



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 26, 2025

WORK SESSION 6:30 PM

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

Planning Commission Excused: Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Spencer Wade

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

Visitors: Richard Roginski, Pascal Meyer, Matt Leavitt, Tyler Leavitt

1. Review of agenda items

Troy Moyes addressed a tabled item regarding Doug Laub's request for a conditional use permit for a 1,900 sq. ft. accessory building. At the last Planning Commission meeting, there was confusion about whether the setback should be five or eight feet. After review, Troy Moyes confirmed that the applicant's proposal of five feet from the home and six feet from the side meets all requirements, despite the unique lot. PJ Roubinet noted uncertainty about defining front and side yards for this lot and wanted the approved plan to reflect the applicant's intent due to the unique lot and placement of the home on the lot. Troy Moyes explained the city code lacks clear definitions for front and side yards in such unusual cases but confirmed the proposal complies with minimum standards. He noted the Community Development Director interprets the code in ambiguous situations.

Commissioner Taylor confirmed there was no change to the building's square footage and Troy Moyes stated correct and added the applicant plans to remove an existing carport.

Troy Moyes presented the preliminary plat for Neilsen Crossing South, located near Big-O Tires on 2000 W. The subdivision had been rezoned to R-4 by the City Council in May, allowing a density of 5.29 units per acre with 72 lots, each slightly over 5,000 square feet. The plat included two commercial lots, which would require separate site plan approvals. Roads and overall layout remained consistent with previous submissions.

Commissioner Roubinet raised concerns about road labeling and commercial use definitions, noting ongoing discussions about potentially creating distinct commercial zones for different types of businesses, though no new decisions had been made. Troy Moyes confirmed that utilities and fire access had been reviewed and approved, with only minor outstanding questions about cross-access with Big-O Tires, which would be addressed during site plan review.

There was discussion about a currently undeveloped back corner of Big-O's property, with suggestions to fence it off temporarily to prevent unauthorized access and deliveries through residential areas.

The Commission clarified that the preliminary plat approval focused on road layout and lot design and did not include approval of final construction or commercial development, which would be reviewed separately. The Commission found the plat compliant with city codes and Troy Moyes noted that final approvals would be managed administratively as the project progressed.

Troy Moyes presented the site plan and conditional use permit request for a new specialty building on Lot 2 of the Ogden Clinic property on 3000 W. This was a follow-up to prior work session discussions. Because medical offices require conditional use approval, the Commission was asked to approve the site plan and the conditional use separately.

Troy Moyes explained that the site plan included a landscape buffer, trees and a 10-foot setback, adjacent to the neighboring R-4 multi-family zone. The building's façade and roofline design matched the existing Ogden Clinic and met articulation standards. Parking requirements were reviewed and met, including sufficient employee and customer spaces. A photometric plan showed minimal light spillover onto neighboring properties, with all lighting shielded and directed downward.

He noted that staff had thoroughly reviewed the plans and recommended approval. Troy Moyes highlighted the conditional use criteria in the city code and explained that conditions could be imposed to mitigate any potential detrimental effects, such as adjusting lighting if it impacted neighbors. Commissioners expressed satisfaction with the detailed submittal. Traffic impacts were expected to be minimal and manageable by existing road infrastructure. The Commission saw no major concerns.

2. Other items

There were no other items discussed.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 26, 2025

GENERAL SESSION

7:00 PM

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

Planning Commission Excused: Commissioner Spencer Wade

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

Visitors: Richard Roginski, Pascal Meyer, Matt Leavitt, Tyler Leavitt, Connie Lee, Kevin Lee, Marilyn Olds, Kay L Child, David Mark, Doug Laub, Matthew Child, Jacob Everett, Bethany Everett, May Price, Leslie Clifton, Lisa Schofield, Michele Scadden, Rick Scadden, Eric Anderson, Katie Haugen, Kurtis Haugen, Allyx Tony, Jared Tony, Annette Judd, Celinda Leavitt

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

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. **Public Comments**

Kurtis Haugen, West Point: Mr. Haugen was there to speak his voice on item number 10, which was the rezoning of property on 3900 W 300 N, and he was there to respectfully address the points. He appreciated hearing that there would be respect for each other's opinions, and he did value that. However, he wanted to raise a few points that came up during the last Planning Commission meeting he attended regarding this property. During the previous session, a significant number of residents voiced their concerns about the proposed densely populated neighborhood. They all understood that development on this property was inevitable, and their primary hope had been for a new neighborhood that would complement their existing community, maintaining current standards and property value. Mr. Leavitt had been given an opportunity to address these concerns directly, and the residents had hoped for some reassurance that their feedback was heard and that the development would minimize the disruption to their established neighborhood. Instead, his response shifted the focus to a perception that he hadn't been adequately thanked for the free view of his property or for clearing weeds from the ditch bed on his side of the fence. Regarding the comment about the free view and gratitude, Mr. Haugen, like many others, had compensated this

builder when he purchased his home, and they all understood that Mr. Leavitt would be financially rewarded for this development. They were all happy for him and his family for that. However, the expectation of gratitude for an undeveloped property's view, especially in the context of their current concerns, felt out of place. Secondly, there was the comment about clearing the weeds. None of the residents had ever presumed it was their responsibility to maintain someone else's property. While many of them had, over the years, proactively cleared weeds from both sides of the fence line that bordered the property, since they constantly invaded their lawns, the suggestion that they needed to be grateful for Mr. Leavitt clearing the weeds on his side, given the frequent presence of high weeds in the ditch, was confusing and frankly misdirected. Mr. Haugen pointed out that, so far, he hadn't had a neighbor jump his fence to mow his lawn, though he wouldn't have minded that. Another point raised multiple times was that they should be grateful that Mr. Leavitt wasn't proposing even more homes to be put on the lot. Again, Mr. Haugen felt this was a bit tone-deaf, given the shared concern among citizens. While they understood that development would occur, ideally it would align with the existing neighborhood's character, both in home type and in property size. The current proposed zoning threatened to decrease their property values, and Mr. Haugen struggled to find a reason to be thankful for that prospect. Then there was traffic. On 3830 W, their street has about 17 homes. Mr. Haugen's security camera recorded on May 20th (he picked a random day) the number of cars and vehicles that passed by his house between 5:30 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. He stopped counting at 500 vehicles in that period. That was just an average day and Mr. Haugen believed it might actually have been less than average. That was a lot of vehicles for a street with just a few homes, and it was only going to get worse. The increase in density that the proposal represented would only exacerbate an already significant traffic burden on their residential street, creating more serious safety concerns for their children and pedestrians who used those roads daily. Mr. Haugen's disagreement with the proposal wasn't about preventing development, it was about the type of development and the precedent it set for the remaining undeveloped areas to the west and to the north. As a civil servant for the federal government for 30 years, he had learned that simply checking all the boxes wasn't enough. He had always strived to deliver the best possible service, going beyond the minimum requirements, taking pride in his work, and ensuring that he served people in a way that left them truly happy with the service he provided. He urged the Planning Commission to consider this perspective. He asked them not to approve the rezone merely to check a box that aligned with the city plan for increased density, especially when that area had already seen a significant amount of dense development. Mr. Haugen noted that West Point had other wide-open spaces where this type of development could be far more suitable, and he cautioned against putting the cart before the horse. In that area especially, he believed the city should focus on developing the infrastructure to handle the type of growth it was experiencing and would continue to experience. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Katie Haugen, West Point: Mrs. Haugen agreed with the comments made by Mr. Haugen.

Kara Cook, West Point (as read in by Katie Haugen): Ms. Cook wished to add her strong opposition to the said proposal. Her concerns for the rezoning were increased traffic, decreased privacy in their backyards, and decreasing property values for resale on their homes. She was in favor of it staying zoned as it currently was. She thanked them for listening to the concerns of so many citizens who were directly affected by the change and for being their voices in the recommendation to the City Council.

Kay Child, West Point: Ms. Child was in favor of the development. Her son is of the younger generation in which housing is limited, and she thought having smaller homes such as medium density was not a bad idea. She felt that the bigger homes were good, and yes, they do keep up others property value. But she questioned whether that would really sustain their generation as their kids tried to grow and live locally, rather than being forced to go elsewhere because Utah has a housing shortage. Her son is looking for a house and cannot find one. She understands the homes in this proposal might be more expensive than what he could afford but having the ability for families to at least try to move into a nice area to raise their families and keep families in their area, she thought that was a good thing. She didn't think it was a bad thing, and she really felt that with all of the other property surrounding West Point, eventually it was going to be sold. Eventually, houses were going to be there. She suggested making them a little bit smaller, making them a little bit more affordable for younger families. She does understand the traffic concerns and asked whether something could be done such as a roundabout to make the flow of traffic a little better down on 300 N and 4000 W. She doesn't think, traffic-wise, that there is really a way around it, it is going to be there. These places are going to fill up and she just thought having smaller homes and more of them available would be good.

Richard Roginski, West Point: Mr. Roginski spoke at the previous Planning Commission meeting when this item was tabled. He, like many of his neighbors, was heavily opposed to going from an R-2 to an R-4. When they look at the traffic, particularly on 4000 W, they might think that 300 N was heavily traveled, but if they looked at 4000 W, particularly in the mornings and in the afternoons when kids are in school and even after that, it is clear the situation is concerning. This proposal is looking at putting another road just north of his neighbor Connie Lee's house that would dump onto 4000 W. Once again, there are children coming from subdivisions further up the street, and there is no sidewalk on a good part of the west side of 4000 W. Typically, those children would cross the street in front of Mr. Roginski's garage or by his house. He lives on the corner of 4000 W and 300 N. Mr. Roginski made notes of a couple of things. First, he served on the Planning Commission years ago. He noticed that the developer wants to include his own property as part of the total overall acreage, which was unusual unless he was going to tear his house down or do something similar. The other thing Mr. Roginski wanted to make note after having reviewed the actual acreage per each of the houses the developer wanted to build, the development went from what would be 35 houses per acre up to a potential of 78. But the developer said he was only going to do 47. Eight of those lots that he is proposing would fit into the R-4 zone, and once again, the densities were just too much. Mr. Roginski believed they could all live with 34 or 35, but when they are talking about increasing the number of houses to be built from 35 to 47, that was a 33% increase. Also, during the last session, there had been discussions about twin homes, nine are permitted, one at ten. Once again, it felt like a "nibble, nibble, nibble" approach. But this increase from 35 to 47 went beyond the limit. Having seen the traffic and living on the corner, Mr. Roginski could say it was only going to get worse, particularly on 4000 W. A roundabout, he felt, would not do any good and they would probably end up needing a traffic light there.

Matthew Child, West Point: Mr. Child agreed with Ms. Child and gave an example of how a development like this could benefit the community in general. He works up in Mountain Green, UT and Morgan, UT for a school district and they are currently facing some of the same issues that are happening in West Point when it comes to development. Most of the houses being developed there are on larger lots, like an R-2, and fewer and fewer smaller lot homes are being built, homes that

could possibly be more affordable. What that is doing to the school district is something he doesn't often hear brought up when it comes to home development. If only larger houses are built, homes that cost \$800,000, that's great for property value, but it doesn't bring in young families to keep schools running or maintain a steady stream of students. His school district just went through an entire reduction in force of teachers and other staff members because young families can't afford to live there anymore. What he sees now is that as the community ages, more established individuals further along in their careers are moving in, while fewer and fewer people his age, who are ready to have kids and start their lives, can afford to do so. As he looks for a home himself, he says he would like to stay in the West Point area, it's a nice place to live. But as he continues looking and fewer options are offered, he believes the problem is only going to get worse if they don't allow for something like this development. He agrees with the traffic concerns, it's going to be rough. He comes home every day at 3:30 when the kids are getting out of school, and it's crazy on 300 N. He agrees that kids cross the street and that it's going to be unsafe for them. That will definitely add to the issue, and he understands that. What he would hate to see is fewer kids going to school, fewer kids in the area, and fewer families around.

Richard Roginski, West Point: Mr. Roginski brought up the issue of homes. He notes that they talk about homes and how they're difficult to buy. Build smaller homes that are still going to be \$200,000–\$250,000. One of the things being seen here in the state of Utah is that there have been no increases in minimum wage, which remains at \$7.75 an hour. Even if someone goes from earning \$7.75 an hour to \$30.00 an hour, they're looking at roughly \$60,000 a year. Now, if they're buying a \$200,000 or \$250,000 house, how are they going to pay the mortgage on that? Mr. Roginski says we are getting to a point of unsustainability. The argument to build smaller houses makes them affordable doesn't hold unless the people in this state, specifically the legislature, do something to address wages and the inflation that has been seen. Otherwise, he says, it's a pipe dream for anybody to buy a house. He adds, don't forget about the 25-30% of all single-family houses that are bought by private equity groups.

Billy Schofield, West Point: Mr. Schofield stated having worked with developers in the past, he understand it's their livelihood, they need to make money. Going from an R-2 to an R-3 or R-4 obviously brings some monetary gain. He notes that they've known it's been R-2 for a lot of years; the zoning map shows that. He has lived in his home for 18 years, hoping that one day there would be quarter-acre lots behind his property, similar to their existing houses, helping to maintain property values. But again, he adds, it's no fault of anyone, it's the livelihood of the developers. Mr. Schofield said he wants to echo the gentleman's comment about traffic on 300 N and 4000 W. That's one of the first things he thinks of, especially with the bluff dropping down there. There will be a line of traffic, some which already speed continually down that road, who will heading west causing more problems. He acknowledges that change is inevitable and says they just have to accept that. He opposes changing the zoning from R-2 to R-3 or R-4 and believes they need to keep it R-2.

Allyx Toney, West Point: Mrs. Tony stated she grew up in California, and she feels like Utah is trying to be like California with the overcrowding and overbuilding. They moved to West Point because they like the agricultural farmland that's around them. She says she's not against slow growth; it's inevitable. But she doesn't think what they're there to talk about is that. She believes it's overcrowding. Commenting on the smaller homes for starting families, she explains that they are a

new family. They're just starting out with a couple of kids and she thinks it's important for kids to have yards to play in. The townhomes that are possibly going to go in, probably will not have yards for kids to play in, and that's going to keep them inside, just sitting watching TV. She says that's too bad. She adds that if this rezoning is approved what are other developers who are buying up the other farm properties going to say? They'll point out this was approved, so why can't theirs be approved too? She says all of this overcrowding is just going to spread and spread and spread. Mrs. Tony says she thinks it should be left at an R-2.

Bethany Everett, West Point: Ms. Everett states she lives on 4000 W and asked if a crossing guard can be considered at 4000 W and 300 N for the kids coming home from school. She says she has seen many close calls and offers it as an idea for future planning. Regarding the new development, she knows there were concerns about school and the kids. She's not sure if everyone knows, but she points out that a new elementary school just opened. From what she's heard, it's already quite big. She doesn't know if they have portables out there, but that's what she's heard, though she says to take it with a grain of salt. Ms. Everett believes the schools are fine. When her son was in school last year, there were so many people that 3800 W, right by the school, was very difficult to get in and out of, especially when it came to parking. So again, she feels the schools are fine. With the new school in place, she's sure there's growth capacity for both schools. With kids coming in, she thinks they're fine. However, she does agree with having less housing. She acknowledges that farmers are going to sell their land, but she encourages keeping it small density.

Tyler Leavitt, Tremonton: Mr. Leavitt said he would like to take a few minutes to express his appreciation for the comments that have been presented thus far. However, he believes some clarification might need to be made to help put some minds at ease regarding the development being discussed at 3900 W and 300 N. In response to the comment about townhomes, he confirms that there is a proposal, but clarified that they are twin homes, not townhomes, and that they absolutely will have a yard. He also reminds everyone that the R-2 to R-4 zoning is a zone West Point City created recently, within the last couple of months, to support the effort of affordable housing in West Point, because there is a need for it. Mr. Leavitt agrees that traffic is a concern in the area. He shares that he used to live on 300 N in West Point and believes multiple factors contribute to the traffic problem, one being that cars park on 300 N even though they shouldn't, which forces kids to walk on the road. He says that is a concern. However, he adds that going from an R-2 to an R-4—from 36 to 47 units—amounts to 12 more homes. If each of those 12 homeowners owns two cars, that results in 24 more cars. In the grand scheme of things, he believes that 24 additional cars will not significantly impact the traffic that is already a problem, especially when they are talking about literally hundreds and thousands of cars passing through the area daily on 3830 W and 3650 W. Mr. Leavitt notes that the traffic is a regional problem; Syracuse, Clinton, and Hooper are all experiencing increased traffic. He reiterates that the development does not include townhomes, but twin homes, 20% of the development, and that every unit in the proposal includes a yard.

Lisa Rios, West Point (received as an email): I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to the proposed rezone of the property located at approximately 3900 W 300 N in West Point. I fully recognize the urgent need for more affordable and medium-density housing in Utah and support efforts to address this issue thoughtfully and responsibly. However, I do not believe this particular area is suitable for such development. Traffic congestion in this part of West Point is already

overwhelming, particularly along 3830 West and near 300 North, where recent developments — including medium-density housing on the opposite side of 300 North — have pushed local infrastructure to its limits. Adding 47 more new homes to this area would further strain our roads and negatively affect day-to-day life for current residents. While I am not personally concerned about potential impacts to property values, I am deeply concerned about quality of life. I've lived in West Point for 13 years and have seen firsthand how dramatically the city has changed. What once made this area feel like "West Point" — its openness, calm, and balance — is rapidly disappearing under the weight of unchecked growth. Please take these concerns into serious consideration when evaluating this proposal. I appreciate your service and the difficult decisions you are tasked with making.

Megan Wallace, West Point (received as an email): I cannot attend the meeting on Thursday the 26th so I am emailing you to share my concerns. I live on 3650 West. I love West Point and know that it is growing and adjustments need to be made. However, I am concerned with the negative potential impacts of rezoning the property to medium density. The traffic in my neighborhood is already congested with recreation and schooling events, especially with the new high-density development that recently occurred just to the West. West point is a beautiful area with a deep rural history. Allowing for multiply medium and high-density developments will take away from the overall appeal and property value of this area. Property development is important, but I hope new developments can reflect the rural feel that is so much a part of the West Point community by simply avoiding rezoning this area and future developments to both medium and high-density properties.

Jodi & Tami Johnson, West Point (received as an email): We are original homeowners on 3830 W and we are asking you not to rezone the property at 3900 W 300 N to medium density housing. We have seen several changes since buying our house in 2008. We lost our secluded backyard when the nature center was turned into a sports field and a parking lot. We have seen increased traffic on our road since it was connected to 3650 W and is now an access road for the park. We have seen a significant increase of traffic on 300 N with the construction of the town homes and the patio homes. We are not naive and realize that development of the farmland in West Point is going to happen. What we are asking for is balance. Please consider the quality of life of the residents that already live here before rezoning to medium density housing. We already have the higher density housing to the south of us with the townhomes and the patio homes. It would be nice to keep the continuity of our subdivision with homes that have bigger yards and are not right on top of each other. Adding as many houses as possible onto the property 3900 W will change the feel of the neighborhood and may negatively impact our home values, as there will be smaller homes not only to the south of us but now also to the west of us. It would be nice not to have increased traffic on our road, which at times is already congested with the elementary school, park, and higher density housing recently built to the south of us. Traffic will increase with 3830 W being the outlet road onto 300 N. We love West Point. We moved here for the small town and the slower pace of life. We love our house and the area around it. Change is a constant. We know things are always going to change but we would like to see the changes benefit both the current residents as well as the future residents of West Point.

DeAnn Ross, West Point (received as an email): I am writing to you as the daughter of Connie Lee, a long-time resident whose home is located directly adjacent to the property being considered for

rezoning behind her house, east of 3900 W and 300 North. She opposes any changes from the current R 2 zone. We understand that growth and development are part of a city's natural evolution. However, I want to express several serious concerns we have about the proposed rezoning and the addition of 47 new homes in this specific area. First and foremost, the anticipated increase in traffic poses a significant safety issue. The increased vehicle flow on 300 North and the corner of 4000 West will make it increasingly difficult and dangerous for her to pull out of her driveway. Visibility is already a challenge, and more cars will only make it worse. Given this projected congestion, we strongly urge the commission to consider the installation of a traffic light at the intersection of 300 North and 4000 West to mitigate potential safety hazards. Additionally, we are very concerned about the impact this development will have on my mother's limited financial resources. If a fence is required to separate her property from the new development, she should not incur any expense or cost associated with the new road like the Vinyl fence or sidewalk. It should not fall on her to absorb that cost or the maintenance thereof. She should not be responsible for maintaining the sidewalk or fence, that would impose an undue burden on her. We hope you will take these concerns seriously and carefully consider how the proposed changes will affect long-standing residents like my mother. We are not opposed to responsible growth, but it must be done thoughtfully and with consideration for the people who have lived in West Point for decades. Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Nancy Roginski, West Point (received as an email): I am unable to attend the meeting tonight, but I definitely wanted to add my opinions about this matter. Starting with the turning lane at 4000 West and 300 North... I live on that corner and am very aware of the traffic patterns and volume. A right-turn lane is total overkill for this intersection. There are not that many people that make a right turn at this intersection, except in the mornings and afternoons when school starts and ends. The committee responsible for suggesting this modification have told us that we would have to sell about 5-7 feet of our front yard, which would take out at least one pine tree on the corner, and another pine tree in the yard. The tree in our yard is at least 100 years old! The house itself was built in the early 1900's and I've been told it is the oldest masonry house in West Point. It really should be on the historic register, and if the City presses this turning lane plan, I may have to get it on the register due to its historic value. Then, I believe that the trees would be protected. There is also a huge London Plane tree in the front yard of the Fisher house that would need to be removed! With global warming affecting the summer temperatures in Utah, is this the right time to be removing large, historic trees? I am totally against giving up any part of my front yard and two mature trees so that we can have a turning lane that is not even necessary. I will not agree to this proposal or to selling part of my property to the City for this purpose. I guess the City would have to declare eminent domain and we would need to go to court on the matter. Which brings me to the second half of my concern. Mr. Leavitt's proposal to add *another* subdivision in the pasture north of our houses on 300 North and especially to ask for an egress road coming out onto 4000 West is unacceptable. This would create even more traffic around the intersection of 4000 West and 300 North, which the residents don't want. We already have people turning onto 4000 West, hitting the gas and roaring down the street at high speed. It is dangerous for our pets and for the children walking to and from school. Leavitt's request to change the zoning to allow higher density on the site is ridiculous. I moved to West Point in 1992 and I moved here for the rural quality of life. That is fast disappearing! Every month ground is broken for a new development somewhere near me, and the traffic in Clinton now reminds me of a lot of some intersections in Salt Lake City. The developers have successfully run off all of the farmers that were working here when we moved

in. The rural atmosphere has disappeared and dense development has been resisted at every Planning Commission meeting I have ever attended. *The residents don't want all this development*, the only people who do are those who seek to profit from dividing the land and putting as many homes as they can into every pasture remaining. Mr. Leavitt's proposal will greatly affect my property because there will be even more of an argument for the turning lane which will ransack my property. 47 new homes on that parcel of land is way too dense. If this kind of development continues in West Point, we are going to turn into the West Valley City of Davis County, complete with all the crime and traffic that comes with it. I strongly oppose both of these actions/proposals. Please attempt to retain the rural flavor of West Point by rejecting high-density development.

Jared Toney, West Point: Mr. Toney stated he agrees with much of what has been shared on the side of not creating more density in the homes. He feels there are certain ideas out in the world that are part of the broader conversation about where the country should go, and there are ideas, like the concept of the 15-minute city or getting people crammed in with all their necessities close in one area that seem to be gaining traction. He says it appears legislation or other pressures may be incentivizing movement in that direction. He believes that brings a lot of challenges. When people are piled closer together some of the benefits of having more land and space are lost. Mr. Toney says the question he has for West Point is what are the motivators for the city to become more condensed? Does West Point want to continue being an agricultural city? Because once it goes in this new direction, it's hard to come back. He notes that the motivators for saying yes to more density appear to be visible on the map—there are more streets that seem to lead to further developments on the west side, and it looks like that spread is going to continue. In his opinion, Mr. Toney states he likes the idea of keeping the city agricultural. Rather than condensing things inward, he believes in pushing outward.

Gary Price, West Point: Mr. Price states that he lives on 4000 W. He came to voice his opinion that he believes Mr. Leavitt has every right to build on his ground, but he and others do not agree with rezoning it to R-4. He points out that it is currently zoned R-2. His concern is that a lot of rezoning has already taken place. Across the street from the school, there are over 100 patio homes, along with many apartments that were originally supposed to be town homes but ended up being unaffordable for most people. As a result, he notes, a good share of those units have turned into rentals. He understands the need for housing, he has 15 grandkids who live in West Point, so he sees the value in more affordable housing, but he also believes that too much of it can ruin a community. He adds that not only is Mr. Leavitt's ground proposed for that level of density, but there's also a large piece of land to the west. If that parcel goes into development, a decision to rezone Mr. Leavitt's property to R-4 would make it much easier for someone to argue for R-4 zoning there as well. Instead of 47 homes, they could be looking at 120 homes in a few years.

Mr. Price mentions that there is already a large development going in behind Smith's Food King, sponsored by the LDS Church. It's not built yet, but it will be, and when it is, there will be thousands of town homes. He says West Point is a wonderful place to live. He has lived in West Point for 23 years and loves it, but he believes Mr. Leavitt's proposal is not a good thing for the community. He emphasizes that Mr. Leavitt is a good friend of his, and he's not opposed to him developing his ground, he has every right to do what the city decides he can do. However, Mr. Price says he believes he speaks for a lot of people. He's surprised there aren't more residents present. He spoke to many and doesn't know why they were not there voicing their opinions.

Lisa Schofield, West Point: Mrs. Schofield stated she has grown up in West Point for most of her life, all but maybe 13 years. She says she just wants to express that she believes every city needs balance. She remembers when they were putting in the new junior high, her parents who lived nearby and still live in West Point, were a little worried because of all the traffic, and it does increase traffic significantly. But because of the home sizes at the time, she felt like it was okay and manageable. She now lives on 3830 W, and she shares that at certain times in the morning and at night, you cannot go anywhere. She and her kids, or anyone else, just can't get up and down the road. She explains that her family moved in 18 years ago and was told there would be development behind them. They understood that, and they were okay with it. But they do not agree with the change in zoning. She acknowledges that progress is inevitable, but says she doesn't think it's right to start out a whole development with the concept of it being a certain way and then after people have lived there for so long say, "Oh, sorry, we're going to change it." She questions why it's zoned that way in the first place if it's not going to stay that way.

6. Conditional use permit for a 1,920 square foot accessory building on property located at 673 N 2300 W; Doug Laub, applicant

Doug Laub is requesting a conditional use permit to construct a 1,920-square-foot accessory building on his property located at 673 North 2300 West. The property measures 1.53 acres (66,812 square feet). According to West Point City Code 17.70.030(A)(5), all accessory buildings exceeding 1,500 square feet—regardless of lot size—require a conditional use permit.

This application was first reviewed by the Planning Commission on June 12, 2025. During the meeting, questions arose regarding the required setback for the proposed accessory building. The site plan submitted by the applicant showed an 8-foot setback, while the staff report referenced a 5-foot setback. The applicant clarified that they were requesting the 5-foot setback. Due to the inconsistency and lack of clarity about the correct setback, the Commission voted to table the item to allow staff and the applicant time to resolve the issue and confirm the applicable setback requirements. The applicant and staff have met to clarify the request. The existing carport will be removed and the request is to have a 5' side yard setback and a 17' rear setback as shown in the revised plans. He does meet all the requirements found in West Point City Code.

This item was discussed during the work session and there were no questions. Commissioner Roubinet stated his appreciation to Mr. Laub for waiting two weeks while the correct setback was determined.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to approve the conditional use request for Doug Laub to construct a 1,920 square foot accessory building on his property located at 673 N 2300 W as presented. Commissioner King seconded the motion. All voted aye.

7. Discussion and consideration for a preliminary plat for 72 lots known as Neilson Crossing located at 12 N 2000 W; Rick Scadden, applicant

Rick Scadden, representing Neilsen Crossing, LLC, has submitted a preliminary plat application for a subdivision called Neilsen Crossing located at approximately 12 N 2000 W. The subject property

consists of 13.61 acres of land was recently rezoned to R-4 residential by the City Council on May 6, 2025. The applicant is seeking the necessary approval from the Planning Commission to proceed with their development. The approval of the preliminary plat is an administrative decision and is subject to all the requirements found in the West Point City Code. It is to be noted that with recent changes to the subdivision code all final plans will be approved by staff to determine if all the requirements have been met.

The Neilsen Crossing Subdivision consists of 72 single family building lots on 13.61 acres of ground. The preliminary plat that has been submitted is consistent with the plans that have been reviewed by both the Planning Commission and City Council. A complete conceptual including elevations and development CC&R's were approved with the adopted rezone. The preliminary plat does require a few more details and approval letters before approval can be granted. Both engineering and planning reviews have been completed, with favorable recommendations. The following analysis, summarized in the table below, compares the proposed development to applicable zoning standards and requirements.

Standard – R-4 Residential	Required	Proposed
Maximum Density (units per acre)	6	5.29
Minimum Density (units per acre)	3.7	5.29
Maximum number of lots	≤ 82	72
Minimum lot size (square feet)	≤ 5,000	5,008
A dedicated landscape strip required	N/A	No
Landscape buffering required	No	No

This subdivision also to be noted has commercial lots on 2000 W that will be coming sometime in the future for site plan. UDOT has reviewed this and has approved the access point on 2000 W as well as North Davis Fire District has reviewed and approved.

Concerns were raised regarding the Neilson Crossing development, focusing on detention pond maintenance, site access, and drainage. Commissioner Roubinet asked who would be responsible for maintaining the detention ponds and what was planned for the corner of 1900 W and 125 S. Rick Scadden, speaking on behalf of the developer, explained that the ponds would be located at the rear of certain lots, which were made deeper for that purpose. Instead of forming an HOA, the developers planned to deed the pond areas to individual homeowners. This would allow homeowners to landscape the area as they wished but would also make them responsible for maintaining the detention ponds.

Commissioner King then inquired about a backlot near Big-O Tires, expressing concern about access, traffic, and drainage. Mr. Scadden responded that under an agreement with UDOT, Big-O would retain right-in/right-out access via a new median on 2000 W. He added that the developer would install fencing, curb, and gutter to ensure clear separation between the commercial and residential areas. The access to Big-O's property would be shifted slightly east near a future commercial zone, keeping traffic from passing through the new subdivision. Commissioner Roubinet expressed support for excluding access from 125 S, which he and others had opposed previously.

Commissioner King followed up with a question about how stormwater from the new street would be handled. Troy Moyes responded that, although he did not have final plans on hand, drainage would flow toward the detention ponds. A catch basin was expected to be located at the end of the stub street to intercept runoff and prevent it from spilling onto neighboring properties.

Lastly, Commissioner Taylor asked whether homeowners could modify or remove the detention ponds in the future. Troy Moyes clarified that once the final plat is recorded, a drainage easement would be in place, legally prohibiting homeowners from altering or filling in the ponds. He compared the setup to a park strip - part of the homeowner's yard but subject to city regulations and ongoing maintenance requirements.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to approve the preliminary plat for the Neilsen Crossing Subdivision located at approximately 12 N 2000 W. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion. All voted aye.

8. Discussion and consideration of a site plan for an Ogden Clinic to be located at 2945 W 125 S; Pascal Meyer, applicant

Pascal Meyer from Carpenter Stringham Architects, representing Ogden Clinic, is seeking site plan approval for a new medical building on Lot 2 of the Ogden Clinic Subdivision, located at 2945 W 125 S. Lot 2 is 1.27 acres and is situated east of the existing Ogden Clinic building. The proposal includes the construction of a 15,000-square-foot building intended to expand the services currently offered in the existing facility. Because the proposed building's use falls within the "Professional Office, Business Medical/Dental/Optical Office/Clinics and Laboratories" as identified in the code, this request will also require a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Commission.

This item was discussed with the Planning Commission during their April 24, 2025, work session. The primary purpose of this request is to allow the Planning Commission to review the proposal for compliance with applicable site development standards.

Site Plan and CUP applications are administrative decisions. In administrative matters, the Planning Commission and City Council must review the application for compliance with the standards and requirements outlined in the West Point City Code. The site plan requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission before a final decision can be made by the City Council. The conditional use receives final approval from the Planning Commission and does not go to the City Council.

The site plan was reviewed for compliance with city standards, including landscaping, buffer yards, architecture, lighting, windows, and parking. The project meets requirements for parking based on building size and staff. A landscape buffer with trees, shrubs, and a vinyl fence is included along the residential edge, as required. Lighting is downward-directed and within acceptable limits. Architectural standards, including building design and materials, match the existing Ogden Clinic and meet city code.

Commissioner King asked how many doctors would be in the new Ogden Clinic building. Pascal Meyer, representing the clinic, said there would be five types of providers: Physical therapy, ENT,

spine and pain management, orthopedics, and X-ray, with up to 2–3 doctors per specialty, totaling around 12–15 providers. Commissioner Roubinet asked how this compares to the existing clinic and Mr. Meyer explained that most services would be new, as physical therapy is relocating, family medicine will expand, and the pharmacy will stay.

There will be no emergency or after-hours care, only regular business hours. Commissioners expressed support, noting the benefits of added services in an accessible location. Mr. Meyer also mentioned they attempted to contact nearby townhome residents regarding the conditional use permit, reaching only one. Troy Moyes confirmed that making the attempt is sufficient.

Commissioner Turner motioned to approve the site plan request for Lot 2 of the Ogden Clinic Subdivision located at 2945 W 125 S and forward this item to City Council for consideration. Commissioner King seconded the motion. All voted aye.

9. Conditional use permit for a medical office for an Ogden Clinic to be located at 2945 W 125 S; Pascal Meyer, applicant

The West Point City Code outlines the allowable uses in the Table of Land Use Regulation (17.60.050(B)). These uses are categorized as permitted (P), administrative conditional use (AC), or Planning Commission conditional use (PC). The applicant has requested a conditional use permit for the use of "Professional Office, Business Medical/Dental/Optical Office/Clinics and Laboratories " which is identified as a PC in the regulation table. Conditional uses aim to reduce the anticipated negative effects of a particular use, rather than eliminating them completely. The Planning Commission's role is to mitigate any anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use or site plan by imposing reasonable conditions as outlined in 17.40 of the West Point City Code. The detrimental effects include traffic and street modifications, utility system strain, pedestrian and bicyclist safety concerns, noise and odors, contamination and hazards, lighting conflicts, site and building design issues, emergency access challenges, loss of open space, maintenance issues, and excessive stormwater generation.

The Planning Commission and staff reviewed the detrimental effects and found none requiring conditions to be set. The Commission had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Turner motioned to approve the conditional use request for Ogden Clinic to operate a medical clinic out of their building located at 2945 W 125 S, with no conditions. Commissioner King seconded the motion. All voted aye.

10. Discussion and consideration to rezone 13.14 acres located at 3900 W 300 N from R-2 to R-4 (6 units per acre); Matt Leavitt, applicant (Public hearing was held June 12, 2025)

Matt Leavitt has applied to rezone 13.14 acres of land located at approximately 3900 W 300 N from R-2 residential (up to 2.7 units/acre) to R-4 medium density residential (up to 6 units/acre). During the review process of the General Plan map, the applicant petitioned the City Council to consider identifying this property as future R-4 residential, "referencing surrounding land use patterns and the need for diverse housing options." The City Council supported this request and designated the

property as future R-4 residential on the General Plan Map. Following the adoption of the General Plan in December 2024, the applicant has applied to rezone the property to the R-4 zone.

The Planning Commission discussed this proposal during their meeting on March 27, 2025, April 10, 2025, and May 22, 2025. A public hearing was held on June 12, 2025 in accordance with West Point City Code.

Rezoning requests are legislative decisions, granting the Planning Commission and City Council discretion to determine if a zoning change serves the community's overall welfare. Rezoning must support the goals of the City's General Plan. This plan outlines the long-term vision for development in West Point and serves as the standard for evaluating proposed zoning changes.

Utah State code mandates public hearings on zoning changes, ensuring transparency and public participation. The public hearing must be held by the Planning Commission before the City Council's final decision, and the Planning Commission is required to provide a recommendation. This recommendation may include approval, denial, or tabling for further discussion. City Council will hold another hearing, but notices will not be mailed out.

At the public hearing held during the last meeting, overall concerns from the community focused on increased traffic on 300 N and within the West View Park Subdivision, the inadequate width of Street "A" for expected traffic, the number of dwellings seeming high compared to nearby developments, and the loss of agricultural character due to smaller lots. If the Planning Commission recommends approval, they would also need to recommend a development agreement due to the density being below the minimum required.

Regarding 300 N, the city's transportation master plan showed the road currently handling about 4,800 trips per day, under its 11,000-trip capacity. Traffic peaks occurred during school hours, and projections estimated around 8,000 trips per day by 2050, considering regional growth. It was noted that the street is scheduled for widening within two years. The upgrade would include a center turn lane, two travel lanes, and a wide sidewalk with a park strip. The planned street expansion would not eliminate congestion, but it is expected to improve traffic flow with added turn lanes and fewer conflict points. Street "A" was designed as a local street with a 60-foot right of way, meeting city minimums but not intended as a collector or arterial.

The R-4 zone allows twin homes up to 20%, but Mr. Leavitt is requesting 21%, citing difficulty splitting twin homes. The Planning Commission had previously expressed concern about exceeding the 20% limit, but the applicant wished to proceed with 21%. At the last meeting, there was a discussion about twin homes facing 300 N. Although city code generally prohibits homes from facing minor collectors or arterials, the Planning Commission can grant exceptions.

Troy Moyes stated the existing homes east of the elementary school were zoned R-3, allowing up to 3.6 units per acre, but currently built at about 3.1 units per acre. The proposed development at 3.6 units per acre represented a slight increase; rezoning to R-3 instead of R-4 would reduce the number of lots by six.

R-4 Zone (13.14 acres)		
Standard	Required	Proposed
Minimum Density	3.7 units/acre	3.6 units/acre
Minimum #Lots	49	47
Maximum Density	Up to 6 units/acre	3.6 units/acre
Minimum Lot size	5,000 sq/ft	5,280 sq/ft
Conceptual Plan	Yes	Provided
Landscape Plan – That includes One 2-inch caliper tree per dwelling	Yes	Not provided
Draft CC&R with owner- occupancy requirements	Yes	Yes
Elevations	Yes	Provided; See below
Perimeter fence	Yes	Not Shown
Any required detention areas shall be landscaped	Yes	Unknown
Twin Homes max	20% (9 units)	21% (10 units)

Troy Moyes stated in regards to an emailed question about a property owner installing vinyl fencing, the applicant/developer would be responsible to install the fencing and sidewalk on street "A". In regards to who would shovel the sidewalk, that would fall to the property owner as that is the standard practice and there is no HOA in this development.

Commissioner Farnsworth expressed both pros and cons regarding the proposed rezoning. She recalled that the Planning Commission had been deliberate in assigning R-1 zoning in the General Plan and was concerned that approving this request would disrupt the intentional pattern of gradually decreasing density. She noted that once a zoning change occurs, it can set a precedent that spreads to other developments. While she acknowledged the proposal's benefits, specifically that the twin homes would be owner-occupied for at least 10 years and could provide safer pedestrian access to the school, she remained concerned about its long-term effects. Commissioner Farnsworth emphasized that this area lacked the major road access seen in other recent developments and warned that more dense housing in this location could lead to a more transient population over time, ultimately altering the community's feel. She felt that the city had already thoughtfully planned higher density on the east side of West Point, transitioning outward to larger lots to serve residents in all stages of life. In her view, the only advantage of the rezone, owner occupancy, could also be achieved within the existing R-2 zone. Commissioner Farnsworth stated she did not see the rezone as beneficial to the community and could not support it.

Commissioner Taylor agreed with Commissioner Farnsworth's remarks and emphasized the value of public input in determining how developments align with the community. He noted that when the Commission approved Neilson Crossing, which included over 70 homes, there was minimal public concern, just one comment about a fence. In contrast, the current proposal had prompted significant feedback, much of it critical. He expressed concern that approving this rezone could set a precedent for further development to the west, such as if the Thurgood property were sold, potentially adding another 47 or more homes and increasing congestion in the area.

Commissioner King shared that he agreed with many of the pros and cons listed by Commissioner Farnsworth and emphasized the importance of framing the issue accurately. He pointed out that the development would add homes regardless—either 36 or 47—so the real question was whether adding 11 additional homes was appropriate, not 47. He cautioned against overstating the impact by misrepresenting the numbers. He also raised a question about whether the subdivision could have an outlet road through lots 42 and 43 instead of accessing directly onto 300 N. Commissioner Roubinet and Commissioner Turner both recalled the topic being briefly discussed previously but not in depth.

Commissioner King further noted that since the city now owns 300 N and plans to widen it, adding a new access point could potentially reduce congestion, redirect traffic flow, and resolve some concerns about the twin homes. He asked whether adding a new road in that location was possible or allowed under city regulations. In response, Bryn MacDonald explained that there are specific regulations regarding road spacing, similar to those used by UDOT. She expressed doubt that a road could fit in that location due to proximity to 3850 W and suggested it would likely violate those spacing requirements. She said further consultation with the city engineer, Boyd Davis, would be needed to confirm.

Commissioner Farnsworth asked if an R-2 zone would allow for the full 31 homes given road requirements and single access limits. Commissioner Roubinet and Troy Moyes responded that due to the narrow, irregular shape of the property, it's unlikely they could reach that density.

Commissioner Turner asked Tyler Leavitt, applicant, if he would consider making the east lots in the proposed development single-story homes to help preserve privacy for existing neighbors. Mr. Leavitt acknowledged the consideration but explained that limiting the east side to only ramblers could significantly impact the development's financial viability and home sales. He noted that affordability is often misunderstood as low quality and emphasized that the homes planned are high quality despite being within attainable price ranges for Utah families. Mr. Leavitt stated that both rambler and two-story homes were being considered, and while committing to single-story only on the east side would be difficult, he was open to further discussions. He also responded to earlier commission comments about reducing the number of twin homes from ten to nine, saying he was willing to consider it, especially given that the proposed development already falls under the R-4 zone's minimum density.

Commissioner Turner clarified that his question was meant to explore options for compatibility and compromise, not to demand a commitment. He expressed concern about privacy loss for current residents on 3830 W if two-story homes were built directly behind them. Mr. Leavitt replied that he was exploring building slab-on-grade two-story homes without basements, which would likely keep

their overall height in line, or even lower, than neighboring homes with basements. He emphasized that while he couldn't make definitive commitments, these considerations could be entertained.

Commissioner Turner expressed appreciation for the public's input and emphasized the value of hearing differing opinions. He reflected on the subjective nature of traffic concerns, noting that what feels like excessive traffic to one person may seem reasonable to another. Sharing a personal example, he described how traffic near his own neighborhood increased significantly after the West Davis Corridor opened, something he has had to adjust to like many residents in growing communities. He acknowledged that part of the Commission's role is managing growth and navigating complex questions like what "slow growth" really means. He pointed out the difficulty of determining who can and cannot build, as every development request requires a balance between property rights and city planning goals. Commissioner Turner noted that the applicant had stayed within the city's code and was even proposing less density than required, although that didn't necessarily make the proposal right or wrong in the eyes of everyone. He commented that the issue had taken on a moral or ethical tone, which made the Commission's job even harder.

Referencing Commissioner Farnsworth's work on the General Plan committee, Commissioner Turner explained that a lot of time and research had gone into developing the plan, including traffic and impact studies. Though the plan was later petitioned for change, Commissioner Turner admitted he was still undecided. Ultimately, he stated that the Planning Commission's responsibility was to determine whether a proposal met code and supported the goals of the city's General Plan—and in this case, it did. Bryn MacDonald reminded the Commission that the General Plan is not solely about zoning map colors but includes broader goals. She emphasized that zoning decisions are ultimately legislative, allowing the Commission discretion in their determinations.

Commissioner Turner, while expressing respect for the Leavitt family, stated that the proposed rezone did not align with the intent of the surrounding area or the existing neighborhood character. Commissioner Farnsworth added that the proposed General Plan change was introduced by the applicant at the last minute, after Planning Commission discussions and public comment had taken place. She noted the same situation occurred at City Council, leaving little opportunity for residents to weigh in on the specific change. If the project were to be approved, she recommended reducing the number of twin homes to comply with code and suggested replacing one of the proposed twin homes on 300 N with a single-family home to avoid potential neighbor conflict due to a shared U-shaped driveway.

Commissioner Turner referred to the guideline that zoning changes should serve the community's overall welfare. While he acknowledged arguments in favor like increased affordability for future generations, he agreed with Commissioner Farnsworth that such justifications had become common in recent proposals and were not unique. He noted that despite the push for higher density, many residents were actively seeking larger lots to preserve the area's rural character. Commissioner Turner concluded by reiterating that the city had already designated appropriate areas for R-4 zoning, typically in high-access collector road areas, and this parcel appeared to have been added at the last minute, outside of that original planning intent. He also pointed out that while 300 N was once considered for a major collector, it no longer seemed to hold that role as development along SR-193 progressed.

Commissioner Roubinet expressed mixed feelings about the proposal. He stated he wasn't particularly concerned about the overall density, since 3.6 units per acre aligns more with an R-3 zone, but did express concern about rezoning to R-4, particularly because it could set a precedent for future R-4 requests in the area. He acknowledged that the only element separating the project from an R-3 zone was the inclusion of twin homes, which aren't permitted in R-3. While he appreciated that the twin homes would be owner-occupied and could help with affordability, he strongly opposed the shared U-shaped driveway design for the two twin homes fronting 300 N, believing it would cause neighbor conflict. He firmly stated that the development should be limited to 8 twin homes to stay within the 20% cap and noted that City Council had previously denied projects exceeding that threshold.

Commissioner Roubinet added that if the proposal had been for an R-3 zone without twin homes, it might have been easier to support. He didn't view the lower density of 3.6 as a concession, believing the applicant had deliberately proposed the minimum R-4 density to gain approval for twin homes. He reiterated that his strongest concern was the configuration of the twin homes on 300 N and stated his preference that those be replaced with a single-family home to avoid potential conflict.

Commissioner Turner reiterated his opposition to the rezone, stating that even though the proposal aligned with the General Map, it did not meet the overall welfare of the surrounding neighborhood. He echoed earlier comments that making the eastern homes single-story could help mitigate the impact on existing residents, particularly those in nearby single-level homes on 3830 W. Commissioner Taylor asked whether the homes on 3830 W were two stories, and it was clarified they were all ramblers.

Commissioner King acknowledged Commissioner Turner's efforts to explore compromise, noting that regardless of the final unit count, homes would be built on the property. He agreed with the suggestion that the twin home fronting 300 N should be converted to a single-family home, which would reduce the twin home percentage to within the allowable 20%. Commissioner King also supported Commissioner Farnsworth's earlier comment that the location allowed students to walk to school, potentially reducing traffic impacts. He emphasized that the number of homes was less of a concern for him than the placement of twin homes on 300 N.

Commissioner Farnsworth questioned the true affordability of the proposed twin homes, asking whether their pricing would significantly differ from larger single-family homes in the area. Mr. Leavitt responded that while twin homes were more expensive to build than ramblers, the cost per unit would still be lower, providing some level of affordability. He referenced previous City Council discussions that estimated a cost savings of \$75,000 to \$100,000 by eliminating one exterior wall, though he admitted he couldn't provide exact figures.

Commissioner King motioned to recommend approval of the rezoning request for 13.14 acres of property located approximately 3900 W 300 N from R-2 residential to R-4 residential with a development agreement that would include a variation from the code to reduce the minimum density from 3.7 units per acre to 3.6 units per acre and to change the twin house to a single family dwelling on 300 N, lot 42 and 43 which would reduce the overall units in the development by one and forward this item to the City Council. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion.

Commissioner King modified the motion of the minimum density to go from 3.7 units per acre to 3.5 units per acre due to the change of the twin home to single family. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the modified motion.

Roll call:

Commissioner Farnsworth – No

Commissioner Turner – No

Commissioner Taylor – No

Commissioner King – Aye

Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

The motion failed 3:2.

Commissioner Turner stated that while he appreciated the efforts made by the Leavitt's in designing the project within R-4 standards, he ultimately felt the proposal did not fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood. He acknowledged the importance of public input and noted that nearby residents clearly felt the same. Although he respected the design and intent behind the project, his vote against it was based on consistency with the area and overall community fit.

Commissioner Farnsworth emphasized that while the R-4 zone provided flexibility, similar flexibility could be achieved through an R-2 PRUD or other tools without needing a full rezone. She stressed that the Planning Commission's responsibility was to balance the interests of current property owners with future needs, including preserving city resources like water and infrastructure. She expressed concern that overdevelopment now could limit options for responsible growth in the future. Commissioner Farnsworth also argued that while affordable housing was important, not everyone could or should expect to live in their ideal location immediately. She emphasized the importance of protecting the expectations of residents who had saved and worked for larger lots in lower-density areas, in accordance with the city's General Plan, which was designed to allow density in central areas and gradually taper outward.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to recommend denial of the rezone request of 13.14 acres of the property located at approximately 3900 W 300 N from R-2 residential to R-4 residential due to the possible negative impacts that this development could have on the community. The Planning Commission is supposed to preserve the Community's overall welfare. This proposal does not fit in as we've heard from the community with their positive welfare and it does not fit in the original General Plan concepts that were submitted and I think there could be reasonable accommodations made for this property owner without rezoning and forward this recommendation to City Council. Commissioner King seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Commissioner King – Aye

Commissioner Taylor – Aye

Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye

Commissioner Turner – Aye

Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

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

11. Discussion and consideration for a development agreement for property located at 3900 W 300 N; Matt Leavitt, applicant (Public hearing was held June 12, 2025)

Commissioner Turner motioned to recommend denial of the development agreement for 13.14 acres of property located at approximately 3900 W 300 N. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Commissioner Turner – Aye

Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye

Commissioner King – Aye

Commissioner Taylor – Aye

Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

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

Commissioner Turner expressed appreciation for the residents' involvement, but emphasized that their voices were needed much earlier in the process. He noted that the General Plan update included multiple opportunities for public input, including an open house, posters, and interactive maps, yet few participated at the time. He acknowledged the difficulty of denying a proposal after the applicant had followed the process and received preliminary support based on Council direction. Commissioner Turner encouraged the community to stay engaged, attend meetings, and take part in shaping the city's future, noting that early involvement strengthens trust and helps leaders better represent the needs of the community.

Commissioner Roubinet encouraged residents to stay informed and involved by signing up for email notifications and attending meetings regularly. He suggested that even having one community member attend every few months and report back would make a difference. He reminded residents that all meetings are recorded, and minutes are available online for those who can't attend. He emphasized that while the Planning Commission values public input, their decisions are based on established criteria, not just public opposition. He also urged residents to communicate directly with City Council members, noting they are elected officials who read and consider public feedback. Ultimately, he stressed that engagement, even if time-consuming, is crucial to shaping community decisions.

12. Staff Update

At the last City Council meeting on June 17, they approved the Bastian PRUD, Rojo Rose rezone, and the small area plans. At the July 1st meeting they will continue discussing the new PRUD code and the new landscaping code.

Coming soon to Planning Commission will be a preliminary plat for Bastian PRUD and a discussion on the sign code. Big-O Tires is looking to open July 7.

13. Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner Taylor agreed with Commissioner Roubinet's earlier comment about being involved. He stated it really matters to help everyone see all sides.

Commissioner King agreed with Commissioner Taylor, acknowledging the difficulty of the process and emphasizing that the Planning Commission carefully considers all aspects of each decision. He expressed frustration with misconceptions shared on social media suggesting the Commission forces opinions onto others, noting that their work involves balancing complex and often conflicting factors. He thanked those in attendance, including those who had already left, for being engaged and involved in the process.

Commissioner Farnsworth expressed appreciation for her fellow commissioners, noting that despite differing opinions, the group engaged in respectful and productive discussions. She also thanked the residents for their comments, emphasizing that public input helps inform better decisions. She encouraged the community to be active in local elections, reminding them that mayoral and council positions are influential and that voting truly matters. Commissioner Farnsworth urged residents to research candidates, engage neighbors, and increase voter turnout, stating that involvement can directly impact the direction of their community. She concluded by thanking city staff for their support throughout the process.

Commissioner Turner referenced his comment made earlier as his closing comments.

Commissioner Roubinet expressed appreciation for Commissioner Farnsworth's reminder about the importance of elections. He emphasized that voting is the most powerful way for residents to influence city decisions and encouraged everyone to research candidates thoroughly. He shared that he often emails candidates to gauge their responsiveness, noting that those who don't reply likely won't get his vote. Commissioner Roubinet also praised the respectful tone of the meeting, commending the public for their thoughtful, civil comments and the commission for handling disagreements maturely.

14. Adjournment

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:32 pm. Commissioner Turner seconded the motion. All voted aye.



Chairperson – PJ Roubinet



Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen