

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, February 26, 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, Erin Young, Paul Toller, Megan Sevy, Jeramy Burkinshaw, David Moore and Eries Cornelius

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

Public Attendees: City Councilmembers Abbi Hunt and Joshua McBride, Bruce Robison, Matt Loveland, Alexis Larson, Mitchell Larson, Jacquie Jones, Keith Halls, Rick Jones, Brian Kartchner, Davis McSwain, Paul Belnap, Boyd Argyle, Lee Stenquist, Tim Hirschi, Janeen Evans, Krysten Wheeler, Gary Pierce, Kathy Pierce, and Courtney Cornelius

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 ERIES H. CORNELIUS AS KAYSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSIONER ALTERNATE

Ms. Edstrom swore in Eries H. Cornelius as a Planning Commissioner.

4- PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND AND ENACT VARIOUS CHAPTERS OF TITLE 17 REGARDING PROHIBITED USES AND ENACTING 17-39 - AMBIGUOUS USE CLASSIFICATION TO COMPLY WITH UTAH STATE CODE 10-20-507 CLASSIFICATION OF NEW AND UNLISTED BUSINESS USES

Anne McNamara presented a proposed text amendment to the Kaysville City Zoning Ordinance in response to changes in state law adopted during the November 2025 Utah State Legislative Session. Staff explained that Senate Bill 179, codified in Utah Code Section 10-9a-507, requires municipalities to establish a formal process for reviewing and classifying business uses that are not specifically identified within existing zoning regulations.

Staff stated that the proposed amendment would create a new chapter outlining the procedure for reviewing unclassified or new business uses. Under the proposed process, an applicant would submit a request to the Community Development Department for classification of the proposed business use. The Community Development Director, or the Director's designee, reviews the request and determine whether the proposed use is substantially similar to existing permitted or conditional use within the zoning code. If the use is determined to be substantially similar, it would be allowed in the applicable zoning district consistent with the comparable use.

Ms. McNamara explained that if an applicant disagrees with the administrative determination, the applicant may appeal the decision to the City Council for review. Any uses ultimately denied by the City Council through that process would subsequently be added to the list of prohibited uses within the zoning code.

To implement the new process, the proposed amendment also updates language within each zoning district chapter. The revisions clarify that uses found to be substantially similar to an existing permitted or conditional use are allowed through the classification process and add cross-references within the prohibited uses sections directing applicants to the new classification procedure when a use is unclear or not specifically listed. Ms. McNamara also proposed updating the “Zoning Administrator” language in the code to clarify that the role is fulfilled by the Community Development Director or the Director’s designee.

Ms. McNamara reported that a public hearing notice for the proposed amendment was posted on February 13, 2026, and no public comments were received. She further noted that the City’s General Plan does not specifically address this type of procedural amendment and therefore the proposal is considered neutral with respect to the General Plan. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked for clarification regarding the appeal process referenced in the proposed ordinance. He noted that the language indicated appeals could be made in accordance with Section 17-4-5 of the City Code and asked whether the proposed amendment introduced any changes to the existing appeal procedures.

City Attorney, Katie Ellis explained that Section 20 of the proposed enactment outlines the process for appealing to the City Council and indicated that the appeal process referenced in the ordinance aligns with the City’s existing appeal procedures.

Commissioner Sommerkorn noted that current state code allows for appeals directly to the City Council but that the Legislature is considering amendments during the current legislative session that could modify that process. He referenced House Bill 477 and suggested staff review the relevant sections to ensure consistency once legislative updates are finalized.

Ms. Greenwood acknowledged that the City may need to update its appeal and variance procedures in the future to align with pending state legislative changes. Ms. Ellis added that once the legislative session concludes and statutory changes are finalized, staff would incorporate any required updates into the City’s code revisions.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that, based on his review, the proposed ordinance appears consistent with current requirements but recommended staff verify alignment with upcoming legislative changes.

Chair Packer opened the meeting to the public for the public hearing. No comments were received and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Toller commented on the purpose of the amendment, stating that the state mandate appears intended to ensure municipalities do not summarily deny business applications simply because a use is new or not clearly defined in existing zoning regulations. He noted that new business models and uses arise over time, and the amendment provides a structured process for evaluating those uses rather than dismissing them due to ambiguity.

Commissioner Toller made a motion to approve the proposed text amendment. Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

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

5- PUBLIC CONSIDERATION OF A REZONE FOR APPROXIMATELY 1820 SOUTH SUNSET DRIVE (PARCELS #08-694-0005, 08-027- 0009, AND 08-027-0008) FROM R-A AND A-1 TO R-1-6 WITH A PRUD OVERLAY (CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 8, 2026)

Ms. Greenwood presented a continued item originally heard approximately six weeks earlier regarding a rezone request for approximately 14.7 acres located near 1820 South Sunset Drive. The property is currently undeveloped. Ms. Greenwood explained that the original application requested rezoning to R-1-6 with a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay. Although the agenda language remained unchanged because the item was continued from the previous meeting, the applicant has since modified the request. The revised proposal would designate a portion of the property as R-1-10, with the remainder zoned R-1-6 with a PRUD overlay.

Ms. Greenwood displayed aerial imagery and zoning maps illustrating the surrounding area, which includes R-A, A-5, and other residential zoning districts. She also reviewed the City's Future Land Use Map, noting the area is designated for single-family residential use. She clarified that the City's current General Plan, adopted in 2022, identifies the area for single-family housing but does not specify a particular density range or lot sizes. Therefore, both R-1-6 and R-1-10 zoning designations are considered consistent with the General Plan's single-family designation.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the revised site plan proposes two zoning areas within the development, with R-1-10 lots and R-1-6 lots utilizing a PRUD overlay to allow private streets. She noted the applicant adjusted the internal road alignment from the previous plan in response to concerns raised by residents along Sunset Drive. The modified alignment moves the connection point approximately 100 feet south and introduces curvature to provide traffic-calming benefits and improve the relationship to nearby homes.

Several additional modifications were made following the January presentation. The total number of lots was reduced from 46 to 45. Proposed lot sizes would range from approximately 6,300 square feet to 20,060 square feet, with an average lot size of about 11,100 square feet. Additional open space was incorporated into the design, including a trail and approximately 15,000 square feet of open space area. The applicant also withdrew a previous request to increase maximum building height from 30 feet to 35 feet. Parking spaces were added near the open space and trail area to accommodate overflow parking for the private street.

Ms. Greenwood reviewed proposed Development Agreement provisions that would accompany the rezone. She explained that a Development Agreement is recorded against the property and establishes binding development standards that run with the land. The agreement would limit the project to 45 lots and require development to follow the approved site plan layout and lot configuration. For the R-1-6 portion of the development, the applicant proposed a frontage reduction allowing a minimum lot frontage of 50 feet provided the overall project maintains an average frontage of at least 60 feet. No frontage modifications are proposed for the R-1-10 lots. The proposed development standards include a 20-foot front setback, side setbacks of six and eight feet in the R-1-10 area and five feet in the R-1-6 area, and a 25-foot rear setback. Covered patios would be permitted to encroach into the rear setback provided they remain at least 10 feet from the rear property line. The agreement also includes fencing provisions requested by neighboring property owners, a prohibition on parking along private streets to maintain emergency access, landscaping standards including approved tree species for park strips based on guidance from the City's arborist, and a restriction limiting development to 30 units until a secondary access is constructed.

Ms. Greenwood also addressed roadway connectivity issues discussed in the prior meeting. Staff supports the road connection to Sunset Drive, noting that connectivity is supported by the General Plan and recommended by public safety, engineering, and planning staff. The revised alignment improves sight distance and would be designed to American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards to ensure safety.

She further reported that the City Council recently discussed the long-planned road connection between 550 West, Mare Drive, and Angel Street. The Council expressed strong support for completing that connection, which has been identified in City code for many years. While the applicant previously attempted to acquire necessary right-of-way from the sewer district and was unsuccessful, the City is continuing to pursue acquisition. If an agreement cannot be reached voluntarily, the Council indicated it may consider using eminent domain as a last resort to secure the needed right-of-way.

Ms. Greenwood stated that additional public comments had been received since the previous meeting and had been distributed to the Commission. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council based on the proposal's consistency with the 2022 General Plan.

She noted that if the Commission wishes to support the applicant's request to include both R-1-

10 and R-1-6 zoning areas within the property, a legal description would need to be added to the Development Agreement identifying the boundaries of each zone. Because applying two zoning districts to a single parcel is not standard practice, the legal description would serve as a temporary solution until the subdivision process creates individual lots with a single zoning designation. Ms. Greenwood concluded by noting that the applicant was present and prepared to present additional information regarding the proposed changes.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked for clarification regarding the zoning designation included in the application. He noted that the staff report referenced an R-1-6 zoning request and asked whether the current proposal included both R-1-6 and R-1-10 zoning districts.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that the revised proposal includes both R-1-10 and R-1-6 zoning areas. She explained that the agenda and staff report language referenced only the R-1-6 designation because the item was continued from the January 8 meeting and staff retained the same wording to avoid confusion. She noted that the revised request and supporting materials included in the staff report describe the applicant's request to incorporate a portion of the property as R-1-10 while retaining the remainder as R-1-6 with a PRUD overlay.

Commissioner Toller asked for clarification regarding the zoning request before the Commission. He stated his understanding that the application being considered included two zoning districts, R-1-10 and R-1-6 with a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay, as described in the staff report.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that interpretation and referred to the site plan illustration showing the two proposed zoning areas. She explained that while the application was originally submitted as R-1-6 with a PRUD overlay, the applicant later proposed incorporating a portion of the property as R-1-10. Ms. Greenwood noted that the change was intended to reflect the range of lot sizes being proposed and to respond to public comments received after the January presentation.

Ms. Greenwood further explained that the overall lot sizes proposed in the development have not significantly changed from the previous submission. Rather, the revised zoning labels were intended to better correspond with the variety of lot sizes shown in the plan. She noted that zoning districts establish minimum lot sizes, but larger lots may still be created within a zone. She also observed that many properties in the city, particularly on the east side, are zoned for smaller minimum lot sizes than their actual lot sizes, illustrating that zoning classifications do not always directly reflect the final size of individual parcels. She indicated that the applicant could provide additional explanation regarding the revised zoning approach during their presentation.

Matthew Loveland, representing Symphony Homes, addressed the Commission and provided an overview of revisions made to the proposal since the previous Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Loveland stated that the development team had worked with City staff, the City Council, and members of the community to address concerns raised during prior discussions.

He explained that the revised application proposes incorporating a portion of the property as R-1-10 zoning while maintaining the remainder as R-1-6 with a PRUD overlay. He stated the adjustment was intended to better reflect the range of lot sizes within the development and respond to feedback from the public.

Mr. Loveland reviewed several topics discussed during earlier meetings, including zoning, setbacks, building height, traffic impacts, roadway access, and open space. He noted that the number of proposed lots had been reduced from the prior proposal and that the revised site plan includes 45 lots. He highlighted that the most significant design change involved relocating the proposed Sunset Drive access approximately 100 feet to the south to improve alignment and sight distance and to address concerns raised by nearby residents.

Mr. Loveland described the development standards associated with the two zoning areas. Within the R-1-6 portion of the development, homes would generally be constructed on lots ranging between approximately 6,000 and 10,000 square feet with five-foot side yard setbacks consistent with the zoning district standards. In the R-1-10 portion, the development agreement would establish side setbacks of six and eight feet, for a total minimum separation of 14 feet between structures. He noted the eight-foot setback would be placed on the garage side of homes to improve functionality. Mr. Loveland confirmed that the applicant had removed the previously requested building height increase and would comply with the City's 30-foot height limit.

Mr. Loveland also addressed traffic-related concerns raised in prior public comments. He stated that the revised road alignment increased sight distance at the Sunset Drive intersection and that updated traffic impact analysis conducted by Hales Engineering incorporated more recent crash data. The study concluded that the intersection would operate at Level of Service "A" and did not identify additional mitigation requirements beyond standard design. Mr. Loveland reiterated the proposed intersection would meet AASHTO design standards.

He also discussed the potential future road connection between 550 West, Mare Drive, and Angel Street. Mr. Loveland acknowledged that right-of-way acquisition from the sewer district had not yet been successful but expressed optimism regarding ongoing discussions with the City. He noted that the possibility of eminent domain, as discussed by the City Council, could provide a path forward if negotiations are unsuccessful.

Mr. Loveland then described proposed open space features within the development, including landscaped entrance monumentation, enhanced landscaping like nearby Symphony developments, and a trail connection integrated into the site design. He stated that revisions to the road layout created an opportunity to include additional open space and trail connectivity between different portions of the neighborhood. Additional parking spaces were also incorporated near the open space area to address concerns regarding parking on the private roadway.

Mr. Loveland concluded by stating that the proposal reflects approximately eighteen months of

discussion and revisions and that the development team believes the plan balances community concerns with the project's objectives.

Commissioner Toller asked the applicant about the ownership of the property located immediately north of the proposed development area, specifically referencing the parcels adjacent to Lots 1 through 5 shown on the site plan. He asked whether Symphony Homes owned that property and whether it could be included within the current application.

Mr. Loveland responded that the referenced property is owned by Merrill Sheriff and is not owned or controlled by Symphony Homes. He stated that because the applicant does not have ownership or development control of that parcel, it was not included as part of the proposed application.

Commissioner Sevy asked for clarification regarding the Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay and whether it would apply to the entire subdivision or only to the lots served by the proposed private roadway.

Mr. Loveland explained that the PRUD overlay was intended primarily to allow the private road serving approximately 30 to 40 of the lots. Ms. Greenwood clarified that the intent of the PRUD overlay was specifically to allow the private street configuration and that the remaining streets within the development would be constructed as public roads.

Commissioner Birkenshaw thanked the applicant for the revisions made to the proposal and asked for additional clarification regarding the open space area included in the plan. He asked whether the space would be programmed with amenities or simply landscaped.

Mr. Loveland responded that the proposal includes approximately one-eighth acre of open space that would initially be landscaped with sod. He stated that additional amenities had been discussed but were not currently proposed. He noted that if amenities were included in the future, they would more likely be features such as pickleball courts rather than a playground based on the anticipated homeowner demographic.

Commissioner Birkenshaw also asked the applicant to explain the need for a private road within the development and why the roadway was not proposed to meet public street standards.

Mr. Loveland stated that the applicant preferred to maintain the roadway within the homeowners association as a private road to accommodate the proposed site layout and the project boundaries. He indicated the current design had been reviewed with staff and was submitted as part of the application. Mr. Loveland acknowledged that if additional property were acquired to the south of the project boundary, the roadway design could potentially change and the applicant would be open to converting the road to a public street if appropriate.

Commissioner Birkenshaw asked whether the private road configuration was necessary due to

constraints in lot sizes and site layout. Mr. Loveland responded that a public road could be constructed but would require a wider right-of-way, which would reduce the lot sizes within the subdivision.

Chair Packer thanked the applicant and invited Commission discussion.

Commissioner Toller asked staff to clarify earlier discussions regarding the private road and whether converting the roadway to a public street would require widening the right-of-way and adjusting the lot layout.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that a public street would require additional right-of-way width, which would reduce the size of the adjacent lots and potentially require redesign of the subdivision layout.

Commissioner Toller noted that several elements of the proposal involved deviations from standard zoning requirements. He identified three areas where the proposal differed from existing code standards, including reduced setbacks, allowances related to covered patios under the PRUD overlay, and other minor variations from typical zoning provisions. Commissioner Toller characterized these as relatively minor modifications but stated they represented departures from the standard code requirements.

Commissioner Toller then raised a broader concern regarding development density and roadway connectivity, particularly whether it would be prudent to approve the rezone with a provision allowing construction of up to 30 homes prior to completion of the 550 West roadway connection between Angel Street and Mayor Drive. He asked staff to confirm whether the Development Agreement would prohibit construction of more than 30 homes until a second access connection is completed.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that the Development Agreement includes a provision limiting the project to no more than 30 homes until a second point of ingress and egress is established. She explained that this requirement is consistent with fire code, which require two access points once a development exceeds 30 units. She noted that the restriction is included in the Development Agreement to ensure that both the City and the applicant clearly understand that additional building permits or certificates of occupancy would not be issued beyond that threshold until the second access is constructed.

Commissioner Toller asked whether development could effectively stop at 30 homes if the second access connection were not completed.

Ms. Greenwood responded that such situations can occur in phased developments where temporary access arrangements exist until additional phases are constructed and additional roadway connections are completed.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked whether a future connection along 550 West to Mare Drive

could eventually serve as the required second access.

Ms. Greenwood explained that under the current application, the only confirmed point of access is the connection to Sunset Drive. The potential 550 West connection does not currently exist as a dedicated public right-of-way and therefore cannot be counted as a second access point at this time. She noted that while a connection could occur in the future if surrounding properties develop or if right-of-way is acquired, it is not currently available.

Ms. Greenwood further clarified that the City owns a portion of property along the 550 West alignment but that it is not dedicated as a public street and has not been improved. The City has intentionally avoided constructing the roadway in advance of development in order to allow future development projects to construct the improvements rather than requiring City taxpayers to fund them. She added that the current alignment functions informally as an agricultural access route and is not maintained as a public roadway.

Commissioner Birkenshaw expressed appreciation for the revisions made to the proposal and indicated he could support the R-1-10 portion of the development. However, he expressed concern regarding the proposed R-1-6 portion, stating he believed it created a higher density than appropriate for the area. He noted that the need for a private road within the development suggested the layout was being constrained by density. Commissioner Birkenshaw also expressed concern regarding long-term maintenance of private roads. Based on his experience, he stated that private roads often fall into disrepair when homeowners associations are unable to adequately fund maintenance, which can eventually lead to requests for the City to assume responsibility for roads not built to City standards. He further expressed concern that roadway connectivity issues, particularly the unresolved connection to Angel Street via 550 West, had not yet been resolved and suggested the development might be premature until those access issues were addressed. He added that even if a connection to Mare Drive were eventually completed, traffic traveling north could still be directed through existing residential neighborhoods not originally designed to accommodate that level of traffic.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated he shared some of Commissioner Birkenshaw's concerns, particularly regarding private streets and roadway connectivity. He expressed appreciation for the applicant's proposal to include R-1-10 zoning for a portion of the project, stating it helped address concerns raised by members of the public regarding lot size. However, he indicated he did not have significant concerns about the proposed R-1-6 zoning. Commissioner Sommerkorn noted that the City's current General Plan designates the area for single-family residential use without specifying density levels and that the proposed development would consist of single-family homes consistent with that designation. He further stated that housing affordability and economic conditions have changed over time, making large-lot developments increasingly difficult to achieve, and that smaller lot sizes can contribute to housing supply, though they do not necessarily result in lower home prices.

Commissioner Sommerkorn added that in his experience as an urban planner, private streets can present challenges over time because homeowners associations often underestimate the

cost of long-term maintenance. When maintenance costs arise, homeowners may request that the City assume responsibility for roads that were not constructed to City standards. He expressed concern that approving a private street could create future obligations for the City. Commissioner Sommerkorn also emphasized the importance of completing the planned roadway connection between 550 West and Angel Street. He stated that the lack of connectivity in nearby areas has already created transportation challenges and cautioned that approving the development without resolving the roadway connection could lead to similar issues in the future. While he did not object to the proposed lot sizes, he indicated that roadway design and connectivity remained significant concerns.

Commissioner Sevy asked staff whether there were existing examples of private roads within Kaysville and whether the City had prior experience managing issues related to them.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that several subdivisions within Kaysville utilize private roads. She cited Talbot Estates, located east of Highway 89, as an example of a subdivision entirely served by private streets. Ms. Greenwood noted that while private roads are permitted within Kaysville, other municipalities she has worked for have prohibited them. She also acknowledged that, in her professional experience, homeowners associations occasionally request that cities assume responsibility for privately maintained infrastructure such as roads or detention basins. However, she stated that the City typically declines such requests unless the infrastructure is first upgraded to meet City construction standards.

Commissioner Sevy then asked for clarification regarding the difference between private and public street standards. Ms. Greenwood explained that public streets require a wider right-of-way, generally a minimum of approximately 55 feet, which accommodates roadway width, parking, and utilities. Private roads may be constructed with narrower asphalt widths because the City does not provide services such as snow removal or maintenance. She noted that private streets typically do not allow on-street parking and require homeowners associations to arrange services such as trash collection.

Ms. Greenwood further stated that private streets can reduce the long-term maintenance burden on the City because they are not maintained with public funds. She explained that residential property taxes generally do not fully offset the cost of municipal services such as public safety, road maintenance, and parks. From a policy standpoint, she noted that allowing private streets can reduce infrastructure obligations for the City. Ms. Greenwood added that the City Council has determined that private street subdivisions are permitted within Kaysville and that such developments exist throughout the community.

Chair Mike Packer expressed appreciation for the efforts made by the applicant, Symphony Homes, to revise the proposal in response to prior feedback. He noted improvements such as the adjusted entrance alignment and other modifications that had been incorporated since the project was first presented to the Planning Commission. While acknowledging the work done by the applicant, Chair Packer stated that he shared some of the concerns expressed by other commissioners regarding the use of private roads. He indicated that he did not have concerns

about the proposed lot sizes and appreciated the applicant's willingness to make adjustments to the project. Chair Packer emphasized the importance of securing a secondary access point but stated that he had confidence in the safeguards within City regulations, particularly the limitation that no more than 30 homes could be constructed without a second point of ingress and egress. He stated that he would be comfortable recommending approval of the project even if some aspects remained unresolved, provided the existing code limitations were followed.

Commissioner Young stated that she would also be comfortable with approval under similar conditions. She explained that the 30-home limitation provided a clear stopping point should the additional access connection fail to materialize as anticipated.

Commissioner Young indicated that she did not have extensive experience with private roads and therefore tended to rely on the perspectives of Commissioners who had encountered related issues. However, she noted that private roads already exist in Kaysville and that precedent for such developments is established. She stated she feels the proposal represented a quality project and acknowledged the length of time the applicant had worked with the City and the Commission to refine the plan.

Chair Packer then indicated he would be willing to entertain a motion but invited any additional comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Sevy asked staff to confirm that the areas proposed for the two different zoning classifications—R-1-6 and R-1-10—would require separate legal descriptions if the Commission recommended approval with both zones applied.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that if the Commission recommended approval with both zoning districts, staff would prepare an exhibit and legal description identifying the boundaries of each zone. She explained that this could be incorporated into the development agreement prior to the item being forwarded to the City Council. Ms. Greenwood stated that staff would complete the necessary documentation before placing the item on a future council agenda.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated he could support the rezone under certain conditions. He indicated that he would prefer the private roads within the development be converted to public roads and that the connection between the project and Angel Street be established as part of the development. Commissioner Sommerkorn acknowledged that the property needed for that road connection was not currently owned by either the applicant or the City, which could make formal conditions difficult to enforce. However, he emphasized that the connection was an important component of the overall transportation network and that he believed it should occur in conjunction with the development.

Chair Packer asked staff to provide insight regarding the timing and feasibility of acquiring the right-of-way necessary to complete the connection to Angel Street.

Ms. Greenwood explained that if the City and the Sewer District could reach an agreement for the needed property, the acquisition process could move forward relatively quickly once appraisals and documentation were completed. If the Sewer District was unwilling to sell the property, the City could pursue acquisition through condemnation and eminent domain, though that process could take significantly longer and would require compliance with federal and state laws governing right-of-way acquisition, including fair market compensation.

Ms. Greenwood noted that condemnation could potentially take a year or longer to complete, although if needed, the City could request a court order allowing entry and construction before the final resolution of the condemnation case. She explained that such an approach is sometimes used when timing is critical. However, she also noted that this particular situation involved only a single parcel with no structures, which could simplify the process. She further stated that City leadership preferred to maintain positive working relationships with the Sewer District and therefore hoped an agreement could be reached without litigation.

Chair Packer responded that the explanation addressed his questions and stated that he supported the concept of requiring the connection as part of the development if feasible.

Commissioner Paul Toller made a motion to recommend approval of the rezone request applying two zoning designations—R-1-10 and R-1-6—with a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay. The motion included the frontage width and setback variations outlined in the staff report and development agreement. Commissioner Toller further proposed that the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council include, as a condition, completion of the road connection along 550 West to both Angel Street and Mare Drive.

Chair Mike Packer asked if there was a second to the motion. No second was offered. Following the lack of a second, Chair Packer asked whether another Commissioner wished to present an alternative motion.

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to recommend approval of the rezone request with modifications to the development proposal. His motion proposed approval of the R-1-10 and R-1-6 zoning designations as presented but required that all streets within the development be constructed as public rights-of-way rather than private streets. He further included a recommendation that a road connection be established between the development and Angel Street via 550 West and the connection at Sunset Drive.

Chair Packer asked for clarification to ensure the motion was properly understood. Ms. Greenwood noted that the original proposal included a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay to allow the use of private roads. Because Commissioner Sommerkorn's motion required public roads instead, she explained that the PRUD overlay would no longer be necessary. Commissioner Sommerkorn agreed and restated the motion to recommend approval of the R-1-10 and R-1-6 zoning designations without the PRUD overlay, with all internal streets constructed as public rights-of-way meeting City standards and with the connection to Angel Street and Sunset Drive be provided.

Further discussion clarified that the motion required a connection from the development to Angel Street but did not require the connection north to Mare Drive because the property needed for that connection is not currently owned by the applicant.

Commissioners discussed that if the development ultimately proceeded as proposed, the subdivision would have two access points: the primary connection to Sunset Drive and a connection through Angel Street.

Staff noted that converting the private road to a public street would likely require adjustments to the site plan, including changes to roadway width, lot sizes, and the hammerhead turnaround configuration.

Commissioner Sommerkorn acknowledged that those design modifications would likely occur if the streets were required to meet public road standards.

Mr. Loveland, addressed the Commission and explained that converting the private road to a public right-of-way would likely result in a cul-de-sac configuration rather than the hammerhead turnaround shown in the plan. He also expressed concern about requiring the Angel Street connection as a condition tied directly to the development because the applicant does not control the property necessary for that road connection. He stated that the Development Agreement already contemplated the need for two access points but did not specify the exact location of the second connection.

Commissioner Sommerkorn acknowledged the applicant's concern but reiterated his belief that the Angel Street connection was an important part of the transportation network in the area.

Ms. Greenwood further clarified that the Planning Commission's motion would serve as a recommendation to the City Council and that the Council would have the authority to modify or remove conditions as part of its final decision.

Chair Packer then confirmed that the Commission had a motion on the floor and again asked whether any Commissioner wished to second the motion or present an alternative motion. Commissioner Paul Toller summarized the differences between his earlier motion and Commissioner Sommerkorn's motion, noting that the primary distinctions involved requiring public streets instead of private streets and removing the previously suggested connection requirement to Mare Drive while retaining the recommendation for the Angel Street connection. Ms. Greenwood reiterated that the Planning Commission's action would ultimately serve as a recommendation for consideration by the City Council.

Commissioner Young seconded the motion following the second, Chair Packer opened the floor for final discussion. He reiterated that the proposed road connection to Angel Street involved property that the applicant, Symphony Homes, did not currently control. Chair Packer stated that while the connection was an important objective, it might be unreasonable to fully

condition the project on an action outside of the applicant's authority. He emphasized the importance of clearly communicating to the City Council that the connection is a significant priority.

Commissioner Birkenshaw suggested that one alternative could be to continue the item until the issue of the road connection was resolved. Chair Packer acknowledged that continuing the item was an option but noted that the applicant had requested a decision from the Commission at the current meeting and that the Commission appeared prepared to move forward with a recommendation.

Commissioner Sommerkorn stated that he preferred forwarding the item to the City Council rather than continuing the discussion at the Planning Commission level. He indicated that the Council would ultimately determine how to address the conditions and whether to approve or modify the proposal.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the City Council's decision regarding the rezone could influence whether the City pursued acquisition of the right-of-way needed for the Angel Street connection. She explained that if the Council were not inclined to approve the rezone, they might also choose not to pursue the acquisition. Ms. Greenwood stated that determining whether to acquire the property was ultimately a policy decision made by the City Council.

Commissioner Sommerkorn agreed that moving the recommendation forward to the Council was appropriate. He noted that if the development were modified to require public streets instead of private streets, the resulting roadway design would likely require a slightly larger right-of-way, which could reduce the size of some lots, though likely not significantly.

Chair Packer opened up the vote to the Planning Commissioners and the vote was 4-3 in favor of the motion.

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Young: Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Nay
Commissioner Toller: Nay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Burkinshaw: Nay

6- PUBLIC CONSIDERATION OF AMENDING THE PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE (CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 12, 2026)

Ms. Greenwood introduced the next agenda item regarding proposed updates to the Planning Commission bylaws and rules of procedure. She explained that the item had been discussed at a prior meeting, but because only four members of the Planning Commission were present at that time, the Commission chose to defer the discussion until a meeting when the full commission could participate.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the proposed bylaws had been reformatted to closely mirror the structure and format used by the City Council's rules of procedure. She stated that aligning the formatting would assist the City's parliamentarian and create consistency between governing bodies. Because the bylaws had been substantially reformatted, staff was unable to present the document with redline edits. As a result, staff recommended that the Planning Commission formally repeal the existing 2024 bylaws and replace them with the newly proposed bylaws and rules of procedure.

Ms. Greenwood outlined several key updates included in the proposed document. One change addressed public conduct during meetings, particularly the use of signs, clipboards, and sign-up sheets that had recently been circulated among audience members during public meetings. She explained that these activities had created confusion among attendees and occasionally disrupted the proceedings. The proposed rules would allow individuals to bring signs into the meeting provided they remain with their signs. Any petitions, sign-up sheets, or information-gathering efforts would need to occur outside the council chambers and be clearly staffed by the individuals requesting the information so it is evident the activity is not being conducted by the City.

Ms. Greenwood explained that City Council rules do not allow speakers to transfer or combine their allotted speaking time with others. Staff recommended adopting a similar rule for Planning Commission meetings. She explained that situations could arise where individuals bring multiple individuals who may not wish to speak but instead transfer their time to a single speaker, significantly extending that individual's speaking time. The proposed rule would limit each speaker to their individual time allotment, although the Commission could temporarily modify the rule during a meeting if desired. Ms. Greenwood noted that the Planning Commission typically allows three minutes for public comment but retains the ability to adjust speaking times depending on the number of speakers.

Commissioner Toller asked whether the document displayed was the same version he had previously reviewed and provided comments on. Ms. Greenwood confirmed that it was the same version and that no additional changes had been made since his review. Commissioner Toller explained that his earlier comments focused on two areas. First, he expressed concern about prohibiting the sharing of speaking time. He noted that applicants or residents sometimes bring professionals such as architects or builders to assist in presenting information and suggested there should be flexibility to allow speakers to share their allotted time if desired. He acknowledged that the chair could potentially accommodate such requests through procedural adjustments during the meeting.

Commissioner Toller also raised a concern about the section addressing electronic participation in meetings. He stated that the language appeared to require the declaration of an emergency in order for a Commissioner to attend a meeting electronically. He suggested that the Commission should have the ability to allow electronic participation when necessary to achieve a quorum or accommodate unavoidable conflicts without needing to declare an emergency.

Ms. Greenwood responded that the Commission had previously discussed the possibility of modifying that language and that the rule allowing procedural rules to be suspended by a majority vote could also provide flexibility in those situations.

Commissioner Sommerkorn agreed that the Commission could technically suspend the rule if needed but stated that he preferred Commissioner Toller's suggestion to simply allow electronic participation when appropriate without requiring the declaration of an emergency.

Commissioner Toller clarified that his suggestions were intended as minor improvements to the document and asked whether staff had originally brought the bylaw revisions forward primarily to improve consistency with parliamentary procedures and existing council rules.

Commissioner Toller asked City Attorney Katie Ellis whether the proposed bylaw revisions had been brought forward primarily to improve consistency with parliamentary procedures and to align with Robert's Rules of Order and existing City Council procedures.

Ms. Ellis confirmed that this was one of the goals of the update. She further explained that the City already has an ordinance addressing electronic meetings and remote participation. She noted that the bylaws reference City Code, which governs how electronic participation is allowed.

Ms. Ellis explained that the City Council had recently reviewed the issue of remote participation and chose to require that a quorum be physically present at meetings while still allowing individual members to participate electronically when appropriate. Commissioner Toller asked whether similar language could be incorporated into the Planning Commission bylaws to maintain consistency with the Council's approach.

Ms. Ellis suggested that the language referencing participation during emergencies could simply be removed and replaced with language stating that electronic participation may occur when allowed by law and City policy, since the governing authority already exists in City Code.

Commissioner Birkenshaw asked whether it was necessary to include language about electronic meetings in the bylaws if the matter was already addressed in City Code.

Ms. Ellis responded that it may not be necessary and that the Commission could simply rely on the provisions contained in the Open and Public Meetings Act and City Code.

Commissioner Toller indicated that his primary concerns had been addressed through the discussion and suggested that striking the emergency requirement would resolve the issue.

Commissioner Sevy expressed concern about language suggesting that remote participation could be used to establish a quorum, stating that she preferred maintaining the expectation that a quorum should generally be present in person.

Commissioner Sommerkorn noted that maintaining consistency with City Council procedures would be appropriate.

Commissioner Young also supported maintaining a requirement that a quorum be present in person, stating that while remote participation could be useful in limited circumstances, it should not replace in-person attendance for conducting the City's business.

Ms. Ellis suggested removing the language regarding emergencies and instead referencing the authority provided in the Open and Public Meetings Act and City Code Section 2-2-4.

Ms. Greenwood indicated that the bylaws could include a reference to the City Code section to make the policy clear for future reference.

Commissioner Sevy confirmed that such changes would require a majority vote of the Commission.

Chair Packer stated that he had reviewed the proposed bylaws carefully to ensure they did not restrict the public's ability to provide comments during meetings. He indicated that the revisions primarily clarified procedures related to petitions, signs, and other activities that had previously created confusion during meetings.

Commissioner Young agreed and noted that the provisions regarding speaking time would help maintain fairness and decorum during public comment periods.

Chair Packer also stated that aligning the Planning Commission procedures with those used by the City Council would provide consistency and clarity.

Commissioner Moore then made a motion to repeal the January 2024 Planning Commission bylaws and replace them with the proposed Planning Commission bylaws and rules of procedure as discussed, including the revisions made during the meeting and Commissioner Toller second the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

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

7- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 12, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Young made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 12, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Moore seconded the motion, and the vote was

unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

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

8- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood provided several updates to the Planning Commission regarding upcoming training opportunities and future agenda items. She reminded Commissioners about the Utah Land Use Institute training conference scheduled for the following month in St. George, Utah. She noted that state law requires planning commissioners to complete a certain amount of annual training and that the City maintains a budget to cover travel, lodging, mileage, and per diem expenses for Commissioners attending approved training events. Ms. Greenwood indicated that staff would assist with registration and expenses for Commissioners who wished to attend.

Ms. Greenwood also informed the Commission about another upcoming training opportunity through the American Planning Association (APA) Utah Chapter conference scheduled to take place in Bryce Canyon, Utah. She explained that APA typically hosts two conferences each year—one in the spring in a rural location and another in the fall along the Wasatch Front. Ms. Greenwood shared that she had been invited to participate in a panel discussion at the conference addressing the relationship between land use planning and water availability, a topic connected to the City's recent general plan water element update. The panel would include planning professionals and representatives from regional and state organizations. She encouraged Commissioners to consider attending and stated that additional information would be sent to them.

Ms. Greenwood then provided an update on upcoming agenda items. She explained that public notices would soon be mailed regarding two additional rezoning items related to City-owned park properties, including the Angel Street soccer complex and the Webb Lane restroom facility. She indicated these rezoning items were expected to be straightforward and like recent park-related rezonings previously reviewed by the Commission.

She also reported progress on the City's small area plan. The consultant preparing the plan was expected to deliver a final draft with updated graphics soon. After staff review and feedback, the draft will be presented to the Community Advisory Committee for final comments before being scheduled for a Planning Commission public hearing. Ms. Greenwood anticipated the public hearing would likely occur during the second Planning Commission meeting in April. Ms. Greenwood concluded by expressing appreciation for the Commissioners' service and their participation in the City's "Kaysville University" training sessions, which are intended to help

elected officials, staff, and community leaders better understand the roles and functions of City departments. She noted that the program had been beneficial for both Commissioners and staff and encouraged continued participation in the remaining sessions.

Commissioner Sommerkorn also reminded the Commission that newly appointed Planning Commissioner Cornelius would need to complete the required training before fully participating in meetings. Ms. Greenwood confirmed that onboarding materials and training resources had already been provided and that the City would assist with any remaining training requirements.

City Attorney Katie Ellis recommended that Commissioner Cornelius review the recording of a recent Planning Commission meeting that included a training presentation covering the Open and Public Meetings Act and general planning procedures, noting that the discussion provided a helpful overview for new Commissioners.

City Attorney Katie Ellis provided an update on the City's recently adopted ordinance regulating massage establishment business licenses. The ordinance, adopted by the City Council in November, was intended to address illicit massage businesses operating within the community.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the ordinance provided the City with additional enforcement tools. Using the new regulations, the City initiated enforcement actions against two businesses in Kaysville. Both establishments were given notice and an opportunity to appeal but did not file appeals and subsequently closed.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the ordinance also prevents another massage establishment from operating in the same location for three years if a business is shut down for illegal activity. This provision helps prevent businesses from reopening under a different name at the same location.

9- ADJOURNMENT

Chair Packer adjourned the meeting at 9:01pm.