

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2026

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, July 9, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Kaysville City Hall located at 23 East Center Street.

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chair Young, Commissioners Megan Sevy, Wilf Sommerkorn, David Moore, Paul Toller,

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

Public Attendees: City Councilmember Abbi Hunt, Susan Harris, Val Starkey, Laurene Starkey, and Jennifer Borup

1- WELCOME AND MEETING ORDER

Chair Young 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 TO AMEND VARIOUS CHAPTERS OF TITLE 17, TITLE 18, AND TITLE 19 REGARDING PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING ZONING DISTRICTS, REMOVING A PLANNING COMMISSIONER, AND APPEALING LAND USE DECISIONS TO COMPLY WITH RECENT AMENDMENTS TO UTAH STATE CODE.

Chair Ms. Ellis introduced Vance Pedri, a summer legal intern with the City. She noted that Mr. Pedri is a senior at Weber State University majoring in political science and plans to apply to law school in the coming months.

Mr. Pedri presented a proposed ordinance amending various sections of Titles 17, 18, and 19 of the Kaysville City Code to bring the City's land use regulations into compliance with recent changes to Utah State law. He explained that the amendments address several procedural updates, including revisions to the appeals process, requirements for the removal of Planning Commissioners, and modifications to the land use application review process. He noted that under the new state requirements, applicants may appeal directly to the City Council if the Planning Commission has not taken action on an application within the prescribed timeframe.

Chair Young opened the public hearing on the proposed ordinance amendments. She explained that the Commission would first receive any public comments before returning to the applicant for questions and Commission discussion. Chair Young noted that public comments are typically limited to three minutes and asked each speaker to state their name for the record. She added that, given the meeting schedule, the Commission could allow some flexibility with the time limit if necessary. She then invited members of the public to come forward and address the Commission.

Val Starkey addressed the Commission and expressed support for providing additional flexibility

for accessory dwelling units. He raised several questions regarding the proposed ordinance amendments, including provisions related to the City Council's authority to amend zoning regulations, the appointment of the Zoning Administrator, and references to public meetings within the ordinance. Mr. Starkey also suggested that the ordinance include language addressing due process and cause for the removal of Planning Commissioners. In addition, he expressed concern that increased flexibility for accessory dwelling units could result in additional on-street parking impacts and suggested that parking considerations be further addressed within the ordinance.

Susan Harris addressed the Commission regarding the proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance. She shared concerns based on her personal experience living adjacent to an existing detached structure that has impacted her property and expressed support for establishing reasonable standards for setbacks, building height, and neighborhood compatibility. Ms. Harris encouraged the Commission to consider the impacts of ADUs on existing residents, including parking, traffic, water availability, and overall neighborhood character. She also questioned whether limitations should be considered regarding the number of ADUs permitted within a neighborhood and urged the Commission to balance the need for additional housing opportunities with the interests of established neighborhoods.

Jennifer Borup addressed the Commission regarding the proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance. She stated that she supports ADUs in principle and noted that attached ADUs in her neighborhood have provided housing opportunities for family members. However, she expressed concern that greater consideration should be given to the design and appearance of detached ADUs, including architectural compatibility, setbacks, building height, window placement, and potential impacts on neighboring properties and privacy. Ms. Borup encouraged the Commission to review how other communities have addressed detached ADUs and questioned whether the ordinance should address short-term rentals. She also suggested that future public notices use clearer, more accessible language so residents can better understand the issues being considered and participate in the public process.

Ms. Ellis clarified that the ordinance under consideration did not pertain to accessory dwelling units. She explained that the City would be considering a separate ordinance regarding accessory dwelling units at a future meeting and noted that, while the comments provided were helpful, the current public hearing was limited to the ordinance listed on the agenda.

Commissioner Toller thanked the speakers for their comments and requested that future speakers include their place of residence when introducing themselves so the Commission could better understand the context of their comments. Ms. Borup stated that she resides west of Boondocks in Kaysville.

Laurene Starkey addressed the Commission and noted that her understanding was that the recent state legislation included provisions related to accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which led to her comments on that topic. Chair Young explained that the City is currently developing separate regulations addressing ADUs and that a future public hearing would be held to receive

public input on those proposed standards. She noted that while comments regarding ADUs were welcome, the ordinance before the Commission addressed only certain provisions of the recent state legislation. Ms. Ellis further clarified that the City was implementing the legislative changes in phases and that the current ordinance represented only a portion of the requirements contained in the bill.

Laurene Starkey addressed the Commission and raised several questions regarding the proposed ordinance amendments and the City's future implementation of related state legislation.

Ms. Starkey first asked for clarification regarding the role and appointment of the Zoning Administrator. She referenced prior discussions in which the Zoning Administrator, City Attorney, and a City Council representative were identified as participants in certain land use review processes. She questioned who would serve in that role during a vacancy in the Community Development Director position, whether the individual would be required to reside in Kaysville, and what oversight would be provided to ensure consistency in future staff recommendations.

Ms. Starkey also asked how members of the public could verify that required notices had been mailed to property owners within the prescribed 500-foot radius before a land use application was considered. She referenced a prior application that had been postponed because noticing requirements had not been properly completed and asked whether documentation of compliance would be available to the public.

Regarding the revised appeals process, Ms. Starkey noted that the Planning Commission and City Council would no longer serve as their own appeal authorities. She asked how an administrative law judge would be selected, what qualifications and criteria would be used, and what process would apply when an applicant or resident challenged a land use decision. She also requested clarification regarding the respective roles of the City Attorney and the State Attorney General in selecting or appointing an appeal authority.

Ms. Starkey further asked staff to explain the term “water exaction” in plain language and to describe how the recent legislation would affect the City's authority and obligations related to water allocation and land development.

Ms. Starkey then expressed appreciation for the time, training, and care provided by members of the Planning Commission. She stated that residents make significant investments in their homes and neighborhoods with the expectation that the City will maintain clear and consistent development standards. She referenced Kaysville's reputation as a safe and desirable community and attributed that reputation, in part, to thoughtful land use planning and established standards.

Although accessory dwelling units were not the subject of the ordinance before the Commission, Ms. Starkey encouraged the City to carefully use the discretion retained under

state law when drafting future ADU regulations. She identified setbacks, building height, owner-occupancy requirements, privacy, light, and neighborhood compatibility as important considerations. She stated that large accessory buildings and dwelling units had already created conflicts between some neighboring property owners, including loss of privacy, blocked sunlight, increased heat, and strained personal relationships.

Ms. Starkey concluded by urging the Commission to establish meaningful local standards that balance additional housing opportunities with protection of existing residents and neighborhood character. She thanked the Commission for its service and consideration.

With no additional public comments, Chair Young closed the public hearing and opened the item for Commission discussion. She invited questions from the Commission, particularly regarding issues raised during the public hearing, and suggested that staff address the question concerning the role of the Zoning Administrator.

Commissioner Toller inquired about the ordinance's use of the term "zoning administrator," noting the change in capitalization.

Ms. Ellis explained that the terminology was not one of the substantive changes included in the ordinance before the Commission and invited Mr. Pedri to provide additional clarification.

Mr. Pedri explained that the capitalization changes were made to conform with the Utah State Legislature's ordinance drafting standards and were intended to provide consistency with current drafting conventions.

Chair Young observed that similar formatting changes appeared throughout the ordinance as part of the overall cleanup of the City Code.

Ms. Ellis further explained that the concept and responsibilities of the Zoning Administrator had been addressed through a separate ordinance previously considered by the City Council. She noted that the current ordinance did not modify those provisions.

Commissioner Sommerkorn explained that "Zoning Administrator" is a functional title used within the zoning code to identify the individual responsible for administering and interpreting the City's land use regulations. He noted that the appointment is made at the discretion of the City Council and is most commonly assigned to the Planning Director or Community Development Director, although it may be assigned to another qualified staff member.

Commissioner Sommerkorn further explained that while staff may perform the day-to-day review and analysis, the individual designated as the Zoning Administrator retains the authority to make final administrative determinations under the zoning code.

Commissioner Toller asked whether the ordinance's capitalization changes affected the role or responsibilities of the Zoning Administrator. Ms. Ellis clarified that the current ordinance made no substantive changes to that position and that the amendments were limited to formatting and terminology.

Commissioner Toller also inquired about the selection and qualifications of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), noting that the Planning Commission would no longer serve as the appeal authority for certain land use decisions. He asked how an ALJ is selected, compensated, and whether conflict-of-interest requirements apply.

Ms. Ellis explained that the City already has provisions in its code regarding Administrative Law Judges and has used them on a limited basis. She stated that, historically, the City has selected Administrative Law Judges through a request for proposals (RFP) process, requiring the individual to be a licensed attorney with municipal law experience. She noted that the City has previously utilized outside municipal attorneys to serve in that capacity. Ms. Ellis further stated that, if the use of Administrative Law Judges becomes more frequent under the new state requirements, staff may recommend developing a more comprehensive internal process. She noted that the City's current method of selecting an Administrative Law Judge is not specifically codified in the City Code.

Commissioner Toller reviewed the section of the ordinance establishing the appointment of an Administrative Law Judge and noted that the City Council would appoint a qualified individual to serve in that capacity. He stated that this clarified his understanding that the appointment would be made by an elected governing body.

Commissioner Sommerkorn provided additional background on the evolution of land use appeal authorities in Utah. He explained that appeals were historically heard by Boards of Adjustment and later by designated appeal authorities. As land use appeals became increasingly technical and legal in nature, many jurisdictions transitioned to using Administrative Law Judges or hearing officers with legal and land use expertise to hear appeals.

Commissioner Toller asked whether an appeal already pending before the City would be processed under the existing procedures or under the proposed ordinance. Ms. Ellis explained that appeals are governed by the code in effect at the time the appeal is filed, and therefore any pending appeal would proceed under the current process.

Commissioner Toller thanked staff and members of the public for their comments. He suggested that the ordinance continue to ensure Planning Commissioners could not be removed for arbitrary or capricious reasons.

Chair Young responded that the ordinance's specific grounds for removal were intended to provide that protection by limiting removal to the circumstances expressly identified in the code.

Commissioner Moore stated that he had reviewed the proposed ordinance amendments in detail and believed the provisions regarding the removal of Planning Commissioners were fair and provided clear expectations and guidance for Commission members. He stated that the ordinance established an appropriate framework for the Commission to follow.

Commissioner Moore made the motion to forward a recommendation of approval of the proposed ordinance amendments to the City Council for the text amendment for Title 17, 18, and 19. Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

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

4- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM JUNE 25, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Sevy made a motion to approve the June 25, 2026 minutes and Commissioner Moore seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

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

5- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. McNamara provided an update on current planning projects. She reported that staff continues to work on the detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU) ordinance and anticipates bringing it before the Planning Commission soon, noting that the process will include opportunities for public input.

Ms. McNamara also reported that Symphony Homes had submitted a revised rezone application for property located east of 550 West consisting of approximately 33 lots with a proposed R-1-14 zoning designation. She stated that the application was tentatively scheduled for the July 23, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. McNamara further informed the Commission that both the City Center Small Area Plan and the Presbyterian Church rezone application were scheduled for City Council consideration the following week. She concluded by noting that, aside from those projects, development application activity had remained relatively slow.

6- ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Sommerkorn motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 pm.