

Approved 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
(Codis 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

Approved 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.

Approved 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

Approved 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

Approved 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

Approved 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

Approved 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.

Approved 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.

January 7, 2026

Stephanie Shelley

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk