



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

MAY 8, 2025

WORK SESSION 6:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

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

Visitors: Michelle Day, Mandy Nistler, Erik Craythorne

1. Discussion of a proposed rezone for property located at 3700 W 1300 N (Erik Craythorne)

The property at 3700 W 1300 N totaling 4.2 acres, was proposed for rezoning from A-40 to R-2. The General Plan already designated this area as R-2. The developer, Eric Craythorne, proposed 12 lots in two phases. However, the calculated density for R-2 zoning only allowed 11.34 units, which traditionally rounded down to 11. The developer requested a development agreement to round up to 12 units, noting all minimum lot sizes, widths, and depths were still met.

Phase 1 would consist of single-family patio homes designed for aging residents, with most living space on the main floor and optional upstairs rooms for visiting family. Mr. Craythorne explained that the intent was to fill a niche for low-maintenance homes, featuring 1,800–2,100 sq. ft. floor plans, consistent architecture, and xeriscaped front yards. Phase 2, to be developed separately by Chase and Josh Beard, would not include patio homes.

The property would connect to the south via the Preserve at Willow Bluff road, with a temporary hammerhead for emergency access until future development allowed a full connection. City staff and commissioners discussed whether rounding up to 12 units set a precedent. Most agreed the unique layout—with one straight road and no extra infrastructure—made the additional lot feasible without compromising standards.

Commissioners generally supported the idea, citing the limited impact of patio homes on traffic and population density. They emphasized the area's existing variety in lot sizes and housing types and agreed to set a public hearing for the next meeting, where development agreement details would be presented.

2. Discussion of the revised PRUD zone

Troy Moyes presented the first reading of a proposed text amendment to the PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) overlay zone. The proposal aimed to repeal and replace the existing ordinance due to numerous duplications and limitations in the current code.

Troy Moyes explained that the PRUD overlay could only be applied to R-1, R-2, and R-3 zones, and not R-4 or R-5. Any property size could apply for a PRUD, but only developments over 10 acres would qualify for bonus density—up to 10%—based on factors like affordable housing, architectural enhancements, or recreational amenities. Smaller properties could receive flexibility in layout but no density increase.

Commissioners Turner and Wade sought clarification on whether the amendment provided the city flexibility to approve or deny developments. Bryn MacDonald emphasized that all PRUD applications would remain legislative decisions, giving the city full authority to approve or reject proposals based on merit rather than entitlement.

The updated ordinance removed rigid standards like lot size minimums and instead allowed for more discretion by the Commission. For example, fencing, architecture (brick or Hardie options), and street trees would be required for all PRUD applications. Street trees would follow city standards with a requirement of at least two trees every 50 feet.

Common space subdivisions, where the home footprint is the lot and all other areas are shared, would be allowed in R-2 and R-3 zones. Attached units, such as twin homes or one-story patio homes, were restricted to those zones as well. Private streets would only be allowed in attached multi-family developments within R-3.

Several commissioners appreciated the reduced bonus density (from 20% to 10%) and the encouragement for creative development without compromising zoning intent. They noted this ordinance could have benefited prior projects, offering flexibility without requiring a zone change.

The Commission agreed to move forward with a public hearing and planned to make final adjustments as needed.

3. Discussion of the proposed landscaping ordinance

Troy Moyes presented a first reading of updates to the city's landscaping ordinance in response to recommendations from the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, which encouraged cities to adopt six water-efficient landscaping measures. The city had already adopted four of the six, and these proposed changes would cover the remaining two.

Troy Moyes explained that the updated ordinance removed the previous limitation of 30% mulch coverage and added a new provision limiting turfgrass in new residential front and side yards to 35%. It also clarified that landscapes completely devoid of planned live vegetation, such as yards covered only in rocks, would be prohibited. The ordinance maintained requirements for live plant coverage and allowed materials like mulch, artificial turf, and rock. Additionally, it required drip irrigation in new landscaped areas less than eight feet wide, each on a separate irrigation zone.

Commissioner Roubinet questioned whether residents still needed to submit a landscape plan for approval. Troy Moyes clarified that a formal plan was no longer required unless a resident wanted to exceed the 35% turf limit. Bryn MacDonald added that while current standards remained in place, requiring every new home to submit a plan was unnecessary; compliance with requirements would suffice.

Regarding enforcement, Commissioner Turner asked if the ordinance would be actively enforced. Bryn MacDonald and Troy Moyes confirmed that enforcement would likely be complaint-driven, similar to practices in nearby cities like Syracuse. New residents would receive informational handouts outlining the code, and most people were expected to comply voluntarily.

Commissioner Roubinet asked about drip irrigation requirements, and Bryn MacDonald confirmed that language was required by Weber Basin. Troy Moyes proposed scheduling a public hearing, and commissioners agreed.

It was also noted that once the ordinance was adopted, the city would qualify for Utah's "Slow the Flow" rebate program. Residents would be eligible for landscaping rebates if they pre-applied and met program conditions, with rebate amounts based on square footage and the condition of existing landscaping.

4. Discussion of the proposed General Plan Land Use Map amendment

Troy Moyes summarized a previous discussion regarding proposed General Plan map changes in both newly incorporated and unincorporated areas, along with the addition of a new agricultural zone—A-20. This A-20 zone would allow for half-acre lots, complementing the existing A-5 (five-acre) and A-40 (one-acre) agricultural zones. The A-20 was proposed to align with the sewer lift station service boundary, while A-40 was suggested near the FEMA flood line.

The Planning Commission had discussed introducing a neighborhood commercial zone at 2425 N and 5000 W, splitting the parcel and designating the western portion as A-20. However, the City Council recently met with the Parkers, who requested an R-1 zone. The Council tabled the matter pending completion of infrastructure studies but indicated general support for keeping the area R-1. Although the Parkers' application complied with the current general plan and zoning, no immediate changes would be made.

Commissioner King noted that the Ivy Meadows developer also chose to delay their proposal until studies were complete. Commissioner Roubinet mentioned concerns raised in the study regarding road widths and drainage, which would take 10–12 months. Bryn MacDonald stated that both projects were essentially paused, waiting on study outcomes.

Commissioner Farnsworth noted the Council's reluctance to consider A-20 zoning previously due to lack of a clear plan. She suggested that presenting a well-conceived A-20 plan could influence the Council. The Commission agreed to proceed with the A-20 proposal and return with both the map and zone change together.

Troy Moyes confirmed the proposed zone language was nearly complete. Commissioners generally

Planning Commission 05-08-2025 Page 3 of 12

expressed support for the proposal. Discussion followed about incorporating the A-20 zone into a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) to provide developers flexibility for mixed lot sizes. Commissioner Roubinet raised a concern about placing A-20 near commercial and school district property, but there was consensus that a mix of zones in that area was acceptable.

Troy Moyes brought up the possibility of an industrial addition in the area, and Commissioner Turner noted the natural beauty of the property. The Commission generally agreed to limit commercial development to the slough.

Concerns were raised regarding PRUD abuse, where large lots could be used to cluster smaller lots. Troy Moyes and Bryn MacDonald proposed adding purpose language to discourage clustering and emphasize lot variety. The Commission supported adding the A-20 to the PRUD option and refining the purpose statement.

Commissioner Roubinet suggested increasing the minimum acreage required for a PRUD in A-20 areas. Bryn MacDonald offered to analyze parcel sizes, noting most were already large. Commissioner Farnsworth pointed out that the 10% density cap already limited impact, and Commissioner King agreed it likely wouldn't create significant density increases.

Troy Moyes concluded by confirming that the Commission was ready for a public hearing and would proceed with adding A-20 to the PRUD, along with clarifying language to guide future development.

5. Other items

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the Bastian property on the agenda. Bryn MacDonald explained that while a traffic study would be required during the subdivision process, it was not typically needed at the zoning stage. She clarified that past council delays were related to broader infrastructure concerns.

Troy Moyes noted the property was in the Hooper Irrigation District and would require water service letters during the preliminary stage. Commissioner King asked what had changed since the last review, and Troy Moyes said nothing substantial had, emphasizing that the applicant now sought a 16% bonus density under the PRUD by dedicating a quarter-mile of regional trail and four acres of open space.

Commissioners discussed whether the offered improvements justified the full 16% bonus. Commissioner Turner and others agreed the green space and trail dedication were valuable, and Troy Moyes added that architectural standards would also be included, though none had been submitted yet. Commissioner Farnsworth asked about the cost to build the trail, and Commissioner Roubinet commented that it would be significant.

The work session ended as time had expired.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

MAY 8, 2025

GENERAL SESSION 7:30 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

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

Visitors: Michelle Day, Mandy Nistler, Travis Larsen, Bill and Annette Lucas, Brandon and Stacie Benoit, Stephen Matkin, Mike Bastian

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer** – Commissioner Farnsworth
4. **Disclosures from Planning Commissioners**

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. **Public Comments**

Stephen Matkin, West Point: Mr. Matkin stated due to the amount of growth coming, which is inevitable, a major concern has become traffic. He enjoys using SR-177 as it is convenient; however, the next phase of SR-177 will affect everyone due to the end point and the number of projects going in at the location at the same time. He stated his commute home has forced him to go the long way, which is quicker than the normal way. He does not know how much planning can be done to make it easier on the residents to move throughout the city, getting to and from schools, home and work with all the ongoing projects. He understands there are several different housing developments going in at the northwest corner of the city and asks that something be done to alleviate traffic for the residents to move through and around the city easier.

6. **Discussion and consideration to add the PRUD Overlay Zone to property located at approximately 2350 N 5000 W; Lone Pine Development, applicant**

Mike Bastian, representing Lone Peak Development, is proposing a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay zone for 82.94-acres of land (comprised of 11 parcels) located at approximately 2350 North 5000 West. The property is currently zoned R-1 Residential (density of 2.2 units/acre). A public hearing is scheduled to gather public input and discuss the proposed PRUD overlay zone. Note: This proposal was previously discussed during Planning Commission work

sessions held on October 10, 2024, January 9, 2025, and April 10, 2025. Initially, a General Plan amendment was under consideration. However, at the meeting on April 24, 2025, the Planning Commission and the applicant determined that pursuing a PRUD overlay zone would be the most appropriate course of action for this development at this time.

The purpose of the PRUD overlay zone as described in WPCC 17.60.160(A) is to "encourage imaginative and efficient utilization of land through large-scale residential development and provide greater flexibility in the location of buildings on the land, the consolidation of open spaces, and the clustering of dwelling units."

The PRUD overlay zone is a special zoning designation that allows for greater flexibility and increased density in exchange for higher development standards. To qualify for the PRUD zone, a development must meet certain requirements, including providing bonus density amenities. Bonus density amenities are features or improvements that go above and beyond the minimum requirements for residential development. Examples of bonus density amenities include parks, playgrounds, street trees, and trails. These amenities provide benefits to both the residents and the community as a whole.

Rezone requests (including PRUD Overlay Zoning) are legislative decisions. In legislative matters, the Planning Commission and City Council have broad discretion, provided that it can be demonstrated that their action will promote or protect the community's overall welfare. Changes to zoning require a public hearing and recommendation from the Planning Commission before a final decision can be made by the City Council.

Again, the applicant is proposing 211 building lots on 82.992 acres, resulting in a project density of 2.54 units per acre. This exceeded the current R-1 zone maximum density of 2.2 units per acre, which would allow only 183 lots. The requested increase represented a 16% bonus density, while the PRUD overlay zone allowed a maximum bonus of 20%. All proposed lots met minimum size requirements.

To qualify for the bonus density, the applicant included enhancements as required by the PRUD overlay zone. These enhancements fell under Section C (recreational amenities) and item V (dedication of land to the city for a regional trail system), which together could allow up to a 10% bonus. The proposed trail dedication was along the ridge of the slough and aligned with West Point City's master trail plan.

To reach the full 16% bonus, the applicant also requested an additional 6% under Section F, which allowed up to 15% for other beneficial amenities. These included the dedication of 3.5 to 4 acres of open space around the trail and a development agreement to incorporate architectural design standards. However, the specific architectural standards had not been provided. The trail itself was proposed to be 8 to 10 feet wide.

Commissioner Roubinet confirmed that the proposed bonus density was based on the trail, the surrounding open space, and architectural standards. Troy Moyes clarified that while architectural standards were part of the proposal, the specific details had not yet been provided.

Commissioner Turner asked about the property to the north along 2425 N, which was not part of the development, and raised concerns about access due to restrictions on driveways along collector roads. Bryn MacDonald responded that the issue had been reviewed and noted that the Planning Commission could allow driveways on collector streets depending on how the property was developed, such as with one-acre lots. She acknowledged that development could be difficult but not impossible.

Commissioner Roubinet pointed out that the issue with access would exist regardless of the zoning due to the property's boundary location. Commissioner Turner then asked whether the road could be shifted to border the property, allowing future homes to face south.

Mike Bastian, representing the applicant, stated that the landowner of that northern piece was present and could speak to their plans. He explained that creating double-fronting lots would be inefficient and costly, especially if it required extending the road. Commissioner Turner suggested shifting the road entirely, and Troy Moyes responded that moving the road further north would place it too close to the intersection of 2425 N and 5000 W. Mr. Bastian acknowledged the concern and said they had considered it during the layout process.

a. Public Hearing

Travis Larsen, West Point: Mr. Larsen shared a few comments regarding the trail system. He noted that there was already an unfinished trail in the area and questioned whether it was ever going to be completed, as it currently stopped at the Weber County line. He said it would have been nice for others to be able to use the trail further down and acknowledged that it was in the planning stages, but he wondered if it would ever actually come to pass. Mr. Larsen also raised concerns about the open space surrounding the trail, asking who would be responsible for maintaining it. He questioned whether the city would handle maintenance or if it would simply become overgrown with weeds. While he expressed support for the idea of a walking path, he voiced uncertainty about what would ultimately happen with it—whether it would be maintained and functional, or just turn into empty space with a trail running through the middle.

Brandon Benoit, West Point: Mr. Benoit stated that he and his family own the section of land to the northeast, where it bordered the proposed development. He said they had spoken to the owners of the other two lots in that area, but those owners were not interested in selling at this time. Mr. Benoit explained that their plan and goal had been to eventually build a house, a shop, and a pasture for their horses on the 2.75 acres they own. He added that they intend to keep tabs on the section of land to the west as well. Mr. Benoit agreed with Mr. Matkin's earlier comments, expressing concern that the number of proposed houses would result in horrendous traffic. He stated that he did not believe the roads or infrastructure could support that level of growth. He concluded by saying that was his biggest concern.

Stacie Benoit, West Point: Mrs. Benoit explained that she and her family had moved to West Point almost 18 years prior because it was the quiet, rural town they were looking for. She shared that she had grown up in Morgan and that the "insanity" had since followed them.

Mrs. Benoit noted that 7-Eleven was the first development she recalled being built, and from

there, growth had rapidly expanded. She attested to the significant traffic near the corridor by Holiday, describing how difficult it had become just trying to take her kids to school or her son to football. She stated that it was already horrendous. Mrs. Benoit shared that they lived on nearly an acre on 4000 W, where they have loved living, raising their kids with horses. However, she expressed feeling as though they had been pushed out of the environment they had originally moved there for, acknowledging that while such change might be inevitable, it was still disheartening. Mrs. Benoit said they had purchased another piece of land to build their dream home, including a shop and pasture for their horses, as her husband had mentioned. She admitted the situation with this development made her sick to her stomach. Echoing the concerns of others, she stated there was no way the roads in Hooper or West Point could handle the increased traffic, emphasizing that it was already terrible. This, she said, was one of her main concerns. She also asked for clarification about the trail, whether it would be paved or dirt and questioned who would maintain it. Mrs. Benoit explained that one of the main reasons they were moving was because their home on 4000 W would soon have the corridor running directly behind it, down the bluff. She concluded by saying they were moving in pursuit of their dream home and expressed how much they loved the city, which made the situation even more saddening.

Commissioner King motioned to close the public hearing
Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion
All voted aye.

b. Decision

Mike Bastian stated that road capacity concerns were common with development, but improvements would be made. He explained that 5000 West would be widened to city standards as development occurred there, and sewer lines would be brought up through the subdivision. When connecting to 4500 West, that road would also need to be widened at that time.

Commissioner Roubinet confirmed a traffic study would be required and Mr. Bastian agreed. Commissioner Roubinet and Bryn MacDonald explained that traffic studies typically assess trip generation, peak times, lane requirements, and intersection performance. Commissioner Roubinet noted that although traffic studies reflect averages and may not align with public perception, they follow accepted standards and must be completed by a certified traffic engineer. Commissioner Turner emphasized that if the study showed the roads couldn't handle the traffic, they would have to be widened, and if the developer refused to pay for improvements, the subdivision would not proceed.

Commissioner King asked what portion of the improvements would be the developer's responsibility. Troy Moyes explained that the developer would need to upgrade their portion of the road to meet the city's transportation master plan. Mr. Bastian added that, based on his experience, his responsibility extended from the centerline of the road to his property. He would need to address any issues such as ditches and coordinate with ditch users if alterations were needed.

Commissioner Roubinet asked about trail maintenance and timing. Bryn MacDonald said the trail property would be dedicated to the city and maintained by the city once constructed. There were no immediate plans to build it, but parks impact fees could fund future development. The trail would likely be 8–10 feet wide and paved with asphalt. Commissioner King asked what the surrounding green space would look like. Bryn MacDonald responded that larger areas, especially behind homes, might be grassed and maintained, while space near the slough would likely remain more natural. She did not expect amenities like playgrounds but mentioned benches and trees as possibilities.

Commissioner Wade raised concerns based on his experience with nearby trails, observing that homeowners often encroached on city property with gardens. Bryn MacDonald clarified that such encroachments had occurred but were not officially allowed. Commissioner Wade noted that the open space behind homes might informally become extensions of backyards.

Troy Moyes clarified that the southern side of the trail, bordering agricultural land, would be fenced. Commissioner Wade praised the city's current trail maintenance efforts.

Commissioner King asked where the existing trail ended. Bryn MacDonald believed it stopped at the Weber County line, likely referring to the trail along 4500 West. Mr. Larsen confirmed that flyers indicated it was in planning and that it was intended to connect to the trail at 1300 North.

Troy Moyes added that the city had received a county grant to extend the trail and that the trail installation was tied to a delayed development project on the Mike Hatch property and trail construction would occur through future development.

Commissioner Farnsworth asked about the cost of asphalt for the trail, but Mr. Bastian stated he had no estimates. He indicated the current plan was to dedicate the land for the trail to the city rather than construct it, so the city could complete it when funding was available.

Commissioner Turner and others questioned whether the proposed open space was useful or better repurposed into larger lots. There was also concern about whether the triangular open space section was necessary. Bryn MacDonald clarified that removing three lots on the road rather than adjusting lot depth would better benefit density and allow for park space.

There was considerable discussion about the 16% density bonus. Mr. Bastian explained the goal was to use a mix of open space and architectural standards to achieve this, referencing similar standards used in the Whitesides development. Commissioner Turner and others questioned whether the trail dedication alone justified the 10% allowance, especially since the trail wasn't being built immediately.

Several commissioners expressed interest in rearranging the layout to achieve a more usable park or open space, possibly sacrificing one or two lots to do so. Bryn MacDonald emphasized the importance of securing the land for the trail system while it was still available, warning that without dedication now, future trail connectivity could be lost.

Commissioner's King and Wade supported the idea of preserving land for trails and building a quality subdivision to serve as a transition zone between nearby commercial areas and residential development. There was concern about the plan's current lack of variety, creativity, and usable park space, and some felt it was overly focused on efficiency.

The group discussed ways to make open space more functional, such as including a playground, pickleball court, or bike track. Bryn MacDonald noted that the Parks Master Plan identified this area for a neighborhood park, not just open space, and asked if lot size flexibility could help meet this goal.

Mr. Bastian explained he was open to adjusting lot widths or sacrificing one lot (specifically lot 49) to provide more open space for park amenities, as long as he could still meet the 16% density bonus. He emphasized he needed clear direction to avoid repeated delays. Multiple commissioners suggested that even a loss of one or two lots to create better open space would be worth the tradeoff.

There was also mention of possibly eliminating park strips and widening sidewalks, as was done in another development (Craythorn), to help make lots feel deeper and reduce maintenance burdens. Staff confirmed that such changes could be done with a PRUD without a development agreement.

Commissioner Farnsworth recommended approval of the PRUD overlay zone to property located approximately 2350 N 5000 W, Lone Pine Development, applicant, with the condition of adding architectural standards equivalent to White Sides, removal of lot 49 being dedicated as open with the cap at 16% density, and add in some variation of lot widths and sizes in the middle of the development. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion.

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

The motion passed unanimously as a recommendation to the City Council.

7. Staff Update

At the previous City Council meeting, the Parkers had agreed to table their request and wait a few months for studies to be completed, placing their project in a holding pattern. The rezone to R-4 for the Nielsen Crossing residential area was approved, but the commercial portion at the front was not yet approved, as the council wanted more information on the intended uses. It was noted that one side would include a medical dental office, and the other would house Nielsen's Frozen Custard.

The Jeremy Humphreys rezone on 4500 W was discussed and scheduled for a public hearing in two weeks. The council had questions about an unusual piece of land associated with the Humphreys

project. Bryn MacDonald had followed up with the Canal Company, which indicated they would take responsibility for that piece.

Matt Levitt was still working on revisions to his project, planning to flip lots and implement previously discussed changes. He intended to return once those adjustments were finalized.

The residential portion of Nielsen Crossing had already been approved, and the developers had contacted staff to inform them that the subdivision plat would be submitted soon.

Regarding the CW Urban commercial development on 300 North, the residents had moved out, and demolition of the houses was expected shortly. The plat was awaiting recording, and building permits had been issued. Construction on that corner was anticipated to begin within the month. The project would proceed with access only from 300 North.

8. Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner King thanked the public for attending the meeting.

Commissioner Taylor thanked the staff and he appreciated their work.

Commissioner Farnsworth acknowledged that expressing concerns publicly was difficult, but she appreciated the kindness and patience shown throughout the process. She noted that, given the size of the land and its proximity to the corridor, the outcome could have been much worse. She expressed appreciation for the thought and attention Mr. Bastian had put into the project to avoid higher density. Despite the challenges, she felt the proposal represented a good compromise and thanked the staff for their efforts.

Commissioner Wade had no comment.

Commissioner Turner had no comment.

Commissioner Roubinet echoed Commissioner Farnsworth's comments and expressed appreciation for those who attended the meeting. He encouraged the public to come to more meetings, even when they aren't public hearings, noting that it's more enjoyable to have people in the audience rather than empty chairs. He acknowledged the significant growth occurring in West Point, as well as in Davis County, Weber County, and West Haven, and admitted that it could feel overwhelming at times. He valued hearing public comments to gain different perspectives and additional information. He also mentioned that new zoning changes were being considered and encouraged everyone to read the agendas for City Council and Planning Commission meetings to stay informed. He thanked everyone for attending.

9. Adjournment

Commissioner Wade motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:06 pm. Commissioner Turner seconded the motion. All voted aye.



Chairperson – PJ Roubinet



Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen