the issue. He explained that the development agreement included a 30-unit limit until the west connection was operational, a provision he added to ensure no more than 30 homes could be built until the second access was available. He stated that Symphony was close to resolving the remaining property ownership issues but did not want to create expectations beyond what it could control.

Mr. Loveland then asked the Commission to provide consolidated feedback if the project was not likely to receive a positive recommendation, so he could understand what changes would be needed to move the proposal forward.

Commissioner Toller responded that he appreciated the reduction in density and the revised product compared to the August proposal but said those were not the primary concerns. He stated that the unresolved traffic, access, and safety issues were the major obstacles, and that he was not comfortable proceeding without certainty that those issues would be resolved. He said he would not make a motion to forward the application to City Council and would vote against such a motion if one were made.

Chair Packer stated that he was comfortable with the proposed lot sizes and zoning, noting that the R-1-6 zone already exists in Kaysville and is used in other parts of the city. He expressed concern with the idea that this area of Kaysville should be treated differently or be reserved only for large lots, stating that he could not find any legitimate planning reason why smaller lots could not be in this area.

The Chair explained that when evaluating the proposal, he focused on the 14.7-acre phase that was before the Commission rather than speculating about future phases or unresolved access issues. He stated that even if the project was limited to 30 homes, he would still find the proposal acceptable.

He acknowledged that traffic is always a concern with development but stated that traffic issues exist throughout the city and that families across Kaysville regularly deal with roads that are far busier than Sunset Drive. He indicated that traffic concerns alone were not sufficient, in his view, to prevent the project from moving forward.

Based on those considerations, Chair Packer stated that he would support recommending the proposal to the City Council.

Commissioner Young stated that she felt similarly to the Chair and was generally supportive of the proposal. She indicated she would be open to recommending the project to the City Council but also would not oppose tabling the item if that would allow the Angel Street connection to be finalized. She identified open space as the primary element she felt was lacking in the current proposal and stated she would like to see more open space included. However, she said she was comfortable with the proposed density and believed the project could be a high-quality development that would not harm surrounding neighborhoods. She also noted that the density had been reduced by more than half from the original proposal and that the revised plan represented a much-improved product.

Commissioner Sevy agreed with both Chair Packer and Commissioner Young, stating that she felt the proposed density and product were appropriate. She characterized the project as a higher-end development that would bring a consistent buyer market into the area and said the applicant had made significant concessions since the original proposal, including substantial reductions in density. She stated she did not have concerns with the zoning and believed the development would ultimately blend into the surrounding area as it became established.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that he also did not have a problem with the lot sizes or zoning, noting that the proposal remained a single-family residential development, which aligns with the General Plan. He said the project could be done in this location. However, he expressed interest in potentially tabling the application to apply pressure toward resolving the 550/Angel Street connection, which he viewed as an important long-term circulation improvement. He also noted that, since the project was being processed as a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD), he would like to see additional community benefits, such as increased open space, included as a trade-off for the flexibility provided by the overlay. Finally, he expressed concern about the use of private streets, explaining that in his experience they often become long-term maintenance problems for neighborhoods and frequently lead to residents later asking the city to assume responsibility for them.

Chair Packer asked the applicant to clarify whether the use of private streets was driven primarily by size constraints or by another purpose.

Mr. Loveland responded that the private streets were partly intended to differentiate between the two product types in the development, with one portion designed to be elevated relative to the other. He stated that private streets were also part of the prior development plans for the

property and that Symphony had become accustomed to incorporating them as part of the overall project concept.

Commissioner Birkenshaw offered to restate his concerns and requested confirmation that the applicant had captured his detailed feedback. Mr. Loveland confirmed that he had taken detailed notes and understood the concerns that had been expressed.

Chair Packer then stated that the Commission generally understood where each member stood on the proposal and asked the Commission what direction it wanted to take next, given the range of views expressed.

Following extended discussion among the Planning Commission regarding the proposed rezone and development, Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that based on the concerns raised—particularly regarding traffic circulation, access, connectivity, open space, and unresolved infrastructure issues—he believed additional work and clarification were needed before the Commission could forward a recommendation to the City Council. He indicated that the discussion had provided meaningful direction to the applicant and staff regarding areas requiring further refinement.

Commissioner Sommerkorn then made a formal motion to table the rezone request currently before the Commission, to allow time for additional information, revisions, and alternative approaches to be developed and considered. Commissioner Toller seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Birkenshaw: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay

Following the motion to table, Chair Packer stated that the agenda item was now tabled and asked how the Commission should proceed regarding when the matter would be put on another meeting agenda. He questioned whether the item would automatically be placed on a future agenda or whether it would come back to Planning Commission once additional information was available.

Commissioner Sommerkorn indicated that the item should be brought back when there was more clarity and progress on the outstanding issues.

Ms. Greenwood explained that staff would work to coordinate discussions with the Sewer District and with the applicant to attempt to resolve the connectivity and access issues, particularly related to the proposed Angel Street and 550 West connection. She noted that the

Sewer District meets only once per month, which could slow the timeline. Because of this, she did not anticipate the item returning at the next meeting and stated that it might not be ready even for the following meeting. She encouraged members of the public to sign up for City agenda notifications using the QR code provided so they would be alerted when the item was scheduled again.

Mr. Loveland stated that Symphony Homes would be prepared to return in approximately two meetings and expressed a desire to establish a general timeline so that both the applicant and the community would know when the item was expected to come back. He also noted that the Sewer District's position on selling right-of-way property was a key variable, since if the Sewer District declined to sell, the Commission would still be faced with similar access issues.

Commissioner Sommerkorn commented that he hoped pressure could be applied to the Sewer District to help move the issue forward.

Chair Packer clarified that the application would not appear on the next January agenda and likely would not appear at the first meeting in February, but that the same application would return once it was ready. He also noted that since a public hearing had already been held, it would not typically be reopened when the item returned.

4- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 11, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Sevy made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Young seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Birkenshaw: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Toller: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay

5- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood encouraged Commissioners to participate in the upcoming Kaysville University training program, which is intended to help elected and appointed officials better understand city operations and departments. She noted that Commissioner Young had already expressed interest and emphasized that even attending a few sessions would be beneficial. She compared the program to a similar one she had completed while working in Chandler, Arizona, which helped her gain a deeper understanding of municipal departments such as police, planning, and public works. Ms. Greenwood stated she would resend the information and confirmed that the program would be held on Wednesday evenings.

There was discussion among Commissioners regarding the start date, with clarification that the program would begin on January 21. Chair Packer confirmed that a flyer was available with the correct date. Toller, Moore, and Sevy indicated interest in attending, and Ms. Greenwood stated she would notify City Manager.

Ms. Greenwood also advised the Commission that amendments to the Planning Commission bylaws may be forthcoming. She explained that the City Council is currently addressing an issue involving individuals circulating clipboards at public meetings, which has caused confusion among residents who may believe they are providing information directly to the City when they are not. She said similar provisions may be added to the Planning Commission bylaws to prevent misleading practices and protect the public from unintentionally sharing personal information.

Ms. Greenwood informed the Commission that staff has been working on rezoning several City-owned properties, particularly parks that are currently zoned residential, to a Public Use zoning designation. She explained that this change would not alter how the properties function but would align the zoning with their actual public use and provide more accurate zoning statistics for the City. Staff intends to bring these rezonings forward at a future meeting when the agenda is lighter, noting that little public comment is expected because no functional changes would occur.

Commissioner Toller thanked staff for intervening earlier in the meeting regarding the yielding of public comment time, noting that the City Council bylaws prohibit speakers from transferring their allotted time to others.

City Attorney Katie Ellis confirmed that the City Council's rules prohibit yielding time and explained that, while Robert's Rules of Order may be referenced, the Commission is not required to follow them, and the Chair has authority over procedural matters.

9- ADJOURNMENT

Chair Packer adjourned the meeting at 9:58 pm.