

---

**Fw: Old Farm Proposed Development**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Libby Hansen <libby@libbyhansen.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:52:14 PM

**To:** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** Old Farm Proposed Development

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am opposed to the current proposed development plan for the Old Farm Development. I do not believe this proposal is the highest and best use of the land!

There is a rush to approve this I I sincerely ask that you step back, listen to the citizens of Farmington and consider further investigation.

Please do not approve this development as proposed at this time.

Sincerely

Libby Hansen

The Adams Company

801 201-6570 [libby@libbyhansen.com](mailto:libby@libbyhansen.com) Sent from Gmail Mobile

---

**Fw: Brickmoor Residential Project**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

---

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Linda Hoffman <lindacall.hoffman@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:30:47 PM

**To:** Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** Brickmoor Residential Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councilmembers,

Thank you for the opportunity to share ideas and concerns regarding the Brickmoor Residential Project. Please consider the following:

- 1) Increased focus on the safety issues raised by Mr. Andrew Gemperline concerning the North entrance of the development. His points are based on expertise, experience, and legal perspectives.
- 2) Again, I would like to ask you to consider including some housing for the fastest growing population in the USA: seniors desiring to size down. Many of us are very active and not yet ready for the many assisted care centers in the city. Single-story patio homes or duplexes could fit nicely into this plan, increasing the opportunity for older adults to continue living near friends, children, and grandchildren.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Linda C. Hoffman  
1766 Campden CT  
Farmington, UT 84025



---

**Fw: Our Requests of the Brookmoor (Old Farm) Project**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

---

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Derek Snow <derek-snow@leavitt.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:30:00 PM

**To:** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>

**Cc:** Jaci Snow <jaci.cummings5@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Our Requests of the Brookmoor (Old Farm) Project

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and City Council,

We remain very concerned about this project and the lack of several components being nailed down IN the agreement as we read it. We ask that you:

1. **Include specific details in the agreement such that nothing of consequence is left to further negotiations or discussions between the developer and City—and even that the developer can unilaterally decide what best suits them,** including: altering parking spaces/capacity, ingress/egress requirements, community spaces, dealing with the water/stream, eliminating and/or modifying the mitigation requirements for dealing with the water that could cause flooding of homes/basements in the area, etc. There is so much that should be included in detail. The developer should appreciate this so they are clear as to expectations and protection of their reputation (this project will assuredly impact their reputation with everyone in our area). This protects the City Council from accusations it isn't operating in good faith. And lastly, it would ensure the developer can be held accountable.
2. It's obvious this project will have a negative effect on those of us living in this area. **Please require a traffic impact study that clearly includes all relevant safety issues.** Adding another traffic light within that tiny distance would be a nightmare for all of us who have to travel through this multiple times each day. The obvious probability of greatly decreased safety when pedestrians are present and drivers are aggravated clearly demands such a study—as does any proposed solution. While traffic lights are solutions to some traffic problems, adding a fourth signal within such a small distance is no solution: it's a cop out. You've received an offer from an experienced traffic engineer to work pro bono to conduct this exact study; please engage him and see that this is done. There is no excuse for pushing forward without doing so given the potential legal liability we would be incurring as a city.

Thank you again for your willingness to serve us and the entire Farmington community. We are truly grateful for your service and sacrifice.

Sincerely,

Derek and Jaci Snow  
1890 Kensington St.  
Farmington, UT 84025



---

**Fw: Concerned Old Farm Resident - Still tracking Brickmoor**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** karl farbman <aaronofthepigeons@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 4:49:29 PM

**To:** Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** Concerned Old Farm Resident - Still tracking Brickmoor

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello all,

I just want to express my continued interest and concern for this project. I have not forgotten and continue to have serious doubts and concerns.

Will be attending tonight's council meeting.

Aaron Silver





---

**Fw: Brickmoor Concerns**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

---

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Jake McIntire <jakealexmccintire@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 4:40:44 PM

**To:** Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** Brickmoor Concerns

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a resident of an adjacent neighborhood I have the following concerns about the Brikmoor Development being considered.

- Ideally, I believe this land should be preserved as open space in protection of the wetlands and agricultural character of the property. Sale of this land from the City to a land trust to protect the land and character is a very feasible option.
- A resident asked at a recent meeting for budget justification of the fire station being built on the west side of the City that is being used as the reason for selling this land. I have been following this process and have not seen justification for the exceptionally high construction cost compared to similar projects in the region. It appears there are ample opportunities to streamline this budget and simplify the proposed design to reduce the pressure to sell the Old Farm property.
- If the City decides development of this land is absolutely necessary and in keeping with the community's vision, there are many options for development that would be in better keeping with the agricultural and multi-generational spirit of Farmington. I have previously shared concepts in public meetings and via email for the development of a multi-generational "agrihood" that prioritizes the historical, environmental, and local context of this site. There are many creative options to develop this land that are more appropriate for and reflective of our community. The proposed development is generic and continues to degrade our community character. I am happy to share more about these possibilities.
- A primary component of the proposed development in conversations with community stakeholders was the inclusion of a public park/open space on the UDOT land. This is one of Farmington's only sledding hills and is a highly used public asset. This concept has been removed from the proposed



development without clear communication to the community. Protection and improvement of this land should absolutely be required as a condition of the development

- In a previous council meeting City Council members communicated that affordability is a major concern and that this development helps with that priority. Allowing “supporting and enhancing the historic home/bakery” to count as qualification to meet additional moderate income housing requirements should not be allowed. These are two separate priorities – both important but they should not be blended. The developer should not be allowed to avoid moderate income housing requirements beyond the 9 being offered – if they cannot do this, there are other developers in our state who can.
- I do not believe public safety in terms of traffic and active transportation (bike, pedestrian, etc) has been appropriately considered or addressed.
- I do not see appropriate reflection of the community benefits or conditions made by the City/developer to the community are reflected in the Development Agreement. These items seem to be expected in good faith but are not included in the Agreement which gives me little faith in them being realized. The removal of the park is a perfect example of how this development has already been watered down from what was sold to local stakeholders. I have confidence that the developer will continue to dilute the concept and further pad their profits. I worry specifically about the following: community amenities, open spaces, the historic stream, connection to the historic home/bakery, and density. These things would all be easily adjusted or removed as the phases progress and economic realities set in.
- I do not believe this development is being built in the best long-term interest of our community. Long term vision and investment in authenticity are what make communities special. This development does not do that. I worry this development will be in conditions of blight in 20 years. As community members and stakeholders it is not only our responsibility to think about what is best for today but to think about what is best for future generations. I fear we are creating long-term unintended (but foreseeable) consequences to solve an immediate need when there are alternative solutions to solve that need that do not require long term costs of the same scale.



---

**Fw: Main St Development**

---

**From** Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Date** Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

**To** DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** sheri sheri <s.sherisheri@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2025 3:52:29 PM

**To:** Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** Main St Development

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Farmington Mayor Anderson & Farmington Council:

Regarding : Main St Development

As a resident of Somerset Farms for 35 years I have watched the development of Old Farm & Zions Bank. And I've attended the Council meetings regarding the Boyer acquisition of the Main Street Property.

Our neighbors have repeatedly stood before you as representatives for all of us, and have respectfully pleaded with the Council to listen to our concerns. We have consistently raised our hands in support of the verbal shared comments at each meeting (as Council requested, instead of clapping).

Please, please make sure our concerns are specifically defined in the Development Agreement so that Boyer cannot alter or delete or modify all the items that we have been repeatedly pleading for:

- keeping community spaces,
- keeping the historic stream,
- don't let Boyer discard mitigations for water (allowing for flooded foundations),
- Don't let Boyer install choked parking,



- Don't allow them to put in an unconscionably tiny two lane north entrance
- Don't let Boyer claim financial need to alter unit number or unit size/style.

---

Traffic Concerns:

We've submitted to The City Council the extensive traffic impact studies & warnings of EXTREME Congestion & Traffic overload that this new development will add to the narrow Main St lanes in North Farmington.

We are begging for **"a right in and right out of that intersection and that in particular would take care of a good 90% of the safety problem"** without a need for a signal so close to an intersection.

We don't want any children or lives taken.

---

Water Concerns:

This area has always been a water catch basin. Long term residents have memories of kids playing in this area with their water 'toys' after rain downpours. This area has always been a year round catch basin.

We don't want the current financial stability of Our Farmington City to become bankrupt by future lawsuits regarding flooding.

---

Again, we plead with you to add these specific items to the Development Agreement (before it's signed) so that Boyer cannot alter, change, delete, modify the items that we have consistently brought to you as our utmost concerns.

Respectfully,  
Sheri Evarts  
1735 N Hampton CT  
Farmington  
801-898-7613  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Patricia Andersen <patricia.a.andersen@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, September 15, 2025 12:12:05 PM

**To:** Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>;

Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>;

Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

**Subject:** On record regarding insufficiencies in the development agreement -- Brickmoor development

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Patricia Andersen

671 Somerset St, Farmington UT 84025

[patricia.a.andersen@gmail.com](mailto:patricia.a.andersen@gmail.com)

September 15, 2025

To: Mayor Anderson and Members of the Farmington City Council

Re: Attention to Insufficiencies in the Development Agreement – Brickmoor Development

Dear Mayor Anderson and City Council Members,

I am writing to formally object to the broadness of the proposed Brickmoor development agreement. It lacks sufficient requirements for the daylight stream, the north entrance/exit, the south emergency exit, high water, and density. Promises have been made by this council to the community, which also cares for the safety and livability of this area.

Given that the developer is providing vague ideas which can all be adjusted in time, I respectfully request the following be formalized in the **development agreement** specifically as well as on the Project Master Plan.

1. Density. "Bonus density" has been claimed per PUD allowances. The PMP doesn't show sufficient percentages to approve 26 more units than are allowed at 9 units per **purchased** acre. The NMU is understood to restrict over-building and has been altered.
2. High water. Clearer, more specific requirements are needed, rather than allowing for draining before permissions are acquired. Kicking Army Corps studies down the road for water that can be so high that people have reported seeing bales of hay floating after harvest. Breaching water has been documented in the south wetland.
3. South Emergency Entrance. Require it to be written into the development agreement for the safety and well being of the neighborhood.



4. North Entrance/Exit. Require a safer entrance than is now planned, regardless of possible future UDOT plans. The original traffic study, commissioned in March, indicates this need. One of its engineers told the commission that he didn't want to scrape a member of the new neighborhood off the road in order to obtain a traffic light warrant study. He offered his expertise, free of charge, to enhance safety.
5. Daylight Stream. Require the daylighting and preservation of the historic perennial stream to be written into the development agreement. This looks great on the PMP, but is not formalized and its alteration must be permitted through the DNR.

Thank you for your work on this. I understand that the developer wants to get started. However, I also know developers will use an insufficient development agreement to their own advantage.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Andersen