

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE

The Planning Commission of Fairfield, Utah, shall hold a Regular Session on January 7, 2026, @ 7:00 P.M., at the Fairfield Town Office, 121 West Main Street, Fairfield, Utah.

Agenda

Call to Order

- 1) Roll Call

Consent Items

The Commission may approve these items without discussion or public comment and may remove an item to the Business Items for discussion and consideration.

- 1) Approve the following minutes: September 16, 2025; September 22, 2025; September 24, 2025; September 25, 2025; November 5, 2025; December 3, 2025.

Business Items

The Commission will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

- 1) Letter of support
- 2) Annual Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement
- 3) Annual Ethical Behavior Pledge Form
- 4) Landscape Ordinance
- 5) Commercial Ordinance

Adjournment

Join Zoom Meeting <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84690571210?pwd=DiZROJorp1mDLS20hIV0KT4JqbogqU.1>

Meeting ID: 846 9057 1210

Passcode: 806234

Certificate Of Posting

The above agenda notice was posted on or before the 6th day of January 2026 at the location of the meeting, Fairfield town office, 121 West Main Street, Fairfield, UT, and at the Fairfield town website <https://fairfieldtown-ut.gov/meetings/>, and on the Utah State public notice website at <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>.

In Compliance With The Americans With Disabilities Act, Individuals Needing Special Accommodations (Including Auxiliary Communicative Aids And Services) During This Meeting Should Notify Town Offices At 801-766-3509.

Date

Stephanie Shelley Town Recorder/Clerk

We have two different Landscape Requirements in this document.

1- What is in the Codebook 2- One we have been working on.

Chapter 19.

Landscape Requirements.

Section [10.19.10](#). Purpose.

Section [10.19.20](#). Landscaping Plan.

Section [10.19.30](#). Landscape Requirements Residential.

Section [10.19.40](#). Landscape Requirements Non-Residential.

Section 10.19.10. Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide standards and requirements for the installation of landscaping and screening walls for all new and expanded development within the Town in order to promote the general welfare of the community; to effectuate attractive and logical development; to aid in the enhancement of property values; to create an attractive appearance along Town streets; to compliment the visual effect of buildings; to provide appropriate buffers between incompatible land uses and protection from intense activities; and to aid in conserving water by encouraging the use of varieties of plants, trees and shrubs indigenous to arid regions which are characterized by low water consumption. The standards and regulations of this chapter shall be held to be the minimum requirements necessary for the promotion of the foregoing objectives of this chapter.

Section 10.19.20. Landscaping Plan.

A. All applicants for commercial purposes are required to submit a landscaping plan. Landscape plans should achieve the following purposes:

1. Preserve and complement the desert character of the natural landscape, mitigate building and parking lot impact, add aesthetic charm, interest and character, and conserve water;
2. Provide visual interest and variety;
3. Provide necessary screening elements;
4. Add year round site beautification;
5. Blend with the natural landscape;
6. Highlight building design features; and
7. Conserve water.

Section 10.19.30. Landscape Requirements, Residential.

All yards visible to the public must have an area the same size as the square footage of the home that is improved, groomed, and maintained. Examples of this include xeriscaping, driveways, sidewalks, vegetation, and trees which are strongly encouraged.

Section 10.19.40. Landscape Requirements, Non-Residential.

A. All applicants for commercial uses are required by this title to make landscaping improvements and shall submit a landscaping plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect to meet the minimum landscape requirements outlined in this chapter. The Fairfield Building Department will review the submitted landscaping plan for compliance with this chapter and forward the plan to the Planning Commission and Town Council for review and action concurrent with development applications, which require landscaping plans to be submitted. The landscaping plan shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

1. The location and dimensions of all existing and proposed structures, property lines, easements, parking lots, power lines, rights-of-way, ground signs, refuse areas, and lighting;
2. The plant names (both botanical and common name), location, quantity, and size of all existing and proposed plants. The proposed plan should indicate the size of the plant material at the time of planting and at maturation. All existing vegetation that is to be removed or remain on the site should be clearly identified;
3. Existing and proposed grading of the site indicating contours at two (2) foot intervals for grades that are five(5) percent or greater. For areas where grades are less than five (5) percent, contours may be shown at one-foot intervals;
4. Irrigation system plan;
5. Existing and proposed fences and identification of the fencing materials; and
6. A summary of the total percentage of landscaped areas, domestic turf grasses, deciduous and evergreen species, and xeriscaping.

B. Completion of Landscape Improvements. All required landscaping improvements shall be completed in accordance with the approved site plan, landscaping planting plan, and irrigation plan and occur prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the associated structure/building. Exceptions may be permitted and certificates of occupancy issued where weather conditions prohibit the completion of approved and required landscaping improvements. In such cases an extension period of not longer than six months is permitted and a bond for no less than one hundred ten (110) percent of the total estimated value of the landscaping shall be held until the project is in full compliance with this chapter and any approved site or landscaping plans.

C. Planting Standards. The planting standards are the minimum size of landscaping that the Town will accept towards meeting the landscaping required in this chapter. All planting must conform with the Fairfield Soil Ordinance. The Planning Commission and Town Council shall use the planting standards in evaluation of any landscaping plan. The following are planting standards for required landscaping that shall be followed for all new development:

1. Trees. Deciduous trees shall, when planted, have a minimum trunk size of one and one-half (1 ½) inches in caliper measured eight (8) inches above the soil line. Evergreen trees shall have a minimum size of six (6) feet in height. The applicant may elect to use either deciduous or evergreen trees to meet this requirement;

2. Ornamental Trees. All ornamental trees shall have a minimum trunk size, when planted, of one and one-half (1 ½) inches in caliper measured eight (8) inches above the soil line;

3. Shrubs. All shrubs shall be a minimum of one (1) gallon containerized stock, when planted, that will attain a height of at least two (2) feet;

4. Turf. No landscaping shall be composed of more than thirty (30) percent turf;

5. Drought-Tolerant Plants. A minimum of fifty (50) percent of all tree and shrub species shall be required to be drought tolerant;

6. Weed Barrier. Planting beds are required to have a weed barrier with mulched wood chips, rocks, or other similar treatment;

7. Parking Areas. Parking areas for vehicles, trailers and all heavy equipment shall be weed free:

8. All areas in front of screening, along frontage and public roads shall be weed free with an aggregate size of three quarters (¾) inch gravel to the depth of three (3) inches or any like material and must be laid on a minimum of two (2) inches of road base.

D. Design Applications. The Planning Commission and Town Council shall use the following design applications in evaluation of any landscaping plan:

1. Selection of Plants. Plants shall be selected for texture, form, color, pattern of growth and adaptability to local conditions. Native plants shall be preferred;

2. Water Conservation. All planter beds shall be irrigated through the use of drip lines instead of spray heads to minimize water loss through evaporation; and

3. Berming. Landscaped berming is required as a headlight screen or buffer surrounding parking areas between different land uses; particularly between nonresidential and residential uses or single-family and multifamily uses.

E. Required Landscaping:

1. An area equal to fifteen (15) percent of the total size of the parking lot must be landscaped;

2. A minimum of the equivalent of ten (10) feet surrounding the footprint of the building must be landscaped;

3. Each side of a building visible to the public or neighboring residential property shall be landscaped;

4. One (1) tree for every ten (10) parking spaces;

5. A minimum of one (1) tree shall be placed for every one thousand (1,000) sq. ft. of required landscaped area; and

6. Storm water retention areas shall be landscaped.

F. The Town Council shall have authority to waive these standards as circumstances dictate.

G. Water Wise Landscaping Standards. The following are the minimum standards for water wise landscaping for any park strip, median, or landscaped area located within a public right-of-way, a commercial, or industrial development:

1. At least twenty (20) percent of the required landscape area shall be live vegetation;
2. Live vegetation shall be distributed throughout the landscape area, and shall not be segregated;
3. Decorative rock material shall be a minimum of one (1) inch aggregate, and shall be at least three (3) inches deep and be placed completely on top of a weed fabric barrier that allows the permeation of water. Rock materials shall not exceed the height of the sidewalk/trail or the top back of the curb, when placed along a public right-of-way;
4. All water wise landscaped areas shall be improved with a drip irrigation system if applicable; and
5. Any individual, corporation, or other entity shall be responsible for any damage caused by landscaping in public rights of way including rocks or other materials that migrate onto a sidewalk, trail, street, storm drain, or other public facility, regardless of how such migration occurs.

Chapter 19.

Landscape Requirements.

10.19.10 Purpose

A. The purpose of this Chapter is to establish minimum standards and requirements for the installation of landscaping and screening walls in connection with all new development and expansions of existing development within Fairfield Town.

B. These standards are intended to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by:

1. Supporting attractive, well-designed, and context-sensitive development;
2. Enhancing property values and promoting visual harmony across properties;
3. Creating a more aesthetically pleasing appearance along public streets and rights-of-way;
4. Complementing the architectural character of buildings and built environments;
5. Providing buffers between incompatible land uses and protecting adjacent properties from visual, noise, or other negative impacts associated with high-intensity uses; and
6. Encouraging water conservation by promoting the use of drought-tolerant, native, or low-water-use plant species suitable for the arid regional climate.

C. The provisions of this Chapter shall be interpreted and applied as the minimum requirements necessary to achieve these objectives and to ensure responsible and sustainable landscape practices throughout the Town.

10.19.20 Landscaping Plan

A. All applicants proposing development for commercial purposes are required to submit a landscaping plan as part of their development application.

B. The landscaping plan shall be designed to fulfill the following objectives:

1. Preserve and complement the desert character of the natural landscape, mitigate the visual impact of buildings and parking areas, and promote aesthetic character while

supporting water conservation;

2. Provide visual interest and variety throughout the site using appropriate plant materials, textures, and seasonal changes;
3. Incorporate screening elements to buffer incompatible uses, shield service areas, and protect adjacent properties from visual and environmental impacts;
4. Enhance year-round site beautification through the use of evergreen vegetation, seasonal color, and complementary hardscape features;
5. Blend with the existing topography and native vegetation to create a natural, cohesive visual experience;
6. Highlight architectural design features of buildings and improve curb appeal; and
7. Support sustainable landscape practices by emphasizing the use of drought-tolerant, low-water-use, and native plants suited to Fairfield's arid climate.

10.19.30 Landscape Requirements – Residential

A. All residential lots shall provide and maintain landscaping in all yards visible from a public street or right-of-way.

B. The area of required improved landscaping shall be at least equal to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit on the lot.

C. Acceptable landscaping improvements include, but are not limited to:

1. Xeriscaping using drought-tolerant or native plant species;
2. Driveways, sidewalks, or hardscape features that integrate with the site's overall aesthetic;
3. Vegetative ground cover, including low-water turf alternatives, shrubs, and groundcover plantings; and
4. Trees, which are strongly encouraged to provide shade, enhance curb appeal, and contribute to Fairfield's desert-compatible character.

D. All landscaping shall be:

1. Groomed, neatly maintained, and kept free of debris and invasive weeds;
2. Installed in a manner that prevents soil erosion and promotes water efficiency; and
3. Designed to complement the architecture of the home and preserve the natural visual character of the area.

10.19.40 Landscape Requirements – Non-Residential

A. Landscaping Plan Required

1. All applicants for commercial or non-residential development are required to submit a landscaping plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect.
2. The Fairfield Building Department shall review the plan for compliance with this Chapter ~~and forward it to the Planning Commission and Town Council for review and action.~~
3. The landscaping plan shall include, at a minimum:
 - a. Location and dimensions of all existing and proposed structures, property lines, easements, parking lots, power lines, rights-of-way, signage, refuse areas, and lighting;
 - b. Plant names (botanical and common), locations, quantities, and sizes at planting and maturity. Existing vegetation to be retained or removed shall be clearly marked;
 - c. Existing and proposed grading with contour intervals (two-foot intervals for grades 5% or greater; one-foot intervals for grades under 5%);
 - d. Irrigation system plan;
 - e. Existing and proposed fences with material specifications; and
 - f. Summary data showing percentages of landscaped areas, domestic turf grasses, deciduous and evergreen species, and xeriscaping.

B. Completion of Landscape Improvements

1. Landscaping improvements shall be completed in accordance with the approved site and landscaping plans prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
2. If weather conditions prevent timely installation, the Town may grant a temporary extension of up to six (6) months, provided that the applicant posts a bond of at least 110% of the estimated landscaping cost.

C. Planting Standards

All planting must conform to the Fairfield Soil Ordinance, and shall meet the following minimums:

1. Trees (Deciduous): Minimum 1.5-inch caliper measured 6 inches above the soil line.
2. Trees (Evergreen): Minimum height of 6 feet at planting.
3. Ornamental Trees: Minimum 1.5-inch caliper.
4. Shrubs: Minimum 1-gallon container stock that will attain at least 2 feet in height.
5. Turf Limit: No more than 30% of landscaped areas may consist of turf.
6. Drought-Tolerant Plants: At least 50% of all trees and shrubs shall be drought-tolerant species.
7. Weed Barrier: Required beneath all planting beds, topped with mulch, wood chips, or rock.
8. Parking Areas: Must be kept weed free.
9. Road Frontage: All areas in front of screening or along public roads must have $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch gravel to a depth of 3 inches, installed over a minimum 2-inch road base.

D. Design Applications

The ~~Planning Commission and Town Council~~ Building Department shall evaluate landscape plans based on the following:

1. Plant Selection: Consideration for texture, form, color, and growth habits; native species preferred.
2. Water Conservation: Use of drip irrigation systems for low-flow water whenever possible ~~planter beds~~.
3. Berming: Required around parking areas to buffer between non-residential and residential or multi-family uses.

E. Required Landscaping Elements

1. Minimum ~~15%~~ 5% of total parking lot area shall be landscaped.
2. ~~At least 10 feet of landscaping along the front entrance of the building, shall surround the building footprint.~~
3. All public-facing and residential-facing sides of buildings must be landscaped.
4. ~~One (1) tree is required for every 10 parking spaces.~~
5. ~~One (1) tree is required for every 1,000 square feet of required landscaped area.~~
6. All stormwater retention areas must be landscaped.

F. Waivers

The Town Council has the authority to waive or modify these standards as circumstances dictate.

G. Water Wise Landscaping Standards

The following apply to park strips, medians, and landscaped areas in public rights-of-way, commercial, or industrial developments:

1. At least 20% of the landscaped area must consist of live vegetation.
2. ~~Vegetation must be evenly distributed, not segregated into clusters.~~
3. Decorative rock must be at least $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1-inch aggregate, applied 3 inches deep over a permeable weed barrier, and may not exceed the elevation of sidewalks, curbs, or trails.
4. ~~Drip irrigation systems are required where applicable.~~
5. Maintenance Liability: Property owners are responsible for any damage caused by landscaping materials that migrate into public facilities (e.g., streets, sidewalks, storm drains).

Section 10.19.900 – Definitions

Caliper

The diameter of a tree trunk measured at a height of six (6) inches above the ground for trees up to four (4) inches in diameter, and at a height of twelve (12) inches for trees larger than four (4) inches in diameter.

Decorative Rock

Naturally colored stone or gravel used for landscaping purposes, with a minimum aggregate size of $\frac{3}{4}$ to one (1) inch. Decorative rock shall not include decomposed granite, construction debris, or gravel used solely for vehicular access or utility coverage.

Drip Irrigation

A high-efficiency irrigation system that delivers water directly to the base of plants through emitters, tubes, or hoses, reducing water waste from evaporation or runoff.

Drought-Tolerant Plant

A plant species adapted to arid or semi-arid climates that can thrive with minimal irrigation after establishment. Includes many native plants and xeriscape species.

Evergreen

A plant or tree that retains green leaves throughout the year and does not go dormant or lose its foliage seasonally.

Hardscape

Non-living landscape elements such as paved surfaces, walkways, patios, retaining walls, fences, and decorative structures that are integrated into the landscape design.

Landscaping

The combination of plant materials, groundcover, mulch, decorative rock, fencing, irrigation systems, and site design features that are intended to improve the aesthetic and environmental quality of a site.

Landscape Architect

A person licensed by the State of Utah to practice landscape architecture, including the preparation of landscape plans, grading, irrigation design, and plant selection.

Landscape Plan

A detailed drawing or set of documents prepared by a licensed landscape architect showing existing and proposed landscaping, irrigation systems, grading contours, plant materials, hardscapes, and site features as required by this Chapter.

Live Vegetation

Any living plant material, including trees, shrubs, groundcover, turf, or perennial plantings, used as part of a landscape design. Artificial turf or synthetic plants do not qualify as live vegetation.

Mulch

A material such as bark, wood chips, compost, or rock placed on soil surfaces to retain moisture, suppress weeds, and enhance visual appearance.

Native Plant

A plant species that is indigenous to Utah or the Intermountain West region and is well-adapted to local soil, climate, and water conditions.

Ornamental Tree

A small tree, often with distinctive flowers, foliage, bark, or branching, used for decorative purposes in landscaping.

Park Strip

The area between a street curb and sidewalk, often planted with grass, trees, or decorative materials, and typically located within the public right-of-way.

Screening

A visual barrier created through fencing, walls, landscaping, berms, or a combination thereof, used to block undesirable views, provide privacy, or reduce environmental impacts.

Turf

A surface layer of soil thickly covered with a mat of grass and its roots, whether natural or synthetic. For the purposes of this Chapter, turf refers only to **natural grass**.

Very-Low-Water Landscaping

A form of water-wise landscaping in which decorative rock, mulch, and hardscape are the predominant surface treatments and live vegetation is limited in number but selected from

drought-tolerant, low-water-use species. Very-low-water landscapes shall still comply with minimum live vegetation requirements established in this Chapter.

Water-Wise Landscaping

Landscaping practices that reduce water consumption through the use of drought-tolerant plants, efficient irrigation systems, and design techniques that minimize water loss and runoff.

Xeriscaping

A water-conserving landscaping approach that uses drought-tolerant plants, mulch, and efficient irrigation to create attractive landscapes suited to dry climates. Xeriscaping does **not** mean leaving areas as bare soil or weeds without intentional planting or design.

PC Working Draft

Ordinance #2024-03. An Ordinance Rescinding Title 10.11.225. (N) and (O); And Adopting New Amendments to Title 10.11.225.(N) and(O). And Adding Them to the Commercial Overlay Zone.
Dated May 9, 2024

Updated May 9, 2024.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 9, 2024, regarding proposed amendments to Title 10, Section 10.11.

WHEREAS, Fairfield Town has deemed it in the best interest of Fairfield Town to amend the Fairfield Town Code: and

Whereas, the Fairfield Town Council has reviewed the proposed amendment to the Fairfield Town Code:

NOW THEREFORE, be it ordained by the Town Council of Fairfield Town, in the State of Utah, that certain sections of Title 10 of the Town Code be added as follows:

Section 10.11.225. Commercial Overlay Zone.

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Commercial Overlay Zone is to provide for commercial businesses, professional offices, and shopping centers that will serve neighborhood, community and regional shopping demands, while also providing other commercial opportunities which are reasonably separated or buffered from residential development but allow residential development within the Commercial Overlay Zone.

B. Prohibited Uses. Any use not specifically permitted in this chapter shall be prohibited.

C. Commercial Overlay Area. Starting at the southwest boundary of Fairfield Town running parallel with and adjoining to Highway 73, the width of three hundred (300) feet on each adjacent side, starting at property owners boundary line to the end point of Fairfield Towns' northern boundary line. If a parcel of land has been declared commercial it can no longer be used as residential.

E. Area Requirements. Lots or parcels in the Commercial Overlay Zone shall be of sufficient size to assure compliance with the Fairfield Town parking, landscaping, utilities, site plan and other land development regulations that may govern all or a portion of each project.

F. Master Site Plan Required. All developments in this zone are required to submit a master site plan that includes maps and descriptions of construction, landscaping, Health Department requirements, and uses.

G. Storm Water. All storm water must be retained on site in accordance with an engineered plan.

H. Garbage. The yards around buildings shall be kept in compliance with the Town Nuisance Ordinance.

I. Minimum Lot Size/Water Requirement. A ten (10) acre minimum lot size is required for any lot not connected to an approved municipal culinary water system.

J. Frontage Requirement. For adequate access by emergency vehicles and local occupants the frontage of each lot shall be a minimum of one hundred and sixty five (165) ft. and shall abut an official State, County or Fairfield Town road which has been paved under the direction of the unit government having jurisdiction and from which frontage gains vehicle and pedestrian access exclusively and entirely across the subject lot.

K. Setback Requirements.

The following setback requirements are intended to describe the amount of space required between buildings and property lines. All buildings in this Commercial Overlay Zone, including accessory buildings, are required to maintain a minimum distance from property lines as set forth below. Conditional uses may require greater setbacks so as to prevent nuisance as determined by the Town Council:

1. Front Setbacks. Front setbacks will be determined by the size of building, landscape and parking requirements. The Town Council, in consideration of a prior recommendation by the Planning Commission, may increase or decrease this if, in its judgment, the changes comply with the following:

- a. Does not interfere with the use, enjoyment, and character of adjacent properties;
- b. The success of the business necessitates a specific setback, proven by data or research;
- c. Additional setback is not solely to provide space for parking between the building and the street; and
- d. Topography or natural features make it impossible or impracticable to place the building within the setback.

2. Sides and Rear Setbacks:

- a. Minimum of ten (10) feet; and
- b. The Town Council, in consideration of a prior recommendation by the Planning Commission, may increase or decrease this if, in its judgment, the changes comply with the following:
 - i. Does not interfere with the use, enjoyment, and character of adjacent properties;
 - ii. The success of the business necessitates a specific setback, proven by data or research;
 - iii. Additional setback is not solely to provide space for parking between the building and the street; and
 - iv. Topography or natural features make it impossible or impracticable to place the building within the setback.

3. Other General Setback Requirements. In addition to the specific setback requirements noted above:

a. No building shall be closer than ten (10) feet to any neighboring private road or driveway; and

b. Exceptions may be made for any part of the building that may contain an approved drive-up window;

4. Setbacks for Accessory Building:

a. Minimum of six (6) feet from the parcel property line; and

b. Additional setbacks will be determined by fire and building code.

L. UDOT Requirements. Any building lot adjacent to any State road must comply with all UDOT requirements. Applicants will contact the Region 3 permitting office to schedule a pre-application coordination meeting before applying for a permit. Additional information can be found online at www.udot.utah.gov, 'Doing Business', UDOT Permits.

M. Building Height. No building in this zone shall be over two stories with a maximum height restriction of forty five (45) feet.

~~N.. Permitted Uses. The following land uses shall be permitted uses in the Commercial Overlay Zone. Any use not specifically permitted in this chapter shall be prohibited:~~

~~—1. Accessory Structure Rev. ord. 03142023-2, passed 03-14-2023.~~

~~—2. Car Wash Facilities.~~

~~—3. Auto-Fueling Convenience Store.~~

~~—4. Convenience Store; Sale of Goods.~~

~~—5. Farm Equipment Sales.~~

~~—6. Nursery.~~

~~—7. Warehouse Space With Offices.~~

~~—O. Conditional Uses.~~

~~—1. Home Based Business.~~

Passed 2024-03 May 9, 2024

N. Permitted, Special and Conditional Uses.

Purpose. The purpose of this section is to provide supplemental land use provisions that apply to permitted, conditional and special uses in the Commercial Overlay Zone which are designed to protect and preserve the general health, safety and welfare of the public;

2. Applicability. In addition to the standards included in this chapter, all other chapters of this code shall apply to the uses as applicable including, but not limited to, Chapter 10.7

Qualifying Regulations and Procedures, Chapter 10.21. Parking; Chapter 9.3.Outdoor Lighting Standards; Chapter 10.19, Landscaping Requirements, 10.21., Signs and Sign

Permits; and Site Plan Reviews;

3. Provisions. Where any provision of federal, state, county, or town statutes, codes, or laws conflicts with any provision of this chapter, the most restrictive shall govern unless enforcement will result in a violation of the federal, state, county or town statutes, codes, or laws.

4. There are 3 types of uses allowed in the Commercial Overlay Zone:

P = Permitted (Permitted uses may still require approval through an application process as detailed in this chapter and other chapters.)

S = Special (Special uses are permitted uses that must also comply with the standards listed in 10.11.225.O. below that are specific to that type of use.)

C = Conditional Use (Conditional uses are permitted uses that must also comply with the standards listed in that are specific to that type of use.)

Uses that are not listed in the above categories are prohibited.

5. Permitted Uses. Permitted uses allowed in the Commercial Overlay Zone:

- a. Accessory structure.
- b. Convenience store; sale of goods.
- c. Farm equipment sales.
- d. Landscaping, plant, and tree nursery or landscape materials.
- e. ~~Warehouse space with offices.~~
- f. Fitness facility.

6. Special Uses. Special uses allowed in the Commercial Overlay Zone:

- a. Automobile detailing.
- b. ~~Vehicle restoration, auto body fabrication.~~
- c. Minor, (fewer than 30), automobile service and car sales.
- d. Light manufacturing, assembly and retail sales.
- e. Truck and equipment service.
- f. Equipment sales.
- g. Funeral home, mortuary services.
- h. Pet grooming/ animal care services.
- i. Small engine repair.
- j. General sales, service, and merchandise.
- k. Printing and lithography.
- l. Publishing services.
- m. Car Wash Facilities.
- n. Auto Fueling.

Conditional uses allowed in the Commercial Overlay Zone:

There are no conditional uses allowed in the Commercial Overlay Zone at this time.

O. Standards for Special Uses.

1. Minor Automobile Service and Car Sales, automobile detailing, vehicle restoration and auto body fabrication Standards. (Less than 30 vehicles).

Automobile sales and/or minor service operations may be permitted only where:

- a. Nuisance. They will not be a nuisance to residences and other surrounding uses; and

- b. Automobile Display Areas. Automobile displays are subject to the following restrictions:

- i. Display areas shall not be permitted in rights-of-way, walkways, sidewalks, park strips, and required landscape buffers

- ii. Display areas shall be designated through the site plan approval process;

- iii. Display areas shall be of concrete, asphalt, or another improved and maintained surface;

- iv. Display areas shall not occupy more spaces than allotted for the leased unit allowed in the zone. Tenants shall leave at least 25% vacant for customer/employee parking;

- v. Display areas shall comply with the clear vision triangle setbacks;

- vi. Vehicles in the display area shall not exceed a maximum height of twelve (12) feet, such height including both the vehicle and display surface as measured from the height of the nearest sidewalk to the highest point of the vehicle; and

- vii. Truck sales and service shall be limited to no more than five stored on site at any given time.

- c. Operating Conditions.

- i. Operations shall not cause traffic hazards or undue traffic congestion. This includes all loading and unloading of vehicles, which shall occur onsite or within a designated area off site which prevents unsafe interaction with traffic;

- ii. Spray painting of vehicles shall not be conducted outside. Spray painting of

parts shall occur inside a fully enclosed building;

iii. Accessory sales activities (i.e., tires, parts, seat covers, floor mats, window tinting, sound systems, etc.) shall only be inside a fully enclosed building;

iv. Temporary canopy tents shall not be permitted when the tents are visible from the street except for special events associated with the subject business. Such events shall not be permitted for more than three days;

v. All signage shall conform to the standards in Chapter 10.21; and sign location shall be reviewed along with sign application and permit approval. All business signs require a submittal and approval of sign permit application;

vi. Junkyard, automobile dismantling activities or storage of inoperable vehicles past a reasonable timeframe for repairs shall not be conducted or permitted; and

vii. Automobiles being repaired shall be stored behind a wall or opaque screening.

2. Auto fueling/service stations and/or car wash facilities.

Automobile gas/service stations and/or car wash operations may be permitted only where:

- a. Nuisance. They will not be a nuisance to residences and other surrounding uses;
- b. Traffic Congestion. They will not cause traffic hazards or undue traffic congestion;
- c. Lot Size. An automobile gas/service station or a freestanding car wash site area will have a minimum of a 15,000-square-foot parcel. The lot frontage, if located on an arterial or collector street, shall not be less than 125 feet;
- d. Automobile Gas/Service Station or Car Wash Setbacks. Automobile gas/service stations or car wash operations with gasoline pumps will have buildings of the type of construction as defined in the International Building Code, and are to be located at a distance of not less than 25 feet from property or building setback lines;
- e. Canopy Setbacks. Gasoline pumps and pump islands for car wash operations or gas/service stations shall have a canopy and the setback (measured from the edge of the canopy) shall be not less than 25 feet from any property lines or shall be in conformity with the building setback lines of the zoning district, whichever is greater;
- f. Driveway Design. Driveway design and spacing for automobile gas/service

stations or car wash operations shall be reviewed by the city engineer, whose recommendation will be forwarded to the planning commission;

g. Distance to Other Uses. The minimum closest distance from the gas vents at an automobile gas/service station or car wash with gas pumps site to the property line of an existing residence, school, park, playground, museum or place of public assembly will be not less than 200 feet; and

h. Outdoor Storage or Rentals. No outdoor storage of rental trucks or trailers, stacks of tires or other merchandise will be conducted by the automobile gas/service station or car wash operation except when such equipment or merchandise is screened by an approved opaque fence not less than six feet in height.

3. Plant and Tree Nursery/Garden Center.

Plant and tree nurseries and garden centers may be permitted only where:

a. Outdoor Sales, Display, Storage. Any associated outdoor sales, display, and Storage of products or equipment must comply with 10.21.225.O.4.Outdoor Sales and Display.

4. Outdoor Sales and Display.

Outdoor sales and display may be permitted only where:

a. Definition. For the purposes of this section, "outdoor sales and display", includes the outdoor storage of materials, products, and equipment incidental to an allowed use which are not accessible to the public and set apart from the outdoor sales and display;

b. Nuisance. The use will not be a nuisance to residences and other surrounding Uses;

c. Location. All outdoor sales and display areas shall not be located within a required setback, area of required landscaping, area of required parking, or area of pedestrian or vehicle access and flow;

d. Site Plan. All outdoor sales and display areas shall be clearly defined on the approved site plan and will be limited to these areas;

e. Signs. The outdoor sales and display area shall not include the use of banners, pennants or strings of pennants;

f. Outdoor Storage. All outdoor storage shall require the following screening Regulations:

i. A masonry wall or solid/opaque fencing shall be required to screen all open storage areas from view of a street;

ii. A solid/opaque fence, screening barrier, or wall shall be required along the side and rear property lines to screen areas of open storage up to and including any gate;

iii. Fences used to screen open storage shall not be less than six feet high.

Fences greater than six feet high may be approved as part of a site plan upon a finding that increased height for screening is necessary to reduce impacts to surrounding properties; and

iv. Materials, products, and equipment within 20 feet of the fence may not be stored higher than the fence.

5. Pet grooming/Animal Care Services.

Animal care services may be permitted only where:

- a. Nuisance. The use will not be a nuisance to residences and other surrounding uses;
- b. Visibility. Any outdoor space used for waiting or care is fully screened, and
- c. Overnight Keeping. The overnight keeping of animals is allowed only for treatment purposes. Overnight boarding is strictly prohibited.

Working Draft Commercial Overlay 25-11-05

Effective Date: This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon passage and adoption.

Passed and Adopted this _____ Day of _____ 2024.

FAIRFIELD TOWN

Mayor
Hollie McKinney

Hollie McKinney	yes _____	no _____
R. Panek	yes _____	no _____
Tyler Thomas	yes _____	no _____
Michael Weber	yes _____	no _____
Richard Cameron	yes _____	no _____

ATTEST:

Town Recorder/Clerk
Stephanie Shelley

FAIRFIELD TOWN

STATE OF UTAH)
) ss.
COUNTY OF UTAH)

I, Stephanie Shelley, Town Recorder of Fairfield Town, Utah, do hereby certify and declare that the above and foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of an ordinance passed by the Town Council of Fairfield Town, Utah, on the _____ day of _____ 2024.

Ordinance #2024-03. An Ordinance Rescinding Title 10.11.225. (N) and (O). And Adopting New Amendments to Title 10.11.225.(N) and(O). And Adding Them to the Commercial Overlay Zone.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Corporate Seal of Fairfield Town Utah this _____ day of _____ 2024.

_____,
Stephanie Shelley
Fairfield Town Recorder/Clerk

(SEAL)

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

STATE OF UTAH)
)
COUNTY OF UTAH)

I, Stephanie Shelley, Town Recorder of Fairfield Town, Utah, do hereby certify and declare that I posted in three (3) public places the following summary of the ordinance which was passed by the Fairfield Town Council on the ____day of _____ 2024 and herein referred to as

SUMMARY.

An Ordinance Rescinding Title 10.11.225. (N) and (O); And Adopting New Amendments to Title 10.11.225.(N) and(O). And Adding Them to the Commercial Overlay Zone.

The three places are as follows:

1. Fairfield Town Hall
2. Fairfield Town Website
3. Utah State Public Notice Website

Stephanie Shelley
Fairfield Town Recorder/Clerk

Date of Posting ____day of _____ 2024

Working Draft Commercial Overlay 25-11-05

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

Minutes

Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office 121 West Main Street Fairfield, Utah

Time: 6:00 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Commissioner Riet opened the meeting at 6:03 pm. (Commissioner Riet Chaired this meeting)

David Riet, Wayne Taylor (via Zoom), Kyler Fisher, Jami Mascaro, Kelton Butterfield

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney, Treasurer: Codi Butterfield, Attorney: Todd Sheeran.

Others Present: Cheri Anderson, Dan McDonald, Councilman Michael Weber, Alina Pringle, Mark Pringle,

Via Zoom: Tal Adair, North Pointe Solid Waste SSD, Amy Walker, Aaron Weight, iPad, jim, Rob, Brian Carver (JUB), RL, Scot Hazard

2) Short Presentation on the Airpark Zone and Airpark Overlay by Todd Sheeran.

Town Attorney Todd Sheeran presented updates on revisions made to the previous draft of the Airpark (Airport Mixed Use) Zone and the Airport Overlay ordinances. He explained that the definitions section was revised to align terminology with applicable federal and state law, and that the compliance and applicability language was clarified to better describe development requirements within the zone. He noted that the development approval section now requires the submission of a Master Plan and includes specific criteria outlining the information that must be provided for review. Todd reported that the development standards were streamlined and reorganized into two parts—General Standards and Airport Standards—for improved clarity and structure. He further stated that special uses were removed from the body of the Airpark Zone ordinance and placed into a standalone Special Uses section (Exhibit C), so that the separate special use criteria govern any use designated as a special use in the table.

Todd emphasized the importance of the Airport Emergency Response Plan requirement, stating that an emergency plan is necessary for Town's awareness and preparedness in the event of an aircraft-related incident or other emergency. He clarified that the plan requirement is intended to ensure the Town can coordinate response and has the needed information on record, and that the ordinance should require the plan to align with applicable federal definitions rather than restating or enforcing FAA operational detail. Todd confirmed that the Airport Overlay ordinance language itself remained unchanged from the prior draft.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

3) Public Comment: *The Commission will accept public comment and may make a recommendation to the Town Council on the following items (no more than 2 minutes per person, with a 20-minute limit per item).*

Dan McDonald (Attorney for Intermountain Regional Landfill, IRL) spoke in person. He introduced himself as counsel for IRL and stated he reviewed the recent notice and ordinance drafts. He asserted there is a major mismatch between the ordinance text and the GSBS overlay exhibits. He said the GSBS map appears to show a 10,000-foot radius airport influence area, which he characterized as a medium-airport approach, while the ordinance text reads as if Fairfield is adopting standards for a small airport, which should correspond to a 5,000-foot influence area. He stated that the definition in §10.11.275.2 and the GSBS map do not align, and he believed the APO boundary definition in §10.11.275.4 also did not match the exhibits.

Mr. McDonald cited Utah Code Title 72, which defines airport influence areas as land within 5,000 feet of a runway. He said state law authorizes municipalities to regulate land use in the influence area only. He cautioned that extending regulation to 10,000 feet could exceed authority and invite legal challenge. He stated that if Fairfield intends a controlled development area of 10,000 feet, IRL cannot support adoption without a collaborative stakeholder process involving IRL, North Pointe, the Airpark, and other affected landowners. He added that IRL had not yet evaluated effects on its existing CUP and needed time to determine whether any new standards would apply to the landfill.

He further criticized terms on the GSBS map legend, such as “controlled development,” saying the term appears only once in the ordinance and needs a clear definition tied to boundaries. He stated that “airport” and “airpark” are used inconsistently in both drafts and should be corrected to avoid interpretive conflict. He suggested revising the ordinance to define “airport, small” as “5,000 feet or less.” He warned that incorporating FAA advisory circulars and state airport land-use guidelines wholesale by reference could put Fairfield in the position of enforcing federal guidance rather than operating within a narrow local zoning role. He concluded that the overlay geography and the ordinance’s scope were not clear to major stakeholders.

Amy Walker (Attorney for West Desert Air Park) commented online. She stated her main concern is the penalty/enforcement language combined with federal preemption. She referenced a letter she sent earlier that day and said municipal regulation of aircraft operations is preempted by the FAA, adding that a recent Utah Supreme Court decision (the “Hideout case”) supports this preemption position. She said other municipal ordinances typically regulate land use and safety surfaces but do not attempt to regulate flight operations or pilot behavior because those are FAA-exclusive. She objected to the draft’s misdemeanor level, stating it describes negligent violations as a Class B misdemeanor; she said Utah zoning law limits such violations to Class C misdemeanors, and only after conviction, and she believed a Class B designation exceeds the Town’s authority.

Aaron Weight, representing Property Reserve (the real estate holdings of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), adjacent to the Airpark, stated that they are closely monitoring the

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

proceedings. He noted that both he and his colleague, who manages the Fairfield Ranch, have been gathering information and communicating with the Mayor, Airpark representatives, and others to better understand the issues and potential impacts of the proposed ordinances. He emphasized that they strive to be good neighbors and partners within the communities where they operate. They do not yet feel adequately educated about the impacts of airport operations or the proposed zoning overlays. They are currently working with their legal teams and others with more experience to review and better understand the potential impacts. Because of that, they are not prepared at this time to comment on the merits of the ordinance, but wanted to be present, listen, and continue following the progress until they have more clarity on how it may affect them.

Todd Sheeran asked a follow-up question to clarify which attorneys Property Reserve was working with. Aaron Weight explained that they are working with Kirton & McConkie, though he was unsure who the primary attorney is, possibly Peter or Christopherson. Todd asked Aaron to let them know they may contact him with any questions.

Neil (North Pointe Solid Waste) spoke online. He pointed to Land-Use Restriction Part C language prohibiting uses that attract birds, create glare, interfere with flight, impair visibility, or create hazards, and noted that later “special considerations” sections reference landfills. He asked whether the landfill special-considerations language overrides Part C, or whether Part C could later be used against landfill operations if alleged bird hazards arise. He stated North Pointe maintains a fuel tank on site and was concerned the fuel-farm language in the draft might require FAA fuel-farm compliance for that tank. He referenced the General Standards requiring compliance with Town code, building/fire code, FAA recommendations, and state recommendations, and asked if that clause could allow FAA hazard opinions to later be used as a basis to shut down landfill operations.

Alina Pringle, an owner of the Airpark, stated the Airpark’s attorney, Amy Walker, had requested additional time for stakeholders and landowners to work with the Town to refine the zone and overlay language. He said the Airpark is willing to agree to a 60-day extension and a moratorium on filing development applications during that period, but delays are costly and have already resulted in lost development progress, including a \$1 million water sale that could not proceed. He emphasized the Airpark is seeking genuine collaboration and “a seat at the table” because the ordinances directly affect their property and long-term development rights.

Councilman Michael Weber commented that the Airpark's willingness to extend the moratorium appears to be an olive branch. He stated that, if accurate, the Town should allow the time needed for a thorough review. He added that it would further demonstrate goodwill if the Airpark agreed to extend the moratorium without additional conditions, showing a genuine interest in working collaboratively with the Town. He said the Airpark moratorium sounded like an olive branch. He believed Fairfield should accept more time for a careful process and stated that a sincere extension offer would help the Town and stakeholders resolve issues cleanly.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

Todd Sheeran explained that on Sunday, he contacted the West Desert Air Park's attorney, Amy, to discuss the Town's looming deadline under the pending ordinance, which requires adoption of a final ordinance within 180 days. With the deadline approaching on the 29th, he asked whether the Airpark would agree to extend the timeframe by refraining from submitting any applications. The Airpark agreed to a 60-day extension, though they also included additional requests. He noted that any agreement on an extension would ultimately need to be decided by the Town Council, and he provided this update to clarify why the matter was not brought before the Planning Commission that evening.

Mayor McKinney noted that the additional conditions included in the Airpark's proposed 60-day extension should be shared with the Planning Commission because several of those conditions involve bringing the Airpark to the table to negotiate the ordinance. She emphasized that the Planning Commission will ultimately be the body engaging in those discussions and therefore needs to be aware of the requested terms. She then asked Todd to read the list of additional requirements.

Todd Sheeran responded. He stated Fairfield is facing a pending ordinance clock requiring adoption within about 180 days and that the deadline was approaching near the end of September. He said he asked West Desert Air Park whether they would agree to a 60-day extension; they agreed but requested conditions. Todd read those conditions into the record, including: the extension must not affect the Ombudsman advisory opinion; related statements about the MDA; temporary issuance of three business licenses currently on hold in the zone; allowance for relocation of fire-marshall-required water suppression tanks; a defined collaborative role for major stakeholders; and adoption within a maximum 60-day window. Todd said these conditions are for Town Council consideration, and he believed additional time for collaboration could benefit all affected parties.

Commissioner Riet asked, Todd, what would you recommend we do to resolve this?

Todd's response, it was noted that several of these items should be decided by the Town Council, which would be meeting the following day. The Council could handle the negotiations itself or refer the matter back to the Planning Commission with direction or parameters, such as an additional review period. It was acknowledged that the draft ordinance is complex and was provided to the Planning Commission only a few days earlier, making a thorough review challenging. Additional time for collaboration with interested parties, including the Airpark, landfills, and the Church, was seen as beneficial for developing a workable ordinance.

Amy Walker asked Todd whether the planning commission could recommend granting this extension. Todd responded that the Planning Commission could recommend an extension be granted.

Commissioner Riet closed the Public Comment period.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

Business Items

The Commissioners *will discuss (without public comment) and may approve the following items:*

1) **Commissioner Discussion on the Airport Zone found in Town Code § 10.11.260.**

The Commissioners continued their review of the proposed Airport Zone ordinance and discussed several key components. Chairman Taylor stated that the Commission's goal was to identify any issues needing correction before forwarding the Airport Zone to the Town Council, noting that the ordinance is complex and time-sensitive under the pending-ordinance deadline. Commissioners also emphasized that any revisions made during this meeting were working-draft edits to be forwarded to Council for consideration.

Regarding the Airport Emergency Response Plan, commissioners discussed how the plan should be required and reviewed without Fairfield overstepping into FAA-regulated operations. Commissioners debated whether the ordinance should include a detailed list of emergency-plan elements or instead require submission of an FAA-compliant plan as part of the Master Plan. Mayor McKinney noted that the development approval section already requires an emergency plan, but a later subsection lists extensive and highly specific plan contents, and questioned whether that level of detail should be removed to avoid over-regulating. The Chair agreed that the FAA already outlines emergency-plan requirements and that Fairfield should not restate or attempt to enforce federal operational detail, as doing so could exceed Town authority; however, he emphasized that the Town still needs an emergency plan on record so local emergency services understand how to respond in the event of a crash, fuel incident, or other airport emergency. Todd Sheeran added that the Town's interest is practical public health and safety—verifying that a compliant plan exists and ensuring the Town can coordinate response—rather than regulating aviation operations. The Commission agreed to retain the emergency plan requirement, require that an FAA-compliant plan be submitted with the Master Plan for Town review and awareness, and avoid codifying detailed federal operational requirements in Town code.

The Commissioners also reviewed the Limited Development Zone around the runway. It was explained that the Limited Development Zone is included in the state land-use guide and is tied to FAA recommendations. Commissioners acknowledged concerns raised by the Airpark but agreed to keep the zone in place because removing it would shift where the overlay's conical safety surface begins, potentially reducing protection to the public. Commissioners further stated

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

that FAA advisory circulars can contradict each other, making it difficult to draft a fully precise ordinance without expert confirmation, and that this was part of the reason additional technical and stakeholder review was needed. Chair Taylor recommended meeting with the Town attorney, engineer, mayor, and key stakeholders to further evaluate the Limited Development Zone and consider any potential refinements.

In discussing air traffic patterns and noise, commissioners agreed to keep the existing ordinance language. They reiterated that Fairfield cannot regulate flight paths or operational flight patterns once aircraft are in the air, as those matters are under FAA control. However, commissioners stated the Town may still adopt land-use standards and local statements addressing potential nuisance impacts. They felt the noise/nuisance language should remain, so Fairfield has a local tool to respond to resident concerns without attempting to control FAA-regulated operations.

The Commissioners then considered the preferred runway designation. The draft listed initially both Runway 17 and Runway 35 for preferred departure. Commissioners decided to revise the ordinance to designate Runway 17 as the preferred departure direction. They discussed that this preference is intended for calm-wind conditions, recognizing that wind and safety ultimately dictate actual runway use. Commissioners described the preference as a strong expectation/honor-system approach meant to reduce aircraft noise impacts over residential areas by encouraging southbound departures when weather allows. They noted that emphasizing Runway 17 departures could lessen noise over Main Street and nearby homes.

The Commissioners decided to retain the runway protection zone requirements in both the Airport Zone ordinance and the Airport Overlay ordinance, including easements and property-control standards. Commissioners stated these provisions are referenced in FAA guidance in both contexts and should remain for safety, consistency, and clarity.

Questions were raised regarding pilot and tenant compliance requirements. Several commissioners questioned whether this section was redundant because other clauses in the ordinance already require ongoing compliance by operators and responsible parties. Todd Sheeran advised that he needed additional legal research on whether Fairfield can regulate pilot and tenant compliance at a public-use airport and how public/private/public-use authority applies. Until that research is completed, commissioners chose to leave the pilot and tenant

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

compliance section in place to preserve the Town's intent and to revisit it once legal guidance is obtained.

Commissioners also briefly acknowledged the operational significance of the extended runway length, noting that the runway has expanded from roughly 2,600 feet to over 5,200 feet, and that ordinance protections should reflect the increased scope and intensity of aircraft activity associated with that expansion.

a) Motion to send the Revisions to the Airport Zone found in Town Code § 10.11.260 to the Town Council for approval.

Commissioner Mascaro motioned to send the revisions to the airport zone found in town code §10.11.260 to the Town Council for approval or denial, allowing the Town Council to decide whether to grant the 60-day extension request by the Airpark. Seconded by Commissioner Fisher. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

2) Commissioner Discussion on the Airport Overlay found in Town Code § 10.11.275

The Commissioners reviewed the size and shape of the Airport Overlay area shown in the GSBS drawings. Commissioners began by comparing the overlay boundary in the GSBS exhibits to the state-defined airport influence area and noted that the drawings depict an overlay extending 10,000 feet from the runway ends and also outward from the runway centerline sides. Several commissioners stated that the overlay, as drawn, appeared extremely large and would affect most properties in Fairfield. They clarified that the overlay was not a simple circle but a runway-based "hot-dog" shape, consisting of semicircular arcs extending 10,000 feet beyond each runway end (north and south) with a 10,000-foot lateral extension on both sides along the full runway length. Commissioners stated that because the runway sits near the center of town, a 10,000-foot hot-dog overlay essentially covers most of Fairfield and seemed to go beyond what state law contemplates. Brian Carver of JUB Engineering confirmed that Utah's airport influence area is defined at 5,000 feet and explained that while an overlay zone must be at least as large as the influence area, it does not need to exceed that distance without a specific legal or safety justification. He stated that, in his professional opinion, the 10,000-foot overlay was excessive

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

and that Fairfield could adopt an overlay mirroring the influence-area size using the same hot-dog geometry with 5,000-foot arcs and lateral offsets. Commissioners responded that the influence area is the zone where landowners must be notified and where FAA paperwork is triggered for construction affecting airspace, and they questioned why Fairfield would regulate double that distance if not required.

The Commission then discussed how the overlay's height-restriction surfaces function and how they intersect with surrounding land uses, particularly the landfills. The Airpark representative explained the overlay color bands on the map, noting that the blue area represents the conical surface and the green area represents the horizontal surface. He stated that within the conical surface area, structures exceeding roughly 200 feet above ground require FAA notification, while the horizontal surface triggers FAA notice at approximately 150 feet. He emphasized that the overlay does not automatically prohibit development at those heights but requires FAA notification and appropriate marking or lighting so pilots can identify obstacles. Commissioners compared these limits to existing landfill allowances, noting that nearby landfill properties are already permitted to build to roughly 200 feet. They expressed concern that an oversized overlay could create unnecessary future conflicts or burdens on established landfill operations without providing a clear additional safety benefit.

As the discussion continued, commissioners weighed whether to recommend immediately reducing the overlay boundary to 5,000 feet to align with state standards or to forward the ordinance to the Town Council as written due to the pending ordinance timeline. Commissioners stated that although the overlay map likely needs correction to match the state influence-area definition, they were under time pressure and believed Council could evaluate and finalize the appropriate boundary. One commissioner stated that maintaining a 10,000-foot overlay would impact twice as many landowners "for no reason," while others said the safest procedural course was to move the ordinance forward now and allow the Town Council to determine whether the overlay should be redrawn to 5,000 feet.

The Commissioners voted to either leave the Overlay at 10,000 or shrink it. The vote was three to two. With three to 'Leave it' and Two to shrink it.

Commissioner Taylor - Leave it
Commissioner Riet - Change It
Commissioner Fisher - Leave it

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 16, 2025

Commissioner Mascaro - Change it

Commissioner Butterfield - Change it

- a) Motion to send the Revisions to the Airport Overlay found in Town Code § 10.11.275 to the Town Council for approval.**

Commissioner Fisher motioned to send the revision to the airport overlay, found in the town code 10.11.275, to the Town Council for approval or denial. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. Unanimously approved

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Mascaro to end the meeting. Commissioner Riet seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 7:45 pm.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 22, 2025

Minutes

Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office 121 West Main Street Fairfield, Utah

Time: 7:30 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Commissioner Taylor opened the meeting at 7:30 pm

David Riet, Wayne Taylor, Kelton Butterfield, and Kyler Fisher (arrived at 7:43)

Excused Commissioners:

Jami Mascaro

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney, Treasurer: Codi Butterfield

Others Present: Michael Weber, Joel McKinney

Via Zoom: Brian, iPad, iPhone (158)

Business Items

The Commissioners will discuss (without public comment) and may approve the following items

1) Review the Airpark Mix Use Zone and Special Uses Ordinance.

The Commissioners reviewed Ordinance 2025-16, which repeals and reinstates Fairfield Town Code Section 10.11.260, renaming the Air Park Zone to the Air Park Mixed Use Zone, and amends Town Code Section 10.16 (Special Uses) to regulate special use provisions by adding additional special uses.

Chairman Taylor read portions of Ordinance 2025-16 into the record, including the ordinance purpose, findings, and authority sections, specifically the “Whereas” clauses describing the Town’s reliance on FAA Advisory Circulars (Exhibit 1), the Airports and Land Use Guide and Introduction for Local Leaders (Exhibit 2), and consultation with aviation experts. Chairman Taylor explained that these sections establish the regulatory basis for the Airpark Mixed Use Zone and related special use provisions. Commissioners indicated they had no questions regarding the advisory materials or supporting documentation included with the ordinance.

2) Review Exhibit A, Airpark Mixed Use Zone.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 22, 2025

The Commissioners reviewed Exhibit A, which sets forth the regulations for the Airpark Mixed Use Zone. Chairman Taylor drew attention to Section 10.11.260.9 on easements and property control requirements, reading into the record that, “Any public use airport or public airport located within Fairfield town limits shall conform to the requirements of this chapter and 14 CFR part 77 and Utah Code 72-10.403, Airport Zoning Act, and FAA AC 150/5300-13b.” Commissioners expressed no concerns regarding this section.

3) Review Exhibit B, Standards for Special and Conditional Uses

The Commissioners reviewed Exhibit B, which establishes standards for special and conditional uses. It was mentioned that revisions had been made to address earlier concerns, particularly in the section on private air schools. The prior language could have prevented non-owners from operating at the airport, so it was modified to ensure the current operator may continue without restriction.

The Commissioners reviewed Exhibit B, which establishes standards for special and conditional uses. Staff stated that the language had been revised since the prior meeting to reduce redundancy and to clarify sections that were previously “wordy.” Particular attention was given to private air school operations. Staff explained that the earlier draft could have been interpreted to prevent non-owners from operating at the airport, including the current operator, and that the section was modified to ensure the existing private air school may continue operating without restriction. Commissioners indicated the revision resolved the earlier concern and aligned with the intent of the ordinance.

Chairman Taylor referenced a highlighted comment on page 4 regarding permitted hangar uses and small-airport standards. The ordinance states hangars must be used primarily for aeronautical purposes, including aircraft storage, and references FAA small-airport guidance. Mayor McKinney discussed that FAA advisory circulars define a small airport as 20 based aircraft/hangars, while the Fairfield Airpark currently has 29 hangars. The Commission agreed the ordinance should remain consistent with FAA small-airport standards, and that the existing 29 hangars would be treated as a legal, grandfathered condition. Commissioners noted FAA circular standards can be “gray areas,” and compared this to runway standards—explaining that while a small airport runway standard is 5,000 feet, Fairfield’s runway is approximately 5,300 feet, and any future expansion beyond the small-airport standard would require returning to the Town for review. No further changes to Exhibit B were requested.

Staff also noted a correction made the previous evening: a fuel dispenser/fueling use had been mistakenly listed both as a conditional use and a special use. Staff clarified it is a special use and removed the conditional-use duplication. Commissioners agreed with the correction.

When Commissioner Fisher arrived at 7:43 pm, the Commissioners brought him up to speed on the discussion and allowed him time to review the updated Exhibit B before

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 22, 2025

proceeding. After final review, members indicated the revised language was clear, precise, and aligned with the Commissioners' intent to support existing airport operations while remaining compliant with applicable regulations.

Commissioner Riet motioned to send Ordinance #2025-16. To the Ordinance Repealing and Reinstating Fairfield Town Code § 10.11.260. Airpark Zone (renamed Airpark Mixed Use Zone), and Amending Town Code § 10.16. Special Use Regulations, Adding Additional Special Uses. With a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission for approval to the Town Council. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Reit - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

The Planning Commission had several meetings in September. Chairman Taylor asked if anyone had "heartburn" about cancelling the October 1, 2025, meeting because it was only 8–9 days away; Commissioners agreed and asked the Recorder to post cancellation on the website. So they decided to cancel the October 2025 meeting.

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Riet to end the meeting. Commissioner Fisher seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 7:51 pm.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 24, 2025

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office 121 West Main Street Fairfield, Utah

Time: 6:30 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Commissioner Taylor opened the meeting at 6:30 pm

David Riet (via Zoom), Wayne Taylor, Jami Mascaro, Kelton Butterfield (on the phone)

Excused Commissioners:

Kyler Fisher

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney

Others Present: Codis' iPhone, Amy Walker

Business Items

The Commission will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

1) **Ordinance #2025-17 An Ordinance Repealing and Reinstating Fairfield Town Code § 10.11.275 Airpark Overlay.**

Mayor McKinney noted that the date on the written agenda was incorrect.

Chairman Taylor stated that, therefore, the meeting was not noticed correctly and could not be legally held.

Adjournment

Commissioner Taylor closed the meeting.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
November 5, 2025

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office 121 West Main Street Fairfield, Utah

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Chairman Taylor opened the meeting at 7:00 pm

David Riet, Wayne Taylor, Kyler Fisher, Jami Mascaro, Kelton Butterfield

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney, Attorney: Brad Christopherson,

Others Present: Tal Adair, Michael Weber

Via Zoom: Jane

Chairman Taylor introduced Brad Christopherson (attorney) as the Town's new legal counsel.

Consent Items

The Commission may approve these items without discussion or public comment and may remove an item to the Business Items for discussion and consideration.

1) Minutes: August 6, 2025; August 14, 2025; September 3, 2025; September 9, 2025;

The Commissioners discussed wording in the August 14, 2025, minutes regarding private wells/well-sharing and agreed the Recorder would adjust the language to reflect the discussion more accurately.

Commissioner Mascaro motion to pass the consent minutes for August 6, 2025; August 14, 2025; September 3, 2025; and September 9, 2025. Commissioner Riet seconded the motion. Unanimously approved

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Business Items

The Commissioners will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

1) Fairfield Industrial Park, an additional 50-foot flagpole location.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Regular Meeting

November 5, 2025

Chairman Taylor explained that the Fairfield Industrial Park had previously been approved on April 8, 2025, for a 50-foot flagpole with two new possible locations: one by the main gate/entrance to development, and one by the entrance to the truss plant lot. The current request was to add two additional potential locations, increasing the total to four. A map was presented to show all proposed sites, with the two previously approved locations highlighted in orange and the two new locations highlighted in blue, identified near the main gate entrance and by the entrance to the truss plant lot.

Chairman Taylor stressed the need to formally approve all four locations as shown on the map to prevent future confusion. Commissioner Riet then drafted a clear motion to approve the updated map locations within the Fairfield Light Industrial West zone, noting that placement must remain compliant with federal, state, and local laws.

Commissioner Riet motioned that we pass agenda item 1, Fairfield Industrial Park, light industrial west zone, 50-foot flagpole addition locations, there are four locations on the map, and the commission would sign the map designating that we approved it. Commissioner Mascaro seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

2) Report from the Mayor

Mayor McKinney gave updates on several ongoing town projects. She reported that Comcast will begin boring on Monday and that the town has completed the required blue stake process. She also noted that the town's new attorney, Brad Christopherson, has begun work on the airport ordinance not yet fully reviewed by counsel; He's working on it to get there, but there's a lot of issues that you have to get through to get there.

The Mayor announced that the updated code book is nearly finished. A complete draft incorporating all ordinances passed over the last two years has been prepared and will soon be sent for codification. Once complete, this will place all town ordinances in one consolidated location, making it easier for residents and officials to track and understand what has been adopted. Currently, the older code book and more recent ordinances are stored separately on the town website, creating confusion.

Regarding the park project, Mayor McKinney explained that some of the original dirt had to be removed because it contained arsenic and could not be reused. That dirt was taken to the landfill, and clean fill dirt was brought in. Capping work is now underway. Strong's company is completing the project, and their bid came in at roughly half the cost of other proposals.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Regular Meeting

November 5, 2025

Mayor McKinney also announced that Comcast expects the Fairfield area to be completed by December 2, 2025. Comcast said it will run fiber to every home in town, and Comcast may work on Sundays if needed to stay on schedule, depending on weather conditions. She concluded by noting that additional work is still needed on the commercial zone, land use ordinances, and road ordinances.

3) Commercial overlay/ zone

The Commissioners reviewed the Commercial Overlay Zone currently in place. They restated that the overlay runs along SR-73/Highway 73 on both sides through the town and extends approximately 300 feet back from the highway from the north end to the south end of Fairfield. They noted that the overlay area includes existing residential properties and touches areas that may be industrial or transitioning in use.

They discussed concerns with the ordinance language, indicating that parcels labeled commercial can no longer be used for residential purposes, especially since many affected properties are long-standing 5–10 acre residential lots along the highway. Attorney Brad Christopherson explained that overlays are typically intended to add allowable uses rather than remove underlying residential rights unless the town specifically chooses that outcome. He advised that residential use should remain permitted within the overlay unless the Commissioners intend otherwise. The Chairman and Commissioners emphasized the importance of protecting existing residential uses and avoiding unintended loss of residential rights.

Commissioners and counsel addressed compatibility between commercial and residential uses. Brad Christopherson recommended a transition approach where commercial areas adjacent to homes are limited to lighter impacts, using concepts such as “neighborhood commercial” or other buffering standards to prevent high-intensity commercial uses from being placed directly next to existing residences.

A significant portion of the discussion focused on conditional uses. Brad stated that in Utah, once a use is listed as conditional, it becomes difficult to deny if the applicant meets the ordinance standards; the Town may impose reasonable conditions, but cannot refuse simply because the use is undesirable. He cautioned that broad conditional-use lists increase legal exposure and recommended dramatically shortening the use lists and potentially eliminating most conditional uses in favor of clearer permitted/accessory/special-use standards. Commissioners agreed that prior practice relied too heavily on conditional uses and that a more structured chart-based approach would be preferable.

The Commissioners also flagged several ordinance issues for further work. They noted missing standards for spacing between multiple buildings on the same lot, and questioned whether current setbacks alone would prevent buildings from being placed too close together. They reviewed height standards and expressed concern that the ordinance references two stories while allowing buildings up to 45 feet. Brad Christopherson stated that 45 feet is not two stories

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Regular Meeting

November 5, 2025

but closer to four stories, creating a loophole that could allow much taller buildings than residents expect. Commissioners agreed that the building needs to be addressed and discussed, reducing the height limit closer to 35 feet, with allowance for screened mechanical units above the roofline.

Additional wording in the ordinance was highlighted, including access standards. The Chairman questioned language suggesting vehicle and pedestrian access should be “exclusively and entirely across the subject lot,” noting it could be interpreted as requiring full-frontage access or sidewalk development. Brad recommended simplifying the requirement to a frontage/access standard and reminded the Commissioners that UDOT controls SR-73 access approvals, so Town standards should align accordingly. The Commissioners also discussed whether nuisance standards (noise, odor, glare, etc.) should be more clearly defined in a separate nuisance section and referenced within the overlay.

Regarding use lists and existing businesses, Brad explained that if certain uses are removed from the overlay, any existing operations under those uses would become legal nonconforming uses and could continue unless abandoned, meaning removing uses would not automatically shut existing businesses down. Commissioners agreed not to use the Light Industrial West list as the basis for commercial overlay uses and directed that the overlay be rebuilt from scratch with a short permitted list, requiring other uses to come before the Town for approval.

Commissioners agreed to continue studying options before final decisions. This included considering multiple commercial zones of different intensities, aligning the overlay with the General Plan, reviewing the Tech Overlay Zone, and examining examples such as Eagle Mountain’s commercial zoning and maps. The Commissioners also discussed possibly engaging planning consultants or a planning firm to assist with the overlay framework and use list development.

During this item, a member of the public (Jane, via Zoom) briefly shared historical context on commercial zoning in Fairfield. Chairman Taylor allowed the brief comment but reminded attendees that public comment is not permitted during business items and requested future comments be submitted by email due to the contentious nature of the topic.

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Masacaro to end the meeting. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 8:38 pm.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 3, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office, 121 West Main Street, Fairfield, Utah

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Minutes By: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Chairman Taylor opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

David Riet, Wayne Taylor, Kyler Fisher, Jami Mascaro, Kelton Butterfield

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Officer: Sargent Garrett Duston, Treasurer: Codi Butterfield (Codi's iPhone)

Via Zoom: mhany (Mike Hanyon), iPad, Tal Adair, Oscar's iPhone

Consent Items

The Commission may approve these items without discussion or public comment and may remove an item to the Business Items for discussion and consideration.

1) Minutes: September 16, 2025; September 22, 2025; September 24, 2025; November 5, 2025.

Chairman Taylor explained that after discussing with town staff, he felt the minutes were "a little light," particularly given the weight of the air park discussions they contained. He suggested tabling the minutes to add more detail, noting they covered "the meat" of what happened but might be missing important elements.

Commissioner Riet agreed that while the minutes seemed to cover key points, it was worth ensuring they didn't miss anything significant.

Commissioner Riet motioned to table the minutes this meeting to give us time to further review the meeting minutes and make sure that we didn't miss anything. Commissioner Butterfield seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

2) **2026 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule with a Start Time of 6 pm or 7 pm**

The commissioners discussed whether to maintain the current 7:00 PM start time or move to 6:00 PM for meetings. Commissioner Riet expressed concern about meetings running late, noting it interferes with his work the following day. Commissioner Fisher mentioned that the first half of the year works well for him at 7:00 PM, while the second half would be better at 6:00 PM due to sports scheduling.

Chairman Taylor suggested maintaining consistency with the 7:00 PM time while being mindful to keep meetings from running too late. Commissioner Riet recalled past experiences with meetings running until 10:00-10:30 PM that were problematic for his schedule.

Commissioner Mascaro motioned to approve the 2026 Planning Commission Meeting schedule with a start time at 7 pm. Commissioner Riet seconded the motion.

Unanimously approved

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Business Items

The Commission will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

1) **Hape Properties Site Plan**

The Commissioners reviewed the Hape Properties site plan and its location. Chairman Taylor let the Commissioner know that it is located in the Bolinder subdivision and near the storage units.

Commissioners discussed the commercial site plan checklist and noted it had expanded substantially since past uses. Commissioner Riet stated the checklist felt “hellacious” compared to earlier versions and included items that did not seem necessary for site plan approval at this stage. Chairman Taylor said he has been using this checklist for a while. Commissioners agreed that several checklist items were more appropriate for building permit review than for Planning Commission site plan review.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

Commissioner Fisher pointed out one specific item they could not find on the plan: the fire hydrant was shown, but not labeled with a dimension in feet. Chairman Taylor acknowledged the missing explicit dimension but noted that, based on the plan scale, the hydrant distance appeared compliant and not a major concern. Commissioners confirmed that waterline and sewer measurements were shown.

Commissioners also discussed a utility easement and gas line references.

Commissioner Riet said the utility easement appeared to be drawn, but the notation/key was unclear. Chairman Taylor agreed that some references in the key did not visibly match markings on the plan, making them hard to verify on paper. Commissioners concluded that the easement was along the road frontage, even though they could not easily see the note on their printout.

Discussion then shifted to fencing. Commissioner Taylor stated the plan showed a fence line on the property and that the submitted detail sheets described a chain-link fence with screening. Mike Hanyon (applicant) clarified that the site already had an 8-foot metal “no-see” fence consistent with nearby storage units. Commissioners expressed that they were satisfied with the fencing plan.

Mike Hanyon explained the project scope and phasing. The overall plan showed four buildings, but only Building 1 was being constructed initially due to current power limitations, with future buildings to come later as utilities allow.

Commissioner Riet brought up how many parking stalls are in the plan. If the Commissioners do not know what type of use the buildings are going to be used for, how can they determine if they have enough parking stalls? Mike Hanyon, stated that because the buildings are speculative/rental space, they cannot predict final tenant use now, but additional stall area is available if needed.

Mike Hanyon informed the Commissioners that the development would proceed in phases and that only one building would be completed and ready for occupancy initially due to current power limitations.

Mike Hanyon informed the Commissioners that the arsenic report and other reports have been submitted. This was verified by Chairman Taylor with Mayor McKinney prior to the meeting that these documents were in the Mayor's possession.

Mike Hanyon further described the building type and site layout. The building will be a concrete-and-wood “stand-up” style structure (similar to one previously built in Lehi), approximately 22 feet tall with concrete walls, wood framing above, a metal roof, stucco

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

exterior, and brick on the front façade. The site includes a looped internal roadway connecting north and south entrances on Allen Ranch Road, with truck circulation designed so semis can access the rear loading doors. Pavement is planned around the building with staged completion as development proceeds.

Mike Hanyon informed the Commissioners that all required documents had been submitted and that one water share was transferred today, with finalization underway. Chairman Taylor noted that although water shares may typically align with building permit timing, they remained on the (Site Plans) current checklist, and the requirement was satisfied.

Commissioner Mascaro asked about the letter 'will serve' from Rocky Mountain Power. Mike stated that Rocky Mountain Power is dragging their feet. He has met with them and is awaiting a response. He stated that the lack of power is why only Building one is going first, and the tenant type is limited to lower-power users (likely contractors/storage). He also said they would wire the buildings now for future three-phase power.

Chairman Taylor asked Mike whether he had spoken with the Fairfield Industrial Park about the three-phase power. Mike said Mayor McKinney had spoken to him about what they were doing and what they were waiting on from Rocky Mountain Power. Chairman Taylor encourages him to reach out and talk to them.

Commissioner Butterfield asked Mike Hanyon about the street lighting. Mike said they have the lighting on another plan. Some of the lighting will be on the building. There is some lighting on the gates.

After confirming that major required elements were present and that the remaining checklist issues were largely procedural or better suited to building permit review, Chairman Taylor asked for any further concerns; none were raised.

Commissioner Mascaro motioned to approve business item number one, the Hape property site plan to approved it. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

2) OMBM amended Site Plan

Chairman Taylor explained that this item was added to the agenda late with the expectation that plans would be submitted in time for review. However, as of 9:00 PM the previous night, the plans had not been received, which was too late for proper review.

Commissioner Riet motioned to table Item number 2 until we have further plans and time to review them. Commissioner Mascaro seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

3) Landscape Requirements

Chairman Taylor talked to the Commissioners concerning the Landscape Ordinance draft as a work-in-progress intended for detailed review and refinement. Chairman Taylor noted that definitions had been added to the document and emphasized that the The Commissioners are trying to strengthen the ordinance and will not be moving it forward to the town council in this meeting.

Chairman Taylor read through the ordinance's purpose statements, explaining that the chapter is intended to protect public health, safety, and welfare by supporting attractive, well-designed, context-sensitive development; enhancing property values; promoting visual harmony; improving the appearance of streets and rights-of-way; complementing building architecture; buffering incompatible land uses; reducing visual or environmental impacts from high-intensity uses, and encouraging water conservation through drought-tolerant, native, or low-water plant species suited to Fairfield's arid climate. Commissioners agreed that these objectives were appropriate and should be treated as minimum standards that applicants may exceed.

Chairman Taylor reviewed the section requiring commercial applicants to submit a landscaping plan with their development application. The Commission discussed the listed objectives, including: preserving desert character, mitigating the visual impacts of buildings and parking areas, providing variety through plant materials and seasonal changes, adding screening to buffer service areas and adjacent uses, and enhancing year-round beautification through evergreen vegetation, seasonal color elements, and

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

complementary hardscape. Commissioner Riet interpreted “seasonal changes” as the inclusion of landscaping (e.g., trees or vegetation) that changes color or appearance throughout the year, Commissioners agreed.

Commissioners discussed the draft term “evergreen vegetation.” The Commissioners agreed evergreens are plants that stay green year-round, such as pine or juniper trees or certain shrubs. Chairman Taylor stated they had looked up the definition to confirm. Commissioner Riet then noted Fairfield’s soil and water-table conditions vary widely from the Town Center toward highway/outskirts areas, affecting what can practically grow; they suggested acknowledging these realities when finalizing standards.

The Commissioners addressed the draft language that assigned the landscape plan evaluation to the Planning Commission and Town Council. The Commissioners stated that landscaping review should fall primarily to the Fairfield Building Department during the building permit stage, because the Commissioners only see site plans once and do not re-review landscaping details later. The group agreed to strike the Planning Commission/Town Council from that line and replace it with the Building Department as the compliance reviewer. Chairman Taylor indicated this was consistent with how final permit packages are handled.

Commissioners also discussed the level of professional qualification needed for landscape plans. Commissioner Butterfield felt that requiring an architect or engineer for basic landscaping could be an undue burden; they agreed the ordinance should require a “licensed landscape professional” rather than an architect/engineer, since many suppliers provide professional plan layouts without additional cost.

Chairman Taylor reviewed residential requirements: all yards visible from public streets must be landscaped, and the improved landscaping area must be at least equal to the square footage of the primary dwelling. Acceptable improvements include xeriscaping with drought-tolerant/native plants, integrated hardscape (driveways, sidewalks, etc.), low-water ground cover and shrubs, and trees, are strongly encouraged but not required. The Commissioners supported the approach of encouraging trees without mandating them, given Fairfield’s growing challenges.

Chairman Taylor talked about stormwater retention areas, which must be landscaped, and said rock/hardscape counts as landscaping.

Commissioners discussed water-wise standards for commercial/industrial areas, including a draft requirement that at least 20% of the landscaped area be live

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

vegetation. Commissioner Riet initially expressed concern about enforcing a percentage requirement; however, Commissioner Butterfield supported it as a necessary baseline to promote beautification and avoid developments consisting only of rock or decorative metal features. Speakers noted the requirement originated from Jordan Valley Water Conservancy guidance and was aimed at supporting native grasses and vegetation that can survive in desert conditions. The Commissioners leaned toward keeping the 20% standard as written, understanding it as a minimum expectation for live planting.

The Commissioners read, "Vegetation must be evenly distributed, not segregated into clusters," and several Commissioners questioned it and leaned toward striking it.

Commissioners talked about xeriscaping terminology. They explicitly discussed the common term "zeroscaping," and Chairman Taylor read the definition, emphasizing it does not mean bare dirt/weeds.

Chairman Taylor reviewed technical minimums such as tree caliper sizes and evergreen height standards, and corrected internal consistency issues (for example, adjusting deciduous tree caliper language to align with definitions elsewhere in the draft). The Commissioners also discussed allowing extensions (up to six months with bonded assurance) when weather prevents timely installation.

Chairman Taylor stated they would incorporate the Commissioners edits into the next draft and return it for continued review.

4) **Commercial Overlay Zone**

Chairman Taylor stated the purpose of the item was to gather Commissioners' ideas based on the General Plan goals, to guide offline drafting before returning with a more complete ordinance proposal.

Key discussion points included:

Commissioners supported commercial development in appropriate areas (examples included a potential gas station), but emphasized protecting existing residential areas that are currently mixed within commercial zones.

The Commissioners discussed creating distance or buffering requirements between high-intensity commercial uses (e.g., gas stations) and homes, schools, or churches, to reduce impacts such as traffic, noise, and lighting.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

December 3, 2025

Chairman Taylor used a very specific scenario (gas station between Verns' house and Grandpa Reed's house) to illustrate why distance buffers matter, and floated possible buffer distances (300/400/800 feet—unknown number, just illustrating concept).

Chairman Taylor described seeing commercial lighting a few feet from a backyard in Eagle Mountain, "lit like daylight at night," and said Fairfield should avoid that outcome.

Commissioners discussed that fencing/walls and screening could help mitigate headlight and light spillover into backyards; examples from other cities were referenced, showing poor outcomes when commercial lighting abuts residences.

Commissioner Riet suggested splitting commercial zoning into layered categories (e.g., "commercial residential," "light commercial," "heavy commercial") to protect existing homes better, while still allowing growth, citing examples from Eagle Mountain and current development patterns along the main road.

Commissioner Fisher raised the idea of limiting "permitted uses" lists to avoid unintentionally encouraging undesirable development; Chairman Taylor noted developers may resist delays, so clear standards and strong enforcement would be needed.

Chairman Taylor stated that they would compile the feedback, add supporting materials (including Eagle Mountain examples) to the next packet, and return with a revised draft of the language.

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Mascaro to end the meeting. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 8:59 pm.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

Minutes

Date: Thursday, September 25, 2025

Location: Fairfield Town Office 121 West Main Street Fairfield, Utah

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Commissioner Taylor opened the meeting at 7:01 pm

Commissioners present: Wayne Taylor (Chair), David Riet (via Zoom), Jami Mascaro.
Commissioner Kelton Butterfield arrived at 7:13 p.m. Excused: Kyler Fisher.

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney, Treasurer: Codi Butterfield (via Zoom)

Others Present:

Michael Weber, Mark Pringle, Alina Pringle

Via Zoom:

Ihulme, Amy Walker, Cherie Anderson, iPad, iPhone(3)

Business Items

The Commission will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

1) Ordinance #2025-17 An Ordinance Repealing and Reinstating Fairfield Town Code § 10.11.275 Airpark Overlay.

Chairman Taylor stated the Commission's role was to review Ordinance #2025-17. An ordinance repealing and He reiterated that the purpose of the ordinance was to repeal the existing Airpark Overlay section and reinstate it in a form consistent with Utah State Code requirements for public-use airports, and that no new overlay map or boundary changes were being created as part of this action.

Mayor McKinney proposed opening the meeting up to public comment with a two-minute limit per speaker.

Amy Walker, attorney for West Desert Airpark, stated that she had not expected a public comment period but wished to speak briefly. She explained that her understanding was that the proposed change was primarily limited to revising a paragraph of the code to reference applicable state and federal law, and she stated that she supported bringing the ordinance into compliance with the Utah State Code. Ms. Walker emphasized, however, that she had concerns regarding language in the ordinance referencing FAA advisory circulars. She explained that advisory circulars are guidance documents and recommendations, not enforceable law, and

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

expressed concern that requiring compliance with advisory circulars at the municipal level could be interpreted as an overreach beyond what state law requires. She acknowledged that FAA Part 77 is appropriately incorporated and applicable, but noted that the overlay also references FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13B. Ms. Walker stated her concern was ensuring that advisory materials are not treated as mandatory regulatory requirements and thanked the Commission for the opportunity to clarify that distinction before concluding her remarks.

Mayor Hollie McKinney responded that the purpose of Ordinance #2025-17 was to align Fairfield's Airpark Overlay with Utah State Code requirements for public-use airports, not to impose additional or independent local regulations beyond what state law requires. She clarified that FAA advisory circulars referenced in the broader airport mixed-use zoning framework have been used as guidance and recommendations, not as binding law, and emphasized that the overlay revision before the Commission was focused specifically on state-law compliance.

Loyal Hulme (Counsel for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints)

Mr. Hulme introduced himself as legal counsel for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and stated that the Church is a significant property owner in the airpark area. He apologized for arriving late and urged the Commission to delay a decision on Ordinance #2025-17 until the issues could be resolved. He said the ordinance still contained internal ambiguities and needed polishing, and he questioned whether residential use is allowed in the Airport Mixed Use Zone. He referenced §10.11.265, noting it states that only expressly listed uses are allowed and that residential use is not listed, yet other sections of the code contemplate residential development, leaving landowners uncertain about their development rights. He further stated that Ordinance 17 proposes a repeal and reinstatement of the overlay and appears intended to delete §10.11.275 and replace it in full, but that intent was unclear in the drafting. He asked whether the overlay applies only to a public-use airport or also imposes restrictions on non-airport properties outside the boundary, and he warned that if the overlay effectively expands FAA-related requirements onto adjacent parcels, it could raise concerns of land use takings.

As his time concluded, Mr. Hulme stated that his plea was simply for more time so the Church could work with the Town to produce a clear, mutual ordinance. He said it felt like there was a rush that might not be necessary, especially if the airpark owner agreed not to file or take action during a short continuance. He emphasized that granting a standstill would leave the parties no worse off and would allow the Town to re-notice the ordinance after the Notice of Intent expires, with sufficient time to clean up and clarify the code. He said the Church did not need months, but believed the issues could be resolved in a matter of weeks if the continuance were granted.

Mayor McKinney responded that she states the purpose of Ordinance #2025-17 is to align Fairfield's overlay with Utah State Code for public-use airports, not to add new independent town requirements. She clarifies that FAA advisory circulars mentioned in broader mixed-use

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

airport zoning have been treated as guidance/recommendations, and the overlay revision itself is about state-law compliance.

Chairman Taylor answers Ms. Walker's concerns next. He agrees that advisory circulars are advisory, reiterates that FAA Part 77 and state code are the controlling standards, and says circulars were used only as drafting guidance in earlier mixed-use airport zoning work. He again clarifies that no new overlay map/boundary changes are being created tonight.

Mr. Hulme addressed Ms. Walker and asked whether the airpark would be willing to give an extension without conditions. Ms. Walker replied that she would need to confirm with her client, but said they were open to that conversation. She added that she believed the two contingencies the Town had opposed were related to the postponement of specific business licenses. Mr. Hulme then stated that, without an unconditional continuance, Ms. Walker was likely to receive an ordinance she did not like and that the Church also did not like, whereas granting a continuance would leave everyone no worse off. Ms. Walker responded that if she could have a few minutes to consult with her client, she would check, and she said she agreed with Mr. Hulme's position. Thank you, Wayne. I'm new to the table. We understand your former attorney may have withdrawn out of frustration with the timing. If Ms. Walker agrees to no contingencies, we could all agree to a standstill. You could issue a new Notice of Intent the next day, with no gap.

Chairman Taylor responds to the extension idea and explains escalation/timing. He says this is the first time he has heard of an extension without contingencies. He adds that the town had been seeking input from the Church for months, including sending correspondence to Church leadership (First Presidency/Presiding Bishopric), and that the issue appears to have only recently been escalated to Mr. Hulme. He says that timing, combined with the Notice of Intent deadline, is why the Commissioners feel it must act.

Chairman Taylor states the current Notice of Intent expires September 29, 2025, and legal counsel advised the town cannot extend it under conditions the town is unwilling to accept.

Mr. Hulme apologized on behalf of the Church. It was elevated to him two days ago. But you have our full attention now. We will work promptly if you allow more time. I still don't understand the urgency if Ms. Walker won't take action.

Chairman Taylor acknowledged that the ordinance was not perfect but stated the Commission had been advised by town counsel, relying on an aviation engineering firm, that different standards apply to public-use versus private-use airports. He said the airpark became a public-use airport by submitting a form to the FAA and that the town did not learn of the change until afterward. He further stated that UDOT Aviation subsequently awarded approximately \$2.5 million for runway improvements, and that the town was not consulted before that funding or work proceeded. Chair Taylor added that, to his knowledge, no one representing the town communicated with the FAA or UDOT Aviation regarding the transition except the Planning and Zoning Chair at the time, who he stated was also a part-owner of the airpark. During Chair

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

Taylor's remarks regarding the airport's transition from private-use to public-use status, he stated that the change occurred through submission of FAA paperwork without prior notice to the Town and that subsequent UDOT Aviation funding was awarded without town involvement. He further stated that, to his knowledge, no one representing the Town communicated with the FAA or UDOT Aviation regarding the transition except the Planning and Zoning Chair at the time, who he stated was also a part-owner of the airport. During these remarks, multiple individuals began speaking at the same time.

Mark Pringle interrupted from the audience, challenging Chair Taylor's statements, accusing him of being untruthful. Mr. Pringle then told Chairman Taylor to "lets take it outside." Chairman Taylor responded, "let's go," when the exchange paused, Mayor McKinney immediately intervened, instructing that the discussion be stopped and stating that it was not the appropriate time for such remarks, directing the meeting to move on. Mr. Pringle continued to speak out of turn, and the Mayor again called for order and reiterated that the discussion would be shut down. During this exchange, Alina Pringle also spoke out of turn, telling Mayor McKinney that she was not the meeting chair. Mayor McKinney again directed that the discussion be cut off and that the meeting proceed. (At this point, law enforcement was called by office staff)

Chairman Taylor then resumed control of the meeting and redirected the discussion back to the agenda item before continuing Commission deliberation.

Returning to the ordinance, Chair Taylor reiterated that although the code needed refinement, he believed forwarding it now was necessary so the Town Council could act before the September 29, 2025, Notice of Intent deadline. He emphasized that the Commission was open to continued collaboration with the Church and other landowners to revise and improve the airport-related sections, including addressing identified ambiguities, but that a state-compliant overlay needed to be in place first.

Chairman Taylor told Mr. Hulmes that the Commission would feel more comfortable passing the ordinance forward now and then working with him immediately afterward to overhaul and improve the language. He noted that the runway is approximately 60 feet from the Church's fence and raised the question of whether that proximity could constitute a taking, stating that in his view it does because aircraft are barely above the fence as they come in. He said this reflected his perspective on the issue and then asked for the other Commissioners' thoughts, specifically inviting Commissioner Riet to comment.

Commissioner Riet stated that if the Commissioners passed the ordinance tonight, all they were doing was sending a recommendation to the Town Council. He emphasized they were not adopting the ordinance themselves, and that the Town Council would still have the option to negotiate, delay, or revise it if they chose. He said that passing it forward tonight was important so that the Council would still have that option available within the Notice of Intent timeline. Chairman Taylor agreed with that clarification.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

Commissioner Butterfield, who arrived during the discussion, indicated he had no further comment.

Chairman Taylor then asked Commissioner Mascaro if she had any comments; she did not. He asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Alina Pringle, Airport Owner, thanked the Commissioners for allowing her time. She stated that the conditions the airpark had asked for in earlier discussions were not unreasonable. She specifically referenced that the town had asked them to remove the water tanks or move them under fire marshal direction and said she did not believe it was unreasonable for the town to expect compliance through licensing requirements. She said they had repeatedly asked and “pled” to meet with the Town Council to resolve issues amicably and collaboratively, and that they had asked multiple times to sit down and work things out directly. She expressed frustration that those efforts had been turned down or blocked and that legal involvement continued when she believed the parties could have resolved matters through meetings and cooperation. She concluded by stating that she had not previously had a chance to sit down with the Commissioners or Council and that this was what the airpark desired to do.

Chairman Taylor responded that from the town’s perspective, there had not been a sense of mutual cooperation. He stated that the town felt pushed “from the get-go,” and he described what he considered a pattern where the airpark would seek collaboration only when it aligned with what they wanted, not as part of genuine give-and-take.

Councilman Michael Weber explained his position more specifically. He said he wanted a clear answer on whether the airpark would remove contingencies from any request to extend the timeline. He stated that if there were no contingencies, he believed the town should consider delaying so the ordinance could be cleaned up and clarified. If contingencies remained, he felt the Commissioners should move forward that night with a positive recommendation so the town could proceed under the Notice of Intent deadline. He added that the “option window” was closing quickly, and that hearing the airpark’s position on contingencies immediately would still allow the Commissioners to forward the ordinance for Council consideration.

Commissioner David Riet responded that if the Commissioners passed the ordinance that night, they were only sending a positive recommendation to the Town Council, not adopting it themselves. He emphasized that the Council could still choose to negotiate, delay, revise, or decide differently, but the Commissioners needed to act that evening to preserve those options within the timeline. Commissioner Riet stated he believed the ordinance should be put in place now so the town would have a compliant baseline, and that the town could continue working with landowners afterward to make improvements if needed. He said he did not see what could realistically be done that night to make the ordinance better beyond ensuring it complied with state requirements.

Chairman Taylor informed Mr. Hulme that a Town Council meeting would follow immediately after the Planning Commission meeting and that this item would continue there. Mr. Hulme responded

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Fairfield Planning Commission

Session

September 25, 2025

that this was satisfactory and stated he would make the same recommendation to the Council. He asked whether the Planning Commission's action that night would be the recommendation forwarded to the Town Council, and Chairman Taylor confirmed that the Commissioners had discussed the issue and were prepared to send Ordinance #2025-17 forward for Council consideration.

Commissioner Mascaro motioned to send Ordinance 2025-17, an Ordinance Repealing and Reinstating Fairfield Town Code 10.11.275 Airpark Overlay Zone, with a positive recommendation to the town council. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. Unanimously approved

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Butterfield to end the meeting. Commissioner Mascaro seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 7:20 pm.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk