



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 8, 2024

WORK SESSION 6:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Commissioner Scott Wolford, Commissioner PJ Roubinet, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Joe Taylor, Commissioner Spencer Wade, Commissioner Adam King

City Staff Present: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

Visitors: None

1. Training

Troy Moyes began the discussion by introducing the topic of Robert's Rules of Order, inquiring about the familiarity with this term. Scott Wolford provided an overview, describing it as a system of parliamentary procedure designed to facilitate orderly and constructive discussions, although it can sometimes be intricate and selectively followed for strategic purposes. Troy Moyes expanded on this, highlighting the objective of ensuring fair and efficient group discussions while respecting the rights of all members to participate and stay informed. Bryn MacDonald added that while the Commission generally adheres to Robert's Rules, strict adherence is not required.

Troy Moyes showed a video summarizing Robert's Rules of Order which is a valuable tool for conducting efficient and productive meetings, ensuring fairness and effectiveness through a structured process. By following the prescribed steps for motions, discussions, and voting, members can confidently navigate meetings and make informed decisions, ultimately maximizing productivity and minimizing time spent.

The role of the chair was discussed, explaining that the role is crucial in maintaining order during meetings, overseeing proceedings, and enforcing rules, including determining who speaks at any given time.

Per Robert's Rules, typically a motion is made, a second is secured, then a discussion takes place. However, this Commission often engages in discussion before making a motion and seeking a second before voting.

Scott Wolford explained that the motion maker can discuss their reasoning before seeking a second, leading to open debate, especially on contentious issues. Troy Moyes highlighted the importance of a balanced discussion, mentioning instances in other communities where one person dominates

conversation, hindering group discussion. Robert's Rules typically limit speaking opportunities to two per person to ensure equitable participation.

The chair also helps control the pace of discussions and agenda items, noting that while the chair, with staff assistance, drafts the agenda, the final content is subject to Commission approval during the meeting. Troy Moyes suggested a change in the voting procedure to formally adopt the agenda during meetings. Additionally, he mentioned the need to be cautious when striking agenda items due to the 24-hour posting requirement. Scott Wolford asked if the order of items on the agenda is able to be changed during a meeting and Troy Moyes stated yes.

Troy Moyes explained the process after the pledge of allegiance, detailing how the chair typically asks for a motion to adopt the agenda, followed by a second, and then the agenda is adopted. He provided examples of handling a main motion, emphasizing that while in smaller groups formal recognition isn't always necessary, the chair still plays a crucial role in facilitating discussion. He clarified that a second doesn't necessarily indicate agreement, but signifies readiness for debate.

PJ Roubinet mentioned instances where decisions are made about tabling or declining items that ultimately go to City Council for approval. He inquired about continuing debate after prior discussion, to which Troy Moyes deferred to the Commission's preference. Scott Wolford expressed a preference for allowing further debate after the motion, noting that while many decisions are straightforward administrative actions, it's beneficial to provide the motion maker with the option to speak if desired. He emphasized that the goal isn't to unnecessarily prolong meetings but to ensure thorough discussion when needed. Staff suggested allowing discussion or questions after the motion and second, adding that it provides one last chance for clarification.

Scott Wolford highlighted the risk of groupthink in decision-making processes, emphasizing the importance of avoiding blindly following motions without thorough discussion. PJ Roubinet suggested that discussing matters before making a motion allows for better interaction with applicants, especially in significant cases like rezoning.

Spencer Wade, as a new Commissioner, expressed the need for discussion to understand decisions better, even when everyone agrees. Rochelle Farnsworth added that initial discussions help identify necessary stipulations for motions, ensuring thorough consideration.

Adam King sought clarification on when discussions are restricted to the Commission, to which Scott Wolford explained that it's usually at the discretion of the chair, with the goal of addressing concerns before motions are made. He emphasized the importance of addressing questions and concerns before motions are made to avoid developer dissatisfaction later. He clarified the process for introducing substitute motions and stressed the importance of not feeling trapped by the initial motion, as there are opportunities for amendment or change. Overall, he urged for thorough consideration before decisions are made.

Troy Moyes acknowledged a realization he had about the role of staff in meetings, suggesting that staff should refrain from speaking unless asked a question or for clarification. He admitted finding it challenging at times to remain silent, as he aims to provide understanding without swaying opinions. He provided a cheat sheet (shown below) of terms used for motions in Robert's Rules,

explaining the process for introducing main motions, amending motions, postponing agenda items, and adjourning meetings. He emphasized that objections to procedure, requests for information, and motions to table or address points of privilege can interrupt speakers and require attention from the chair. He reiterated that while the current group does not face these issues, the rules are in place to prevent dysfunction in other settings.

Action	What to Say	Can Interrupt Speaker?	Need a Second?	Can be Debated?	Can be Amended?	Votes Needed
Introduce main motion	"I move to..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Amend a motion	"I move to amend the motion by..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Postpone item	"I move we postpone the matter until..."	No	Yes	Yes	No	Majority
Adjourn the meeting	"I move that we adjourn the meeting."	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
Object to procedure (rule is violated)	"Point of order."	Yes	No	No	No	Chair Decision
Request information	"Point of information."	Yes	No	No	No	No Vote
Table a motion	"I move to table..."	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
Personal preference – noise, temp etc.	"Point of privilege"	Yes	No	No	No	No Vote

Regarding points of information, PJ Roubinet sought clarification on how to address questions to staff, to which Troy Moyes explained that addressing questions through the chair may be a formal option, but the chair may allow informal questioning as well. He emphasized the need for staff to remain silent unless prompted with questions.

Bryn MacDonald highlighted the importance of maintaining decorum during public comments or hearings, emphasizing that staff should refrain from speaking unless the chair specifically addresses them with a question. She stressed the need for organization, particularly during crowded public hearings to present a professional image.

Troy Moyes reinforced the idea that staff should remain reserved until prompted for input, suggesting that detailed staff reports aim to address all questions, but acknowledging that there may still be inquiries.

Scott Wolford emphasized the importance of adhering to proper procedures to avoid confusion or chaos, particularly when decisions could have significant impacts on individuals' lives.

There was no more discussion by the Planning Commission.

2. Discussion of Definitions

Troy Moyes stated West Point City Code features a dedicated section, defining crucial terms to guarantee transparent and consistent interpretation of regulations. In addition to the recent changes made to subdivision regulations by the City Council, specific definitions within the City Code need to be adjusted so that they comply with both state and local regulations. In addition, other definitions will be clarified to enhance clarity and understanding. The Planning Commission will be presented with the proposed changes for discussion.

PJ Roubinet asked regarding the definition for "lot, flag" if this definition will be removed. Troy Moyes stated there were two separate definitions for flag lots and this removal is cleaning up the duplication.

Troy Moyes reviewed the proposed changes and stated due to recent alterations in the subdivision code, certain definitions needed revising, such as the inclusion of administrative land use authority. He requested feedback on the clarity of definitions, some of which are directly from state code. He discussed the removal of the cluster subdivision definition, as regulations for it were eliminated from the code several years ago. Another modification involved updating the definition of private kennels to align with recently adopted regulations from the Davis County Animal Care Code. He explained the removal of redundant definitions, such as the lot flag definition, which contained excessive rules. He mentioned the adjustment of definitions for private lanes and private roads to align with existing standards in the subdivision code, simplifying the process by eliminating unnecessary definitions of standards already outlined elsewhere.

Jeff Turner asked why the private road definition states to have curb, gutter, and sidewalk and Troy Moyes stated that is the current standard. Jeff Turner gave an example on 200 S where there is no curb and gutter. Troy Moyes explained the definition pertains to anything new would have to follow the standards, unless a development agreement was completed.

The next addition is the incorporation of a review cycle, a requirement derived from state code regarding the subdivision process. Additionally, the last four additions are directly from state code: Subdivision improvement plans, subdivision ordinance review, subdivision plan review, and will-serve letter.

Jeff Turner sought clarification on the difference between flag lot and private drive. A discussion ensued to clarify the disparity between the two and Troy Moyes concluded by stating the code had recently changed to only allow private roads in multifamily zones where fire code requirements would still need to be met.

Troy Moyes outlined some changes, noting that certain additional alterations focused on reorganizing definitions for better clarity and weren't included in the report. For instance, the term "alley" would now be renamed "private alley" to align with similar road types like "private lane" and "private road." Another adjustment involved placing the term beekeeping next to apiary (beekeeping, apiary) as the code discusses apiaries, not beekeeping. He mentioned plans to address certain issues related to lot widths and depths to streamline definitions and make them more

understandable. Feedback on these changes will be sought and it was decided to hold a public hearing for the next meeting.

Spencer Wade expressed concerns about reconciling evolving definitions with the community's traditional rural character, especially in instances of dispute resolution. Troy Moyes acknowledged the difficulty in balancing these factors, striving to address concerns without compromising the majority's interests. Bryn MacDonald emphasized the committee's role in implementing the code, clarifying that existing practices are generally respected until changes are proposed. However, development plans must adhere to current standards, which can sometimes lead to friction.

Scott Wolford highlighted the importance of clear code definitions, noting that ambiguity can favor citizens in disputes. Bryn MacDonald echoed this sentiment, underscoring the significance of precise definitions in maintaining regulatory integrity and addressing community concerns effectively. Scott Wolford stressed the importance of avoiding situations where the City's inability to enforce unclear regulations could lead to citizen dissatisfaction.

There was no more discussion by the Planning Commission.

3. Review of agenda items

Bryn MacDonald pointed out the Planning Commissioners have in the back of their packet the wording and correct way to do nominations for Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair.

Scott Wolford stated at the last meeting, the procedure was done incorrectly. The making of a motion on text should not have been entertained. That is called in absentia. While texting a fellow commissioner is okay, during a hybrid meeting the rules are unclear. It becomes the discretion of the chair to allow comments. The electronic meeting has shifted to recording only and if a commissioner needs to join remotely, that will be up to the discretion of the chair. However, when a motion is made, the person making the motion needs to be recognized. The motion itself is not recognized. A person can vote via text, but it is at the discretion of the chair. The nominations and election will take place again with the correct procedure. PJ Roubinet was elected as Chair and it can certainly be that again. He stated he would vote for someone that's interested in serving as chair, but that is for the Commission to decide.

Bryn MacDonald stated looking at the instructions, a nomination is made. A nomination is not a motion. There needs to be a nomination called for three times. There does not need to be a second on a nomination. Once nominations have been called for three times, a motion can then be made. There can be a substitute motion in between. A motion does still need to have a second. When consulting with legal, it was recommended placing the voting for chair and vice-chair as separate agenda items.

Scott Wolford mentioned the Mayor's expectation for the chair to attend City Council meetings when items discussed by the Planning Commission arise. He also highlighted the importance of meeting with staff the week before to discuss and help set the draft agenda, gaining context before. He recalled the leadership from the Mayor when he served as the Planning Commission chair, noting his thorough understanding of the agenda and discussions with staff, which facilitated

progress. He emphasized the implied expectation for the chair to be available on Friday mornings to align with staff, providing insight into background information not disclosed in public meetings.

Troy Moyes stated the importance of the vice-chair is significant as they will become chair when the chair is unable to attend a meeting. The vice-chair may need to meet with Staff to help discuss and set the agenda if the chair is unavailable.

Scott Welford expressed a belief that might not be shared by everyone, stating that he genuinely believes the role of the vice-chair is crucial. He likened it to the Speaker of the House, emphasizing that the chair should be the last to vote. He emphasized that it's the responsibility of the vice-chair to ensure order and access for the Commission, thereby easing the burden on the chair. He suggested that the vice-chair should protect the chair from being overly assertive in questioning or deliberation, especially when discussing potentially contentious issues. Furthermore, he noted the value of having a vice chair who isn't afraid to ask difficult questions, delve into the heart of matters, and stimulate discussion, highlighting the importance of such a role.

There was no more discussion by the Planning Commission.

4. Staff update

Time expired during the work session and this item was discussed at the end of the general session.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

FEBRUARY 8, 2024

**GENERAL SESSION
7:00 PM**

Planning Commission Present: Commissioner Scott Wolford, Commissioner PJ Roubinet, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Joe Taylor, Commissioner Spencer Wade, Commissioner Adam King

City Staff Present: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

Visitors: None

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Prayer – Adam King

4. Disclosures from Planning Commissioners

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6. Approval of minutes from the December 14, 2023, Planning Commission meeting

PJ Roubinet motioned to approve the minutes from December 14, 2023, Planning Commission meeting as written. Jeff Turner seconded the motion. All voted aye.

7. Approval of minutes from the January 11, 2024, Planning Commission meeting

Rochelle Farnsworth motioned to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Spencer Wade seconded the motion. All voted aye.

8. Approval of minutes from the January 25, 2024, Planning Commission meeting

Adam King motioned to approve the minutes from the January 25, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Joe Taylor seconded the motion. Scott Wolford motioned to amend the minutes as corrected. Rochelle Farnsworth seconded the amendment. All voted aye.

9. Election of Planning Commission Chair

Due to improper procedure followed at the last meeting, legal advised redoing the election of the Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair.

Rochelle Farnsworth nominated PJ Roubinet to serve as Planning Commission Chair for a one-year term. Scott Wolford self-nominated.

Jeff Turner motioned to elect PJ Roubinet to serve a one-year term as Planning Commission Chair. Rochelle Farnsworth seconded the motion. Scott Wolford offered a substitute motion to serve as Chair. There was no second and the motion failed. It then went back to the first motion of PJ Roubinet to serve. A roll call vote was called:

- Commissioner Turner – Aye
- Commissioner King – Aye
- Commissioner Roubinet – Aye
- Commissioner Wolford – Nay
- Commissioner Taylor – Aye
- Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye
- Commissioner Wade – Aye

Motion passed with a 6 to 1 vote for PJ Roubinet to serve as Planning Commission Chair.

10. Election of Planning Commission Vice-Chair

Rochelle Farnsworth nominated Scott Wolford to serve as Planning Commission Vice-Chair. Scott Wolford nominated Jeff Turner.

Scott Wolford motioned to elect Jeff Turner to serve a one-year term as Planning Commission Vice-Chair. PJ Roubinet seconded the motion. Scott Wolford stated he has served as Vice-Chair and at the current time would not like to serve and would appreciate those supporting the motion to vote for Jeff Turner.

- Commissioner Turner – Aye
- Commissioner King – Aye
- Commissioner Roubinet – Aye
- Commissioner Wolford – Aye
- Commissioner Taylor – Aye
- Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye
- Commissioner Wade – Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

11. Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner Wade – No comments.

Commissioner Farnsworth – No comments.

Commissioner Taylor – No comments.

Commissioner Wolford – No comments.

Commissioner King – No comments.

Commissioner Turner – He apologized for the confusion at the last meeting with the voting procedure.


Commissioner Roubinet – He stated he was happy the election was completed in the correct manner as procedure is important and this process could be redone. In the training, procedure was discussed and he feels they are capable of adhering to it better. However, if a mistake is made, there is room for correction. He encouraged the new commissioners if they have an opinion, to state it. This environment has been a good place to speak and let opinions be known and it is their duty as Planning Commissioners to have that discussion. When a meeting is over, the outcome may have turned out differently, but they are all still able to leave as friends.

Commissioner Roubinet asked if there was a staff update. Troy Moyes stated there are potential items on for discussion at the next meeting. Plans for Big-O Tire are being reviewed as well as the junior high seminary could be on for decision and site plan next meeting. CW Urban, who is seeking a rezone, is still working through traffic issues. Staff had a precon meeting for the Westfield subdivision and has an upcoming precon meeting for the Whitesides subdivision. Wildfire phase 5 is looking to move forward. The sewer expansion project to the north will begin soon. A joint meeting with City Council regarding the General Plan might be held soon. There is a rezone application for the Craythorne Homestead phase 6. Staff is still in discussion with the J. Fisher property. Road construction on 2000 W is ongoing. There could possibly be two conditional use permits for home occupations at the next meeting, one for a dance studio and one for a daycare.

12. Adjournment

Jeff Turner made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:21 pm. Rochelle Farnsworth seconded the motion. All voted aye.


Chairperson – PJ Roubinet


Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen