



SMITHFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES September 24, 2025

The Planning Commission of Smithfield City met in the City Council Chambers at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, Sept. 24, 2025

Welcome/Pledge of Allegiance & thought/prayer by Jim Marshall

Members Present: Jamie Anderson, Lane Henderson, Bob Holbrook, Jim Marshall, Chris Olsen, Brad Thatcher

Members Excused: Klydi Heywood, Sarah Price

City Staff: Brian Boudrero, Justin Lewis

Others in Attendance: Korey Adams, Kelly Olsen, Jeff Barnes, Kirk Kimball, Patricia Kimball, Amanda Kimball, Becky Hall, Jan Hall, Lisa Schmuhl, Joshua Sorensen, Mandy Rogers, Caralee Stokes

6:30 p.m. Meeting called to order by Chairman Anderson

Approval of the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 20, 2025

Following review by the Commission, Chairman Anderson declared the minutes from the August 20, 2025, meeting to stand with the amendments from Commissioner Marshall as follows: change the word “experienced” to “projected” regarding population in paragraph 3 on page 2. Change the last sentence of paragraph 2 on page 9 to read “Duplexes might be acceptable if they were roughly the same scale as a residential home”. Change paragraph 5 on page 2 to strike the word “not” so that the sentence reads, “Commissioner Marshall would like to ensure that higher density areas will become a launching pad for young families...”. A sentence be added to the top of page 8 “Commissioner Marshall suggested adding ‘Ensure that high-density residential areas are not ignored when planning parks and trails’ to the Parks section. The Commission agreed”.

Public Comment for items not on the agenda or not requiring a public hearing during the meeting

There were no comments or questions.

AGENDA ITEMS

Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025- 19, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-085-0008 and 08- 085-0011 from R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet) to RM (Multiple-Family Residential). The parcels are located at approximately 385 West Center and total approximately 1.4 acres. The request was submitted by Lucerne Management Company.

Korey Adams is the owner of Lucerne Management Company. They are requesting a rezone from R-1-12 Residential (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet) to RM (Multi-Family Residential). The property is bordered on the west by the railroad. There is a perpetual access easement on the east edge of the property for multiple existing properties. They purchased the property years ago. After reviewing the General Plan, they believe there is a housing opportunity. The property to west, on the other side of the railroad tracks, has a multi-family development. This appears to be a good buffer between the R-1-12 zone and the railroad tracks. The area is growing, and the property is currently an eyesore; this project will clean it up, and he believes it could be a true asset to the community. He understands the desire for “small town feel”. His mother grew up in Smithfield.

6:38 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Nancy Duncan owns the property to the north that Mr. Adams called an “eyesore”; she is quite offended by that statement. The yard is maintained and nice. She has barns, corrals, and animal rights. The property has been in her family's ownership since 1897. Placing homes in that location would make it crowded, and she wondered what it would do to her property and how it would be protected from people moving in.

Patricia Kimball is opposed to this proposal, which is located near her backyard. She believes it should stay the way it is; no more traffic is needed in the area. She has grandkids who play in her yard and does not want more traffic along the lane.

Becky Hall said they purchased their home because it is in a rural area. There are animals behind her home. This proposal will place additional stress on the current landowners, particularly regarding the animals. Even though her yard is fenced, she worried about what would happen if a child got into the yard. This is not the place for multi-family development. The railroad tracks also create a safety hazard for families with young children.

Joshua Sorensen lives across the street from the property. He likes the fact that this is an open area and would like it to stay that way. He is opposed to the construction of apartments there. Another concern is the single-lane road, which does not provide sufficient space for additional vehicles or increased traffic. There is no room to widen the road.

Kirk Kimball expressed offense to the property being called an eyesore. He is concerned about putting apartments in and does not think this is an appropriate place.

Mandy Rogers is opposed to this proposal. Her mother is Patricia Kimball, and her parents have lived in their home for 55 years. It was the best neighborhood to grow up in. From a business standpoint, she understands the desire for a profitable project, but she believes this would ruin the neighborhood. She does not want apartments to be built in the “hidden gem” areas of Smithfield. Apartments do not belong here.

John Duncan is concerned that no one spoke to the property owners before this meeting about what was being proposed and their opinions. He is against the proposal.

6:50 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-19

Commissioner Holbrook expressed concern about the narrow road and inquired about the requirements the City would impose. Mr. Boudrero explained that it is an access easement currently used by the Sorensen family for access to their residence, and that continued access would need to be maintained. He noted that the specific construction and design requirements would depend on the design and layout.

Mr. Adams said the proposal is to leave the right-of-way exactly as it is. He apologized and clarified that the property he had referenced as an eyesore was his own, not any of the neighboring properties. The project will have a road leading into the development from Center Street. The project will feature a privacy fence surrounding the entire property. The desire is for single-level townhomes.

Commissioner Olsen asked how much space there is between the railroad tracks and the property. Mr. Boudrero said the western portion, the one being discussed, is already set back appropriately.

Commissioner Thatcher asked how many units are proposed. Mr. Adams said they will work with the City to meet the requirements. Mr. Boudrero said it will be based on the design. The units will have to be rentals in a multi-family zone.

Mr. Adams confirmed for Commissioner Olsen that the privacy fence will prevent residents from using the single-lane road, with access to the development limited to Center Street only. Mr. Boudrero explained that the size of the development requires only one access point. Commissioner Olsen noted that Center Street experiences less traffic than 100 North and that the railroad tracks make a west access impossible.

Commissioner Holbrook appreciates that the proposal is addressing many of the concerns from those residing in the area.

Commissioner Thatcher lives one block south of the proposed development and frequently travels along Center Street in this area. He said the existing multi-family housing across the tracks, facing 400 West, directs traffic onto 100 North and is appropriately situated. When traveling north on 400 West, he often turns onto Center Street, heading toward Heritage Park, and finds it to be a calm area with minimal traffic. He expressed concern that the proposal would significantly increase traffic and disrupt the neighborhood. He also stated that the project conflicts with the “small town feel” being emphasized in the General Plan update. In his view, green space or a single small single-family home would be a better fit.

Commissioner Olsen asked how many single-family lots would fit. Mr. Boudrero said it would be based on the available frontage and the layout.

Commissioner Holbrook recalled past discussions about managing growth by utilizing available space within developed areas rather than expanding outward. He commented that this proposal appears to align with that approach.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Olsen to forward a recommendation to the City Council for **DENIAL** of Ordinance 2025-19, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-085-0008 and 08-085-0011 from R-1-12 (Single-Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet) to RM (Multiple-Family Residential). The parcels are located at approximately 385 West Center and total approximately 1.4 acres. The request was submitted by Lucerne Management Company. Commissioner Thatcher seconded the motion. **The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 1.**

Vote:

Yes: Anderson, Henderson, Marshall, Olsen, Thatcher

No: Holbrook

Absent: Heywood, Price

Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025- 17, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.81 “Master Planned Community (MPC) Zone”, Sections 17.81.030 “Definitions”, 17.81.070 “Streets, Circulation and Parking”, Chapter 17.88 “Planned Unit Developments”, Section 17.88.080 “Streets, Circulation and Parking”, 17.88.120 “Preliminary PUD Plan Approval” and Chapter 16.16 “General Requirements for all Subdivisions”, Section 16.16.030 “Street Layout Standards”.

Mr. Boudrero explained that there have always been concerns, but recently, there have been some design problems related to small private alleyways in residential areas, because there is the ability to build structures close to alleys. Removing alleys from residential areas, but still allowing them in commercial areas, has been a concern of staff and the City Council. Another problem with private roads is that often an HOA (Homeowner’s Association) is required for maintenance, but over time the desire is for the City to take them over for continued upkeep, which the city does not want to do.

The following changes are being proposed:

17.81.070 STREETS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

~~B. Public Rights-of-Ways. Developers may propose that the rights-of-way within an MPC be dedicated, with the standard and all others being private.~~ **All rights-of-way must be dedicated and designed to the applicable criteria found in the Smithfield City “Construction and Design Standards.” Private roads are not allowed in any residential zone.** ~~The Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council a determination as to the viability of the rights-of-way being private. The City Council shall make the final determination as to which streets in an MPC shall be private and which shall be public.~~

~~C. Right-of-Way Width, Streets: See SCDS 249N 1-6.~~

~~D. Right-of-Way Width, Alley: See SMC 17.04.070 “Definitions”.~~

17.88.080 STREETS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

A. The design of public streets within a PUD shall follow the applicable city standards for the width of right of way and construction. ~~Generally, all streets within a PUD in a residential zone shall be public streets, except private streets may be used at the discretion of the planning commission and city council for direct access from public streets to not more than four (4) individual units or two (2) multiple-unit facilities, and private streets may also be approved for other purposes within the discretion of the planning commission and city council. Private streets shall not exceed one hundred fifty feet (150') in length measured from the curb line of the public street to the point at which the street is no longer used for multiple-unit access.~~ The design of public streets within a PUD shall follow the applicable standards adopted by the city for width of right of way and construction including an optional fifty foot (50') PUD right of way which may only be allowed at the discretion of the planning commission and city council. Public streets shall not terminate in a dead end, but shall terminate in a cul-de-sac with a minimum curb radius of forty three feet (43') or thirty-five feet (35') in the case of the optional fifty foot (50') PUD street right of way.

~~B. The design of private streets within a PUD when allowed in a residential zone shall be bound by B. The design of private streets within a PUD when permitted in a residential zone shall be bound by a minimum twenty four inch (24") integral concrete curb and gutter with a minimum width of twenty eight feet (28') from back of curb to back of curb. Streets within a PUD in a commercial zone may be private. The design of private streets within a commercial zone shall be based on the needs of the development and shall be at the discretion of the planning commission and city council.~~

~~C. Designation of streets within a PUD as being either public or private shall be at the discretion of the city council.~~

~~D. All private streets within a PUD shall be dedicated as public utility easements, and all underground improvements shall be constructed per Smithfield City standards.~~

16.16.030 STREET LAYOUT STANDARDS

Add: **C. Private streets are not allowed in any residential zone.**

7:08 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

7:09 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-19

Chairman Anderson supports not having private roads.

Commissioner Olsen pointed out a redundant sentence in 17.88.080 before and after

the strikeout language. Mr. Boudrero said that it can be amended and corrected.

Commissioner Marshall agrees with the idea of not allowing a developer to install a private road that does not meet City standards. There are plenty of private roads that are deteriorating. He grew up in neighborhoods with alleys and small lot sizes. He senses that when there is an alley, the homeowner will access it from the back of the property, which enables them to do more on a smaller lot. Tremonton has older neighborhoods with roads running through the middle of the block, allowing people to have a garage that does not face the street. Alleys are a good design concept, but the City should not have to maintain them.

Mr. Boudrero said alleys are generally used in higher-density developments which in the city are the MPC and PUD (Planned Unit Development) designation.

Commissioner Marshall noted that as the State of Utah puts more pressure on municipalities to accommodate smaller lots, alleys may become more attractive, and he would hate to prohibit them entirely.

Mr. Boudrero clarified that the word “alley” is being removed. The term is a 26-foot alley with no curb or gutter. Smaller roads are not being removed. A PUD allows for a 50-foot right-of-way which is smaller than a standard road. Smaller roads would not be allowed to be put in right up to a building.

Commissioner Marshall asked whether approving the ordinance would prevent a neighborhood from installing a private road in the middle of a block. Mr. Lewis explained that the City is addressing this issue in the MPCs and PUDs. He noted that the City does not currently allow lots smaller than 10,000 square feet unless in a PUD or MPC, and the Code could be amended in the future if needed. If approved, the ordinance would apply to new development; some existing projects with alleys have already been approved. He clarified that the proposal is not directed at any one developer or project, but rather responds to complaints in multiple areas of the City.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Olsen to forward a recommendation for APPROVAL to the City Council for Ordinance 2025- 17, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.81 “Master Planned Community (MPC) Zone”, Sections 17.81.030 “Definitions”, 17.81.070 “Streets, Circulation and Parking”, Chapter 17.88 “Planned Unit Developments”, Section 17.88.080 “Streets, Circulation and Parking”, 17.88.120 “Preliminary PUD Plan Approval” and Chapter 16.16 “General Requirements for all Subdivisions”, Section 16.16.030 “Street Layout Standards” with the removal of the redundant sentence in 17.88.080-A as mentioned. Commissioner Henderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.

Vote:

Yes: Anderson, Henderson, Holbrook, Marshall, Olsen, Thatcher

No: None

Absent: Heywood, Price

Continued discussion on the 2025 General Plan Update

Brian Carver outlined the changes made in the draft as requested at last month's meeting. He highlighted the addition of action Item D within Land Use Goal 3, which defines gateway blocks at the north, west, and south approaches to the city. He also better defined the other actions that can help support and enhance Smithfield's small-town character.

Commissioner Marshall had proposed that particular parts of town be designated or identified as "Old Town" and does not believe that language was included. Mr. Carver said he was waiting for the survey results and further discussion to refine this idea. Land Use Goal 3, Action E "Develop and design standards to encourage distinct neighborhoods" touches on this thought.

Mr. Carver pointed out changes to:

Land Use Goals 6 & 7 on Pages 17-18. Action F, in Land Use Goal 7, was added to create an Economic Development plan that provides specific analysis of the City's strengths and opportunities to guide future investment in diversified employment and services for residents.

Urban Forestry information was added to the Parks & Recreation section on Pages 20-21, with the language included as a plan/policy statement.

Environmental Resources & Hazards – added Action A, B & C, Page 30, regarding trees.

Transportation & Roads pages 34-35, map updated to include functional classifications. Goals 1 & 2 language was refined, and additional action items were included. Mr. Carver confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that the Transportation Master Plan, when it is updated, will come before the Commission for review.

Funding & Implementation Resources, page 45, narrative description added.

Commissioner Marshall had proposed language for Land Use Goal 4 to implement measures to manage the Wildland Urban Interface, including provisions of H.B.48 (from 8/20/25 minutes "adding *Action Item C* to Land Use Goal 4, and including an acknowledgment to state: "*Implement measures to manage the wildland-urban interface, including the provisions of H.B.48 – Wildland Urban Interface Modifications, which was enacted in 2025.*"). Mr. Carver said that it can be included. Commissioner Marshall stated that there was consensus on it at the last meeting.

Commissioner Marshall recommended at the last meeting adding "Ensure that high-density residential areas are not ignored when planning parks and trails" to the Parks & Recreation section. The Commission agreed. Mr. Carver will make that adjustment.

Mr. Lewis said staff were happy with the "small town feel" survey results. The City received questions about why demographic information was included. It appeared that most of the population was represented except for young people, who generally are not homeowners, and renters, as discussed in the last meeting. Mr. Boudrero agreed that

requiring demographic information helped ensure that the response was from the general population.

Commissioner Olsen thanked the staff and Commissioner Heywood for distributing the survey. He believes this helps citizens feel more involved, and the feedback was valuable. Commissioner Marshall echoed that sentiment.

Commissioner Marshall noted that “walkable neighborhoods” was the highest-ranking answer to Question 2, “Which aspects of community life are most important to preserve a 'small town' feel?”. The highest-ranking answer to Question 3, “What City planning decisions are most important to maintaining a small town feel” was the amount of green space and parks. Mr. Lewis said that from a staff perspective, they were surprised that two of the lowest-ranking responses were related to supporting small businesses and preserving historic areas. Commissioner Olsen said sometimes it was hard to pick a first choice because all the options were good.

Last month, Commissioner Marshall created some language but held off proposing it pending the results of the survey. The survey seems to support the proposed recommendation. He suggested adding a new subsection in the Growth & Land Use section titled “Old Town” and including: *“Smithfield residents treasure the small town feel conferred by the architecture and streetscape in the older, central part of town. We will take measures to identify and preserve the characteristics that make this neighborhood special.”* He recommended adding the following policies:

- Identify the specific blocks to which “Old Town” policies apply.
- Identify the specific elements that give it its particular character.
- Develop appropriate design standards.
- Move “Multifamily uses on undeveloped interior blocks should be subject to height limitations” from the Residential section to this new section.
- Insert “Prohibit multi-family housing development within the interior of older city blocks.”
- Move “Encourage medium density housing developments within the interior of older city blocks” from the Residential section to this new section.

Commissioner Marshall said, “prohibit multi-family” is intentionally worded strongly to gauge the City Council’s reaction. He would not be offended if language were adjusted to something such as “allow duplexes provided the scale of the building is similar to that of a single-family dwelling”. The strong language is being proposed to trigger more discussion. He does not want to see someone have a large-scale apartment building next to them as they walk out their residential door. Mr. Lewis asked if Commissioner Marshall would support single-level multi-family development on an intrablock, but not a single-level split-level home if it looks over a fence. Commissioner Marshall has asked himself that same question and said his goal is for middle-of-the-block development to be the same scale as the other buildings on the block.

Chairman Anderson inquired whether this is a Land Use Goal and asked about the timeframe and who would make the determination. Commissioner Marshall would like to see the Planning Commission Chairperson work with the City Council to coordinate and prioritize action items.

Commissioner Holbrook stated that the General Plan does not establish policy. Commissioner Marshall ~~said that~~, some of the things in the current General Plan are explicitly labeled as “policy”. Commissioner Holbrook said the General Plan should be more of a guideline. Commissioner Marshall agreed and noted that goals are given action items to embody these ideas in the code somehow. In his recommendations, he attempted to replicate the language and level of detail found in the previous plan.

Mr. Boudrero said that “identifying specific blocks” is policy and would consider a form-based code, which needs to be codified. Commissioner Marshall does not care where within the General Plan it falls; he would like to express his intention to implement policies that will preserve the area's character.

Chairman Anderson asked where “Old Town” should be located. Commissioner Marshall said it would be beneficial to assign some commission members to study the parcel map and walk around to find the appropriate areas, such as the west side ~~toef~~ 400 West, north ~~toef~~ 200-300 North, and east and west locations on the south end of town. He would like to see a draft created that could be codified or put into the General Plan. His focus is on residential and not commercial areas. Chairman Anderson noted that citizens could also be involved. Mr. Lewis pointed out that “Old Town” from a staff perspective could be defined in several different ways. Commissioner Marshall has traveled extensively for business and has visited other cities with branded “Old Town” areas. What is on the ground should be considered such as density, scale, size, and design.

Mr. Lewis pointed out that a decision will have to be made on which goals to prioritize once the General Plan is updated. There are so many goals that there isn't enough time to accomplish all of them. Commissioner Marshall stated that it would be essential to coordinate with the City Council to make this determination.

Commissioner Marshall asked if there was a consensus for this type of approach. Chairman Anderson is agreeable to it, and Commissioner Olsen also agreed.

Commissioner Olsen is willing to donate his time to work with the Tree Committee to develop a plot map of City-owned trees. Mr. Lewis informed the Commission of the Council's decision to move forward with tree trimming and explained what has been planned. There is a tree inventory on the website.

Commissioner Marshall said on Page 10 – Central Business District (CBD), in paragraph 6, in the last sentence, the wording “...transitional zones can be recommended on the borders...” should be changed to “**are** recommended”

Mr. Carver said he can make these changes and have the draft out for the Commission to review within two weeks. Chairman Anderson said after the review at the October meeting, the draft plan will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for October 22nd, as the City Council meeting has been rescheduled from October 8th to October 15th.

Mr. Boudrero reminded the Commission about the training opportunity with Craig Call on October 15th from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. before the city council meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:05 p.m.

Jamie Anderson, Chairman



**SMITHFIELD CITY
CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, UT 84335**

AGENDA

Public Notice is given that the Smithfield Planning Commission will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, on **Wednesday, September 24, 2025**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 P.M.

Welcome/Pledge of Allegiance & thought/prayer by Jim Marshall

1. Approval of the Planning Commission meeting minutes from August 20, 2025.
2. Public comment on items not on the agenda or not requiring a public hearing during the meeting.
3. Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-19, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-085-0008 08- 085-0011 from R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet) to RM (Multiple-Family Residential). The parcels are located at approximately 385 West Center and total approximately 1.4 acres. The request was submitted by Lucerne Management Company.
4. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-19.
5. Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-17, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 "Zoning Regulations", Chapter 17.81 "Master Planned Community (MPC) Zone", Sections 17.81.030 "Definitions", 17.81.070 "Streets, Circulation and Parking", Chapter 17.88 "Planned Unit Developments", Section 17.88.080 "Streets, Circulation and Parking", 17.88.120 "Preliminary PUD Plan Approval" and Chapter 16.16 "General Requirements for all Subdivisions", Section 16.16.030 "Street Layout Standards".
6. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-17.
7. Continued discussion on the 2025 General Plan Update.

Adjournment

*****Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda*****

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing unique accommodations for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7997 at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.