



MINUTES

November 5th, 2025

Joint Session
Oakley City Council
Oakley City Planning Commission
6:30 PM
Oakley City Hall

Zoom Meeting Platform
Meeting ID 820 258 4629
Passcode 777869

Anchor Location: 960 West Center Street, Oakley UT 84055

In Attendance:

City Administration: Mayor Zane Woolstenhulme; Councilmembers: Joe Frazier, Dave Neff, Tom Smart, and Steve Wilmoth. Planning Commissioners: Richard Bliss (Chair), Cliff Goldthorpe, Kent Woolstenhulme, Jan Manning, Doug Evans. *Commissioner Steve Maynes via Zoom. Councilmember Kelly Kimber is absent.*

City Staff: City Recorder, Amy Rydalch; City Planner, Stephanie Woolstenhulme

Other City Administration: City Attorney, Lisa Baskin Watts.

Members of the Public: In Person: Shad Sorensen, Amy Regan, Heather Massa, Googs Berosset, Kevin Barker, Charlene Barker, Heidi Smart, Stacey Arent (?) Jeff Juip, Stacey Kaminer, Marissa Dillman, Chris Dillman, Kerbee Leavitt, Robbie Atkinson, Rebecca Roberts. Via Zoom: Krista Kelly, Matt Wirthlin, Carla Wilmoth, AF, Jerrie, MacBook, Kerry Bringhurst, DeAnn Woolstenhulme, Samsung SM-A426U, Connor Thomas KPCW.

1. Mayor Woolstenhulme opened the meeting.

- Invocation: **Mayor Zane Woolstenhulme**
- Pledge of Allegiance: **Councilmember Joe Frazier**

42 **2. PRESENTATION OF OAKLEY CITY CENTER AMENDED MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT**
43 **APPLICATION: City Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme**
44

45 **Mayor Z. Woolstenhulme** stated that the presentation is intended to be informative and to
46 apprise the City Council of the work that Planning Commission has performed and to gather
47 context from Planning Commission regarding the application.
48

49 **Planner S. Woolstenhulme** presented the group with the most recent proposed site plan for the
50 City Center development. The site plan includes proposed usage of both the North and South
51 property areas in City Center. She briefly reviewed the timeline and previous versions of the
52 application to demonstrate how the current site plan had evolved. She reviewed the efforts to
53 gather information from the public through multiple public hearings, open houses, and
54 collection of public comments through survey, email, and in regular public meetings. She then
55 reviewed the recent formal actions of the Planning Commissions and City Council.
56

57 Planning Commission formal action from the October 1st, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting:
58

59 *Formal motion by Commissioner Steve Maynes. Second by Commissioner Cliff Goldthorpe.*

60 *"I move that this {matter} proceed to the City Council for evaluation, enumerating the*
61 *considerations that have been articulated by the Planning Commission."*

62 *Motion passed 4-1 in the affirmative.*
63

64 City Council formal action(s) from the October 8, 2025, City Council Meeting:

- 65 1. *To "accept the Planning Commission's recommendation." Motion passed 4-1 in the*
66 *affirmative.*
67 2. *To "authorize city staff, city attorney, and development group to prepare a draft*
68 *development agreement subject to and taking into consideration the Planning*
69 *Commissions concerns." Motion passed 5-0 in the affirmative.*
70

71
72 **Planner S. Woolstenhulme** presented the current proposal, which includes retail spaces, a new
73 post office location, residential apartments, dining, and combined grocery/hardware store. She
74 discussed the square footage of proposed commercial, retail, civic, and residential space as
75 currently proposed. The proposed relocation of the gas station was presented along with the
76 requirement for a text amendment or inclusion in a development agreement should the council
77 be favorable to a gas station in the mixed-use zone.

78 She then reviewed the points of consideration from the Planning Commission outlined in the
79 staff report, by enumeration. (See numbered items 1 through 12 under the heading **Items for**
80 **Discussion and Consideration in Development Agreement** in the staff report.)
81

82 Key considerations pointed out by **Planner S. Woolstenhulme**:

- By code anything in the Village Mixed Use Zone requires a development agreement which is ultimately approved at the City Council level.
- Each time the application is amended it requires a public hearing.
- The application for the City Center has been through multiple public hearings. The various iterations of this application have had lengthy opportunities for public input. She has reviewed every comment from the public hearings, written comments, and points of discussion from Planning Commission.
- As proposed the project includes 88,000 Sq. Ft. of commercial space.
- As proposed, it includes two additional access points onto State Road 32. Planning Commission prefers not to have additional access onto State Road 32.
- Consideration given to the drive thru. Does it work in City Center; does it contribute to congestion; safety concerns.
- Consideration given to through roads from North to South side of project. Should they be offset to mitigate speeding traffic?
- Clarification regarding the US Post Office and lease with the Federal Government. Currently it is inadequate to serve the community's needs. USPS will potentially look for a more centralized larger location in the Kamas Valley or if located within 500 ft. of the existing facility will consider a new facility and does not require a formal RFP process because of the proximity.
- Consideration of a phased plan for City Center development. What should be included in Phase I, the timing, and conditions for additional phasing.
- Concern regarding the amount of retail proposed for the City Center. How much dedicated to retail, what types of retail, favorable to agritourism based?
- Consideration of an Amazon lockers location.
- Is proposed parking sufficient?
- Green Space and walkability.
- Height of buildings. i.e., are three stories acceptable for proposed housing? Planning Commission recommendation to keep height no greater than City Hall.
- Consideration of Attainable Housing and potential locations, and requirements for qualification for the housing.
- Consideration of additional gas station and environmental impact, potential scope and size of fuel station, location.
- Need to define the Architectural Review committee as to structure and scope of responsibility.
- Consideration of signage and lighting requirements.

Upon conclusion of **Planner S. Woolstenhulme's** summary of points for consideration, the **Mayor** asked Council members to direct their questions to the **Planner or Chair of the Planning Commission**. Planning Commissioners and City Councilmembers were able to participate by indicating with a raised hand and recognition by the Mayor.

124 **Chairman Bliss** summarized the efforts of the Planning Commission in their efforts to vet and
125 review the application. He discussed that the application is now at a point where the City
126 Council needs to weigh in regarding disposal of land and other legislative considerations.

127
128 Discussion amongst Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners regarding the various points
129 of consideration. Among the topics discussed were attainable housing, gas station location,
130 renovation/relocation of Cattlemen's Hall, drive-thru, the Post Office location, and process for a
131 development agreement.

132
133 After much discussion, **Mayor Z. Woolstenhulme** asked if there was consensus on the need for a
134 new post office. Consensus among planning commission and City Council in favor of a new post
135 office. Discussion ensued around considerations regarding access, loading bay, and location.
136 **Mayor Z. Woolstenhulme** asked if there was consensus on the new store. Discussion regarding
137 wanting this in Phase 1 of the development, square footage, and location. Agreement among
138 planning commissioners and City Council regarding the store. **Mayor Z. Woolstenhulme** asked
139 the group about their thoughts on the Creamery and the possible easement for access to the
140 Creamery on the South City parcel. Discussion regarding not including other items on the
141 southern portion currently and focusing on the access to the Creamery. Several voiced concerns
142 regarding whether the easement was premature as the parking area is located on land not
143 currently owned by the developer. Concern was also raised regarding the need for this
144 easement as access to the Creamery from State Road 32 was unlikely to be approved by UDOT.
145 It was discussed that access through the south city center lot was generally agreed upon but
146 that inclusion of the easement in a development agreement may not be necessary and could be
147 managed as a separate matter.


148
149 **Mayor Z. Woolstenhulme** asked for closing thoughts from each Planning Commissioner and
150 Councilmember. **Councilmembers Smart and Neff** invited newly elected Councilmembers Amy
151 Regan and Chris Dillman to join the discussion and share their closing thoughts on the project.

152
153 Brief discussion on next steps including a presentation of the current application to the City
154 Council by the development team at the next City Council meeting.

155
156 **Councilmember Frazier** motioned to adjourn the meeting.

157
158
159 Approval is to form this 18th day of November, 2025.

160
161
162
163
164 
Zane K. Woolstenhulme, Mayor


Amy Rydalch, City Recorder