



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
WEST POINT CITY HALL
November 18th, 2025**

Mayor:

Brian Vincent

City Council:

Annette Judd, *Mayor Pro Tem*

Jerry Chatterton

Michele Swenson

Brad Lee

Trent Yarbrough

City Manager:

Kyle Laws

Administrative Session

5:30 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council Administrative Session held on November 18, 2025, at 5:30 PM with Mayor Brian Vincent presiding. This meeting was held at West Point City Hall and livestreamed for the public to view via Zoom. The livestream of the meeting was accessible to view by entering Meeting ID# 849 2150 2155 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Brian Vincent, Council Member Jerry Chatterton, Council Member Brad Lee, Council Member Trent Yarbrough, Council Member Michele Swenson, and Council Member Annette Judd

EXCUSED: None

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Kenny England, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director

VISITORS PRESENT: Jeremy Strong, Lacy Richards, Richard Roginski, Michelle Day, Tyler Leavitt, Hilary Kay, PJ Roubinet, Matt Leavitt, Rochelle Farnsworth, and Ken Whitaker. No sign-in is required for those viewing online.

1. Quarterly Financial Report – Mr. Kyle Laws

Mr. Laws presented the First Quarter Financial Report for FY26 on behalf of Administrative Services Director Ryan Harvey, who was not able to attend the meeting. Mr. Laws explained that the report covers the period from July through September. He reviewed the summary charts included in the Council packet, noting that all City funds currently have revenues exceeding expenditures—except the Capital Projects Fund, which is typical for this point in the fiscal year because transfers that balance that fund occur later in the year.

He walked the Council through the comparative graph showing revenues and expenditures across all funds. Revenues are trending above the 25% benchmark for the first quarter, and expenditures remain below the benchmark. He emphasized that the General Fund departments are all within appropriate ranges for this stage of the fiscal year, with the exception of the Administrative Services Department, which appears high due to annualized expenses such as Trust insurance premiums paid at the start of the year.

Mr. Laws answered questions about which fund election expenses are paid from and confirmed that election-related costs are in the Executive Department, not Administrative Services. No further questions were raised, and the Council expressed appreciation for the report.

2. Discussion Regarding a Rezone Request and Development Agreement for Property at Appx. 3900 W 300 N (Leavitt) – Mrs. MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald presented the proposed rezone from R-2 to R-4 and the corresponding Development Agreement for property located at 3900 West 300 North. She reminded the Council that a public hearing on the rezone was held in September, but because a development agreement also requires a public hearing, both items are scheduled for action later in the evening.

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed the site plan, noting that it is largely unchanged since the last Council discussion aside from minor adjustments to ensure all lots meet minimum size requirements. She explained that the proposal includes two twin homes fronting 300 North and additional twin homes near the subdivision entrance, with single-family lots throughout the remainder. A pedestrian walkway has been added to connect the interior of the development to 300 North.

She reiterated that the project's density is 3.5 units per acre—below the R-4 current minimum of 3.7. Because the density is below the minimum, a development agreement is required to lock in the reduced density. If approved, the property would be limited to 3.5 units per acre unless the agreement is amended in the future.

Mrs. MacDonald summarized public hearing comments from September, explaining that traffic impacts, density comparisons to surrounding neighborhoods, and concerns about precedent were the most commonly raised topics. She clarified state law regarding school-capacity considerations and reminded the Council that accessory dwelling units are allowed by ordinance regardless of rezone decisions.

A substantial portion of the discussion concerned the sidewalk along the proposed entrance road ("Street A"). The developer has requested removal of sidewalk and fencing requirements along the north side of the entrance street, citing maintenance burdens on the adjacent property owner. Council Members discussed whether sidewalk should be required, given the presence of children walking to school in the area and longstanding safety concerns near the 300 North and 4000 West intersection.

Council Members weighed the benefits of connectivity, the need for consistency with City standards, and the reality that many residents currently walk without sidewalk facilities. Opinions varied on whether the south side, north side, both, or neither should include sidewalk. Several Council Members noted that the developer is providing a five-foot walkway connection through the subdivision to 300 North, which may reduce the need for sidewalk along the entire road segment. Others expressed concern that children will inevitably walk along the new street and that the absence of sidewalk may present safety risks, even if not required by code.

Additional discussion addressed typical sidewalk-installation practices adjacent to undeveloped parcels, the responsibility for snow removal, and the lack of existing sidewalk continuity along 4000 West. The Council also briefly discussed street widths, confirming that all roads in the proposed subdivision are full-width public streets rather than narrow private lanes.

The Council expressed general appreciation for the applicant's effort to reduce twin-home quantity and for proposing an overall density lower than R-4 minimum standards. No Council Member indicated opposition to the reduced density. The Development Agreement is on the agenda for a public hearing and action during tonight's General Session, with consideration of approval of the rezone immediately after.

3. Discussion Regarding a Rezone Request for Property at Appx. 1800 N 5000 W (The Holland Group) - Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald introduced the first rezone request processed under the City's recently updated PRUD ordinance. The 20-acre property, recently annexed and commonly referred to as "Pig Corner," is designated as R-1 on the General Plan, and the applicant is seeking an R-1 zone with PRUD overlay approval.

She reviewed the proposed 45-lot layout, explaining that the property includes a drainage corridor that reduces buildable acreage. Because land within the swale cannot be counted toward density, the development calculates at 18.64 acres for density purposes. Under the allowable PRUD bonus (10% maximum), the applicant's proposal of 2.41 units per acre meets the permitted density threshold. The PRUD layout includes a variety of lot sizes, with minimum lots at approximately 10,000 square feet and an average around 12,000 square feet.

The proposal dedicates nearly two acres of land for a regional trail corridor but does not require the developer to construct the trail itself. The Planning Commission discussed at length the alignment and potential access points of the trail and expressed concerns about encouraging pedestrian crossings near the sharp curve at 5000 West and 1800 North. The Commission ultimately recommended approval but also requested that the Council revisit long-term expectations for PRUD "point value" and density incentives given the new ordinance.

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed the applicant's suggested pocket-park/open-space area near the southwest corner. Council Members discussed whether the open space is appropriate at that location, whether modifications to landscaping near the corner might be needed to maintain visibility, and how the trail might best connect through the development or link to future UDOT trail routes. Staff and the developer reiterated that the space is intended as a simple passive node rather than a fully programmed park.

Council Members discussed the visibility of the historic "Pig Corner" theme and options for preserving or commemorating the site. The developer expressed willingness to incorporate signage or interpretive features if desired. The Council also discussed the minimum lot sizes, whether bonus density is appropriately supported by the proposed amenities, and the Planning Commission's questions about how density value should be determined in future PRUD applications. Planning Commissioners Roubinette and Farnsworth were in attendance at the meeting, and present briefly summarized their concerns and requested future joint discussion with the City Council to clarify expectations.

The Council directed Staff to notice the item for a public hearing at the next meeting on December 2nd and will continue the discussion at that time.

4. Discussion Regarding a General Plan Amendment Request for Property at Appx. 39 S 2000 W (Mendenhall) - Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald presented a General Plan amendment request for approximately one acre located just south of Big O Tires on 2000 West. The applicant is requesting a change from R-3 to Commercial (CC). She explained that the request is consistent with commercial frontage that exists immediately to the north and may reflect the corridor's evolving commercial character.

Planning Commission concerns centered primarily on vehicular access. UDOT may restrict additional direct access from 2000 West, making shared access through adjacent commercial property the most feasible option. Mrs. MacDonald noted that preliminary discussions between property owners have occurred.

Council Members discussed whether converting only one parcel to commercial is appropriate or whether the City should consider proactively planning commercial designation along the entire corridor down to the 2000 West and 193 intersection. Several Council Members reflected on the likelihood that the remaining residential parcels along the five-lane roadway may eventually redevelop and questioned whether a comprehensive approach would better serve traffic management, consolidated access, and economic development. Council Members also discussed buffer requirements, anticipated building footprints compatible with a parcel of this size, and concerns about piecemeal development.

The Planning Commission recommended approval, but the Council indicated interest in discussing the broader commercial corridor strategy with the applicant during the public hearing. The Council directed Staff to notice the item for a public hearing at the next meeting on December 2nd and will continue the discussion at that time.

5. Discussion Regarding a General Plan Amendment Request for Property at Appx. 2084 N 4500 W (Nilson Land Development) - Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald presented a second General Plan amendment submitted during the October annual amendment window. The request applies to property north of the recently approved Humphries subdivision and seeks a General Plan change from R-1 to R-4.

She explained that surrounding densities vary: the Humphries property to the south is zoned R-4 with a mix of single-family lots and limited twin homes, while Clinton City's adjacent development to the north consists largely of single-family homes of varying lot sizes. The applicant has not submitted a detailed layout but described smaller single-family detached lots aligned with examples previously shown to the Council in Plain City. A trail connection is being negotiated to connect the UDOT trail system from the Clinton side into West Point.

The Planning Commission recommended denial, expressing concern that continued expansion of R-4 northward would undermine the planned transition in density and create mismatched pockets of higher density beyond the Humphries boundary. Commissioners present at the meeting summarized their reasoning, explaining that R-4 designation on the Humphries parcel was tied to the City's moderate-income housing strategy and proximity to a future school site, but further expansion north appears inconsistent with the broader area's pattern and offers no compensating public benefit.

Council Members discussed the feasibility of development given the presence of the remaining single-family parcel on 4500 West. They questioned how access, road connectivity, and lot layout would function without cooperation from the intervening property owner. Members expressed openness to continued discussion but requested additional conceptual plans showing how the overall block, including the interior parcel, could reasonably redevelop.

The Council agreed that more information is needed, and expressed reservations about whether the General Plan change is appropriate without additional context. Mrs. MacDonald stated that she would relay the request for more information to the applicants and will present it at a future meeting for further discussion.

6. Other Items

No other items were discussed.

The Administrative Session adjourned.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES WEST POINT CITY HALL November 18th, 2025

Mayor:

Brian Vincent

City Council:

Annette Judd, *Mayor Pro Tem*

Jerry Chatterton

Michele Swenson

Brad Lee

Trent Yarbrough

City Manager:

Kyle Laws

General Session

7:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council General Session held on November 18, 2025, at 7:00 PM with Mayor Brian Vincent presiding. This meeting was held at West Point City Hall and livestreamed for the public to view via Zoom. The livestream of the meeting was accessible to view by entering Meeting ID# 849 2150 2155 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Brian Vincent, Council Member Jerry Chatterton, Council Member Brad Lee, Council Member Trent Yarbrough, Council Member Michele Swenson, and Council Member Annette Judd

EXCUSED: None

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Kenny England, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: None

VISITORS PRESENT: Jeremy Strong, Lacy Richards, Richard Roginski, Michelle Day, Tyler Leavitt, Hilary Kay, PJ Roubinet, Matt Leavitt, Rochelle Farnsworth, Ken Whitaker, Connie Lee, Nathan Johnson, Kara Hummel, Stacey Macavinta, Katie Haugen, Kurtis Haugen, H. Marvin Drake, Zeb Booker, Chantyl Staheli, Chris Swenson, Sharon Cammack, Jason Cammack, Marilyn Olds, Lori Sutherland, Celinda Leavitt, Toney, Joelle Caruso, Spencer Wade, Cande Booker, Valentina Augarita, Ashley Aguilar Arellano, and Michael Heinze. No sign-in is required for those viewing online.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer or Inspirational Thought** – Given by Council Member Swenson
4. **Communications and Disclosures from City Council and Mayor**

Council Member Yarbrough – None

Council Member Judd – None

Council Member Chatterton – Expressed his appreciation for the Senior Lunch held earlier in the day, noting an attendance of approximately 140 participants and complimenting City staff and volunteers for their dedication in creating a successful monthly event.

Council Member Swenson – Provided an update from the Arts Council, sharing that the community choir would perform at the upcoming City Hall Lighting Ceremony and at the next Senior Luncheon, with additional performances scheduled at Ogden's Christmas Village and a local care center. She also announced that adult dance classes would begin in January at the new junior high gymnasium, and encouraged residents to watch social media for information on other upcoming events and activities.

Council Member Lee – Reported on the Mosquito Abatement District, announcing the retirement of the District Manager Gary Hatch effective April 1 and recognizing his many years of regional service. He extended congratulations to the winning candidates in the recent municipal election, including Mayor Vincent and Council Members-Elect Swenson and Strong, and acknowledged the efforts of all who participated.

Mayor Vincent – None

5. Communications from Staff

Mr. Laws reported on the Military Memorial Committee’s Veterans Day program held on November 11, expressing gratitude to those who organized and participated. He also expressed appreciation for the Youth Council’s service project placing flags at veterans’ graves in the cemetery to honor the holiday.

He then provided details for the City Hall Christmas Lighting Ceremony scheduled for Monday, December 1, including hot chocolate at 5:30 PM, fireworks at 6:00 PM, and Santa’s arrival by fire truck.

6. Citizen Comment

Richard Groginski – West Point: Provided comments regarding the proposed rezone and development agreement, expressing concern about density, neighborhood impacts, and the differences between the Planning Commission’s recommendation and the perceived direction of the Council. He encouraged the Council to consider long-term implications of approving increased density.

7. Consideration of Approval of 2025 General Election Canvass by the Board of Canvassers – Ms. Casey Arnold

Ms. Arnold explained that In the 2025 municipal election cycle, two City Council seats and the mayor position are up for election. The City contracted earlier this year with the Davis County Clerk’s Office to administer the election, along with all other cities in the County. The Primary Election was held on August 12, 2025 and the Official Primary Election Results were approved by the Board of Canvassers on August 26, 2025. The two mayoral candidates with the most votes in the Primary Election proceeded to the General Election, as well as the four remaining City Council candidates. The General Election was held on November 4, 2025, with the following candidates on the ballot:

MAYOR

(Vote for 1)

Brian Vincent

David Marvin Drake

CITY COUNCIL

(Vote for 2)

Kenneth Bryan Whitaker

Michele Swenson

Jeremy Strong

Brad Lee

She then presented the official results of the November 4, 2025 Municipal General Election. She detailed the voter turnout statistics, ballot-processing information, and causes for ballot rejection as summarized below:

GENERAL	TOTAL
Registered Voters	7,012
Ballots Cast	2,575
Voter Turnout	36.72%

Ballot Types	Total
By Mail	2,451
In-Person Early Voting	3
In-Person on Election Day	116
Provisional	5

Ballots Not Counted	Total	Already Voted	Fleeting Voter	No Proof of Identity	No Proof of Residency	Deceased	Power of Attorney	Incarcerated	Moved	Signed by Other	Not Signed	Signature Did Not Match	Empty Envelope	Not Timely
By Mail	17	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	12
Provisional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	12

Official vote totals were announced as follows:

<u>MAYOR</u>	<u>Votes Received</u>	<u>Percentage of Votes</u>
Brian Vincent	1,477	57.74%
Marvin Drake	1,081	42.26%
TOTAL	2,558	100%

<u>CITY COUNCIL</u>	<u>Votes Received</u>	<u>Percentage of Votes</u>
Jeremy Strong	1,362	29.21%
Michele Swenson	1,291	27.69%
Brad Lee	1,268	27.19%
Kenneth Bryan Whitaker	742	15.91%
TOTAL	4,663	100%

As the Mayor candidate with the highest votes received, Mayor Brian Vincent was re-elected to a new four-year term. City Council candidate Michele Swenson was also re-elected, along with Jeremy Strong. Both will also begin four-terms beginning January 1, 2026.

She expressed appreciation for the Davis County Clerk's Office and its transparent audit procedures. The Council had no concerns with the results.

Council Member Lee motioned to approve the 2025 General Election Canvass

Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

8. Consideration of Resolution No. 11-18-2025A, Accepting the Purchase Offer from UDOT for an Easement for the West Davis Highway – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis reviewed UDOT's request to purchase a 0.429-acre easement across City-owned property adjacent to the future Public Works and park site. The easement will allow Hooper Irrigation to relocate its pipeline as part of the West Davis Highway project. The City will retain ownership of the land, and the easement area will remain usable for park improvements. UDOT's offer of \$18,700 represents the standard 25% valuation applied to easement acquisitions. Staff recommended approval.

The Council had no significant concerns or comments.

Council Member Swenson motioned to approve Resolution No. 11-18-2025A

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

9. Consideration of Resolution No. 11-18-2025B, Approving a Transfer of the Cold Springs Road Right Of Way to UDOT for the West Davis Highway Project– Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis explained that the Cold Springs Road right-of-way was dedicated during a prior subdivision process but never improved. Because the roadway alignment falls directly beneath the future West Davis Highway corridor, UDOT requested its transfer. The property will be conveyed via quitclaim deed, and because it is a public-to-public transfer for transportation purposes, no compensation will be provided. He clarified a clerical error in the draft resolution and asked that the clarification that this is a donation without compensation be included with the approval motion.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Resolution No. 11-18-2025B, with the addition of language stating that there is no compensation for this donation.

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

10. Consideration of Resolution No. 11-18-2025C, Accepting Donation of Property from UDOT for Construction of Cold Springs Road – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that Resolution 11-18-2025C contained incorrect language and was not applicable to the property under discussion, asked that it be tabled indefinitely.

Council Member Judd motioned to table approval of this item indefinitely

Council Member Swenson seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

11. Consideration of Resolution No. 11-18-2025D, Approving a Development Agreement for Property at 3900 W 300 N – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald presented the proposed Development Agreement associated with a request to rezone approximately 13 acres from R-2 to R-4. She reviewed the project's 46-lot layout, density of 3.5 units per acre, including eight twin-home lots. She reviewed the history of the application and efforts by the applicant to modify the layout over the past several months, including reducing the number of twin-home lots, adjusting driveway locations, and adding a paved public walkway connection to 300 North. She explained that the project proposes a density of 3.5 units per acre—below the R-4 minimum—and therefore requires a Development Agreement to lock in that reduced density. She also clarified issues related to traffic, school capacity, ADUs, and Planning Commission comments, noting that while the Commission had voiced concerns at earlier meetings, their deliberations reflected mixed views about the application's consistency with medium-density standards.

Mayor Vincent opened the item for public hearing.

a. Public Hearing

Matt Leavitt – West Point: As the property owner, Mr. Leavitt explained that he had taken “somewhat of a sit-back-and-listen approach” at earlier meetings but felt it was time to address the Council directly. He stated that the process had become “a lot more laborious” than he had anticipated, and he thanked the Council and staff for their patience and thoroughness. He stated that

opposition appeared to center around density, traffic, and change itself. He expressed his belief that the Planning Commission did not fully understand what the R-4 medium-density zone was intended to allow and emphasized that his proposal would add only “11 more units than an R-2” layout. He noted that his family had waited years to move forward with development but that circumstances had changed and “it is time.” He respectfully requested approval.

Chantyl Staheli – West Point: Stated that while she appreciated Mr. Leavitt’s positivity, her concerns were focused on “the children and families that live here NOW,” who would be directly affected by the increased number of vehicles. She referenced the other development at 1800 North and 5000 West, along with anticipated roadway extensions, and estimated “274 additional cars,” asserting that such an increase “cannot not have an impact on safety.” She pointed to the nearby intersection and the hill on 4000 West and asked what the safety plan would be. She acknowledged that the project could support moderate-income housing goals but stated her overriding concern was whether “we have the capacity,” describing current peak-hour traffic as “already very dense.” She asked the Council to deny the request, or at minimum require additional safety infrastructure.

Cara Hummell, whose property borders the proposal, stated that she cares about the Leavitt family and was “not asking you not to develop,” but believed the density was out of character for the area. She said the Planning Commission “didn’t deny it because they didn’t understand—it was because they heard what residents had to say.” She described long delays accessing 300 North during school hours and expressed concerns about home values, infrastructure, and increased taxes. She disputed statements that home values would not be affected, giving examples of homes near comparable developments that were “not able to sell,” even though market conditions previously would have supported quick sales.

Sharon Cammack – West Point: Questioned why the Council would approve the project if the Planning Commission had not recommended it. She stated, “I didn’t vote for them, but they seem to have common sense.” She said she did not understand why the Council would be more concerned about a developer than residents and described the location as a “terrible spot” for increased traffic. She urged the developer to build under the R-2 zoning instead, saying, “It is going to cost us more money to give him this while he gets to make more money.”

Michelle Day – West Point: Inquired as to whether the West Davis Highway would include an exit off 300 North, stating that if 300 North becomes a “main street,” even more traffic will be funneled through the corridor. She said the infrastructure in the area is “not ready,” and that even though she lives on 1800 North, she frequently uses 300 North and sees how congested it already is.

Zeb Booker – West Point: Stated he has lived in West Point for 38 years and has witnessed significant growth. He described current traffic as “horrendous,” especially during school and community events, and stated that adding “hundreds more cars is too much.” He questioned the City Engineer’s statement that 300 North could support the additional traffic, saying he should “go hang out there and see.”

Katie Haugen – West Point: Clarified that concerns about overcrowding referred not only to the school but “the whole area.” She said the neighborhood already contains twin homes and higher-density housing and that adding more would “overcrowd all of it.” She stated that while residents understand that change is inevitable and development was expected, it had always been assumed that new homes would be “developed in the same way our homes were.” She believed the developer and landowner would receive significant financial benefit and asked whether existing homeowners should not receive “the same return on our investments.” She argued that home values *would* be affected, despite assurances to the contrary.

Joelle Caruso – West Point: Described the roadway layout from 3830 West to 3650 West as forming a “huge U,” noting that only two points provide access to 300 North. She said the adjacent subdivision entrance already creates congestion, especially during school and recreational events at the city park. She stated that traffic routinely backs up to her house due to parents using the splash pad parking lot for pickup. She opposed twin homes in the area and urged the Council to “stay R-2 and continue the character of the neighborhood.”

Jared Toomey – West Point: Presented a color map of the area and stated that most surrounding zoning is R-1, R-2, or R-3, and that although some R-4 exists, it is limited. He expressed concern that aligning roads to adjoining parcels suggests pressure for those owners to sell and could trigger additional rezones. He reiterated that while he supports farmland and understands development is inevitable, increased traffic poses safety risks. He referenced fatal pedestrian accidents in nearby communities and said, “More cars will increase that risk.”

Jason Cammack – West Point: Stated that as a 30-year resident, he has observed the City approve significant development without accompanying infrastructure. He referenced Bluffview having multiple “for lease” signs and heard that the City “got tricked” with

prior 200-unit developments. He said he was concerned the Council could “get tricked again.” He expressed distrust in the Council, stating that he hears candidates promise caution but sees decisions that do not reflect those promises. He encouraged the City to slow down.

Lori Sutherland – West Point: Stated that she walks her children to school daily and had not realized “how high the risk is” until paying attention to traffic volumes. She said most parents will drive children, not allow them to walk, increasing congestion. She believes R-4 “is not leaving things better than we found them.”

Alex Toomey – West Point: Stated he opposed the rezone, saying the area should remain R-2. He commented that West Point’s logo, which features farmland, “should be changed to buildings because it is quickly disappearing.”

Tyler Leavitt – West Point: Representing the developer, he addressed concerns about traffic, density, home prices, and rentals. He stated that the added entrance on 3830 West will help school traffic and pedestrian safety. He clarified that this project is “medium density housing, not high density,” and that its 3.5 units per acre is well below the R-4 threshold. He emphasized that housing affordability is determined by market forces, not the developer, and said they had heard criticism that the project was both “too affordable” and “not affordable enough.” He stressed that city ordinance prohibits rentals in this zone and that each home will include a private yard. He outlined several revisions based on feedback, including removal of two twin-home lots, driveway adjustments, and addition of the public walkway. He asserted that the proposal aligns with the purpose of the R-4 zone.

Jeremy Strong – West Point: Raised concerns about the development agreement rather than the rezone itself. He stated that the extended street onto 4000 West will be heavily used, comparing it to how his own road became a connector route to avoid congestion at 4500 West and 300 North. He said removing the sidewalk along the entrance street will endanger children, as kids from both 4000 West and 300 North will use the route to reach the park. He stated that “it needs a sidewalk and fence to protect them.”

Kurtis Haugen – West Point: Stated that while the applicant claims the project adds only 11 additional units, he believes the density still “does not fit the character of the area.” He disputed the idea that these are affordable homes, stating that a \$500,000 base price equates to “almost a \$4,000 monthly house payment.” He expressed doubt that the lots can physically accommodate required trees. He acknowledged that he had built his own home but noted, “This was my third home that we saved for.” He reiterated concerns about compatibility.

Hillary Ray – West Point: Thanked the Leavitts for making adjustments but said the project “still does not fit here.” She described the area north of the property as having nearly 1-acre lots and said the proposed density is incompatible. She stated, “Everyone is against it. Only two are in favor, and they are the developers.” She urged the Council to “listen to what we have to say.”

Rochelle Farnsworth – West Point: As a member of the Planning Commission, provided clarification regarding the Commission’s prior comments. She said the Commission had invested “a lot of time” reviewing the proposal and initially believed the concept might be workable, but ultimately concluded it was “not the right area.” She explained that the concern was not that the project was “way out of place,” but that it was not near a main corridor appropriate for medium density. She emphasized that the Commission must plan for the future, not react to immediate pressures such as the current housing shortage. She stated that the safety and connectivity benefits cited by the applicant “can all be mitigated with an R-2 PRUD,” and that “we don’t need 46 homes to accomplish that.”

Ken Whitaker – West Point: Stated that he has observed the City’s deliberation process for months and feels the Council is “building a case to say we know better.” He described speeding problems on collector roads and noted that speed limits “don’t work.” He also commented on meeting management and felt that public-comment procedures should allow residents to respond to statements made by others.

Marilyn Olds – West Point: Stated that water-pressure issues are already a concern in her neighborhood and that she worries about water availability. She also said parents will not allow children to walk, meaning traffic will only increase.

Mia Leavitt – West Point: Reiterated that the project proposes “only 11 more front doors” than an R-2 development and stated that opposition makes it sound like they were asking for “a hundred, or a million.”

Cande Booker – West Point: Asked whether approving R-4 on the Leavitt property means “the remaining farmland is automatically going to go that way.” She expressed concern that any additional units—even 11—are unwanted by surrounding residents.

Nathan Johnson – West Point: As a neighbor who lives directly across from the Leavitts, stated that he has lived in West Point for 13 years and appreciates the small-town feel. He acknowledged that growth is inevitable and expressed support for the project, stating that if anyone were going to develop the land, he would prefer it be people he knows and trusts to care about the neighborhood.

Council Member Swenson motioned to close the public hearing

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

b. Action

Mayor Vincent noted that the comments raised were similar to those expressed in previous meetings and invited the Council to share any additional thoughts or questions before proceeding with action.

Council Member Chatterton began by addressing the public’s expressions of concern. He stated that he understood and respected the passion residents had conveyed over the past several meetings. He explained that his responsibility as a council member required him to evaluate not just the emotional weight of public concern but also the zoning tools available, the developer’s rights, and the City’s adopted general plan. He indicated that this property had already been designated for R-4 in the general plan, and that the question before the Council was whether the proposed development agreement—which lowered density below what the R-4 zone permitted—provided a better outcome than allowing an R-4 project without a density-reducing agreement. He expressed that while he recognized neighbors felt the project did not “fit,” the Council had to consider fairness, consistency, and legal obligations.

Council Member Swenson followed, acknowledging the difficulty of the decision and the strong community feelings expressed. She stated that she had listened closely to residents and appreciated their continued involvement. She commented that the development agreement included changes that addressed concerns raised earlier—such as removing a pair of twin homes, adding a pedestrian connection to 300 N, and establishing owner-occupancy requirements through CC&Rs. She reiterated that the Council could not deny an application based on school capacity or subjective preference alone. She added that the agreement’s density cap of 3.5 units per acre was substantially lower than what the R-4 zone would otherwise allow, noting that without an agreement the developer could legally pursue a higher number of units.

Council Member Lee commented next, stating that he recognized the traffic concerns raised by several residents. He referenced the City Engineer’s review indicating that surrounding roads and planned future roads had sufficient capacity to accommodate this development. He also commented on the safety concerns around school traffic, stating that the City would continue to monitor conditions in that corridor. He remarked that although change was difficult, the growth occurring throughout West Point required the City to balance neighborhood character with property-owner rights and the general plan’s direction.

Council Member Yarbrough shared that he had spent considerable time reviewing the materials, including the general plan history, Planning Commission recommendations, prior public comment, and the developer’s revisions. He stated that while residents had expressed a strong preference for R-2 density, the general plan designation of R-4 had already been adopted following public noticing and a public hearing in the previous year. He explained that the Council must evaluate applications based on existing law, not personal preference, and that the development agreement—by reducing density below the R-4 minimum—offered meaningful limitations that would not exist otherwise.

Council Member Judd stated that she empathized deeply with the neighbors, especially regarding concerns about increased traffic and neighborhood compatibility. She said she was grateful for the respectful tone of the public comments. She added, however, that the role of the Council was to apply the City’s adopted ordinances consistently, and that the applicant had met the criteria required for the rezone and development agreement. She reiterated concerns about precedent raised during comment, clarifying that the Council’s decisions do not legally bind future Councils to approve similar requests and that each application must stand on its own merits.

Throughout the discussion, several council members acknowledged the Planning Commission's prior recommendation to deny the rezone request, but emphasized that the Commission's role is advisory and that the Council must make its own determination. Following the Council's comments, Mayor Vincent summarized the discussion, reiterating that the general plan designation of R-4 had already been adopted the previous December and that the development agreement before the Council provided enforceable restrictions not otherwise available under standard zoning. He then called for a motion on Resolution No. 11-18-2025D.

Council Member Judd motioned to approve Resolution No. 11-18-2025D, with the addition of language requiring a sidewalk be added to Street A.

Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion

In Favor: Council Member Swenson, Council Member Chatterton, Council Member Judd

Opposed: Council Member Lee, Council Member Yarbrough

The Council approved the Resolution by majority.

12. Consideration of Ordinance No. 11-18-2025A, Rezoning Property at 3900 W 300 N from R-2 to R-4 – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mayor Vincent explained that although the rezone and development agreement were connected, they required separate votes, and he invited the Council to offer additional comments specific to the zoning change.

Council Member Chatterton began the discussion by stating that most of the concerns raised during the public hearing applied equally to both the development agreement and the rezone decision. He explained that he had reviewed the history of the property's general plan designation and noted that the Council had already amended the general plan the previous year to show this parcel as R-4. He reiterated that the general plan is a guiding document adopted after proper noticing and a public hearing, and once adopted, the Council is obligated to evaluate rezone requests consistent with that designation unless there is a compelling legal basis to deny them. He stated that while he understood residents' desire for the property to remain R-2, the City could not revert to R-2 simply because the development was unpopular. He emphasized that zoning decisions must be based on objective standards, not personal preference.

Council Member Swenson added that she shared the neighborhood's fear of increasing traffic, especially near school routes, but reiterated that the City Engineer had found that the road network, including future connections, would adequately support the projected vehicles. She commented that denying the rezone would not prevent development; rather, it would shift the pattern to an R-2 configuration without the negotiated benefits secured through the development agreement. She stated that the R-4 designation was intentional when adopted into the general plan and was intended to allow moderate, not high-density, development in appropriate areas of the City.

Council Member Lee explained that he viewed the rezone as a necessary procedural step following the prior general plan amendment. He said the Council had spent "a lot of time" over the past several months discussing the best use of the parcel and that he believed the R-4 designation was consistent with how surrounding properties and future corridors were planned. He said he understood the concerns about changes to the area but noted that development pressures in West Point were not unique, and the City needed to balance preserving existing character with accommodating planned growth.

Council Member Yarbrough noted that the rezone did not occur in a vacuum and that approving R-4 did not automatically mean the area would experience high density. He reiterated that the development agreement placed a firm cap at 3.5 units per acre, which is less than what R-4 normally allows. He stressed that the rezone itself does not create density; it simply aligns zoning with the adopted general plan. He said that in his evaluation, the developer's willingness to reduce density, remove twin homes, add pedestrian connections, and commit to owner-occupancy requirements demonstrated effort to meet the concerns of the residents and the City. He commented that while some residents felt the project should remain R-2, the property's general plan designation placed it in the R-4 category, and to ignore that would contradict the City's established planning process.

Council Member Judd spoke next, saying she respected the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny the rezone request, but she wanted to clarify that the Council is the final land-use authority and must evaluate additional legal and policy considerations beyond the Planning Commission's advisory role. She stated that she had carefully reviewed the general plan history and believed the designation of R-4 had been adopted correctly and with adequate public involvement. She said she sympathized deeply with the

public's concerns about increased traffic and the pace of growth, but the City was required to make decisions consistent with adopted land-use expectations.

The Mayor summarized the discussion by stating the Council had spent extensive time on this issue across several meetings, including work sessions, Planning Commission reports, and public hearings. He reiterated that the general plan amendment made the property eligible for R-4 and that the rezone would put the zoning map in alignment with that plan. He also emphasized that the accompanying development agreement placed enforceable limits on density, unit type, design, and access—conditions that would not apply under a standard R-4 approval.

The Mayor then called for a motion on the ordinance approving the rezone.

Council Member Yarbrough motioned to deny Ordinance No. 11-18-2025A

Council Member Lee seconded the motion

Roll Call:

Council Member Yarbrough – Aye

Council Member Judd – Nay

Council Member Swenson – Nay

Council Member Lee – Aye

Council Member Chatterton – Nay

The motion to deny failed due to lack of majority.

Mayor Vincent called for another motion.

Council Member Judd motioned to approve Ordinance No. 11-18-2025A

Council Member Swenson seconded the motion

Roll Call:

Council Member Chatterton – Aye

Council Member Swenson – Aye

Council Member Yarbrough – Nay

Council Member Lee – Nay

Council Member Judd – Nay

The Council approved the ordinance by majority.

13. Consideration of Approval to Place Craythorn Homestead Subdivision Phase 6 on Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this was not yet ready to be placed on warranty and asked that it be tabled.

Council Member Lee motioned to table

Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

14. Consideration of Approval to Remove Bluff View Subdivision Phase 1B from Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis reported that improvements in Bluff View Phase 1B satisfied City requirements and recommended that it be removed from warranty.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to remove Phase 1B from warranty

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

15. Consideration of Approval to Remove the Sunview Subdivision Phases 2 & 3 from Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this was not yet ready to be removed from warranty and asked that it be tabled.

Council Member Swenson motioned to table

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

16. Consideration of Approval to Remove the Harvest Fields Subdivision Phase 8 from Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this was not yet ready to be placed on warranty and asked that it be tabled.

Council Member Lee motioned to table

Council Member Swenson seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

17. Motion to Adjourn the General Session

Council Member Chatterton motioned to adjourn

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed.



APPROVED THIS 16 DAY OF December, 2025:

BRIAN VINCENT, MAYOR

CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER