



3200 WEST 300 NORTH  
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

## WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 23, 2025

---

### WORK SESSION 6:00 PM

**Planning Commission Present:** Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

**City Staff Present:** Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

**Visitors:** Stockton Smith, Hunter Murray, Trek Loveridge

#### **1. Discussion of a General Plan Amendment for property located at 800 N 4200 W (Jacob Jones)**

Troy Moyes explained that Jacob Jones, representing AG Stoddard Family LLC, had submitted a request for a General Plan amendment for a 10-acre property near the Layton Canal north of 800 North, seeking to change the designation from R-1 to R-2. He noted that the property had been discussed with a previous applicant one to two years earlier, but this was a new applicant bringing the request forward. Stockton Smith, representing the applicant, presented a conceptual lot layout and stated that the request was primarily driven by the property's odd shape and the 600-foot cul-de-sac length limitation, which made it difficult to design lots under R-1 standards.

Mr. Smith explained that under R-1 zoning, the minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet would only allow six or seven lots, while R-2 would allow smaller 10,000-square-foot lots and add two or three additional lots, resulting in eight or nine lots total. Troy Moyes added that the cul-de-sac depth restriction was one of the biggest challenges, forcing the back lots to remain large. Commissioners also discussed the presence of a proposed flag lot and questioned whether additional flag lots or other layout changes could improve the design.

Several Commissioners raised concerns about water issues and whether the land was suitable for subdivision development, referencing similar drainage challenges in a nearby project. Staff noted that stormwater mitigation would be addressed through engineering review and that basements would not be allowed in this area due to existing zoning restrictions requiring slab-on-grade homes.

Commissioners also discussed the potential impact of adjacent UDOT-owned parcels, which could eventually be sold and might allow for better access or a more practical layout in the future. Commissioner Farnsworth and others suggested that instead of changing the General Plan designation, a development agreement or PRUD approach might be a better solution to allow minor exceptions, such as extending the cul-de-sac slightly, without setting a precedent for broader map changes.

Overall, the Commission expressed interest in exploring these alternatives further, coordinating with UDOT regarding the adjacent parcels, and postponing the General Plan amendment discussion until more information could be gathered.

## **2. Discussion of a text amendment for commercial landscaping requirements**

Troy Moyes explained that the City had previously discussed residential landscaping changes, including the 35% standard passed by City Council and the removal of turf in park strips, based on Weber Basin Water standards. He stated that staff realized commercial landscape requirements had been omitted and proposed adding language to the code limiting turf grass to a maximum of 15% of landscaped area for new commercial development, except in areas intended for active outdoor recreation. He explained that this requirement needed to be included in multiple commercial zones, including professional office, neighborhood commercial, community commercial, regional commercial, and limited use commercial. He also noted that the industrial code contained a table and needed to reference the same turf standard to ensure consistency. He stated that this update was being requested by Weber Basin Water.

Commissioner Roubinet supported the idea of limiting turf in commercial areas, noting that commercial properties often water during the daytime and that the change would encourage different landscaping practices. Commissioner King agreed and stated that the City should follow Weber Basin's standards. Troy Moyes concluded that a public hearing would be scheduled for the next meeting.

## **3. Other items**

Troy Moyes provided an update on upcoming agenda items, noting that two preliminary plats would be coming forward for review: the Heritage Point PRUD and the West Meadows preliminary plan. He explained that West Meadows, also known as the Brad Devereaux/Jeremy Humphreys subdivision, had been rezoned to R-4 and had now submitted updated plans. He stated that the plans had been modified multiple times and that Nilson Homes was now the applicant, as they were under contract to purchase and develop the property. He added that if Nilson Homes needed to deviate from the approved rezoning standards, they would need to return to the Commission.

Commissioner Wade asked whether both existing houses would be removed, and Troy Moyes clarified that one house would remain. Commissioner King asked about the open space triangle on the west side near the canal, and Troy Moyes explained that Hooper Water and the canal company would take over that area. Staff noted they were still working through engineering and access questions before bringing the item forward for full review, likely at the next meeting.

Troy Moyes then mentioned the Heritage Point PRUD would also be returning with a preliminary plat. He stated that the Commission had seen the project several times and that engineering work was still underway. Commissioner King asked whether the green space shown on the plan was a park, and Troy Moyes clarified that it was a detention area. Bryn MacDonald added that the plan was more finalized, included the engineered detention feature, and that the applicant had lost two lots compared to what was originally approved. Troy Moyes concluded that these were the main upcoming items for future action.

Troy Moyes reviewed the Sky Meadows Subdivision that was on for action in the General Session and explained that the applicants, Hunter Murray and Trek Loveridge, were present to answer questions. He noted that the Commission had previously discussed the trail dedication, lot sizes, and the applicant's most recent proposal. He stated that because the annexation had been approved but not yet officially recorded, staff had been working with the applicant and their surveyor to confirm the exact acreage, particularly since the applicant's calculations were based only on buildable land and excluded the slough. He explained that the base R-1 density was 2.2 units per acre, while the applicant was requesting 2.41 units per acre, which represented the maximum 10% bonus density. He noted that under the buildable acreage of 18.94 acres, the base would allow 41 lots, while the applicant proposed 45 lots. Although PRUD zoning had no minimum lot size, he referenced that the applicant was reducing lot sizes from the typical 12,000 square feet down to 10,000 square feet, while maintaining lot frontage that exceeded R-1 standards.

Troy Moyes stated that the applicant was requesting bonus density based on two amenities: Dedication of land for a regional trail corridor and providing a pocket park near 1800 N and 5000 W. He clarified that the code allowed bonus density for dedication of land for a trail system, even though the applicant was not proposing to construct the trail, and that the pocket park could qualify as an additional amenity. He emphasized that it was up to the Commission to determine whether these amenities justified the full bonus density request.

Commissioner King asked whether the applicant had spoken with the Johnston family about a small triangle parcel that could connect trails. Mr. Murray explained that to avoid relying on the Johnstons, the trail alignment had been shifted to the east side of the property and directed north, reducing the need for that connection.

Commissioner Roubinet raised major concerns about awarding density without resolving key issues outlined in a staff report by City Engineer Boyd Davis, including the possibility of a Davis County easement preventing trail construction, safety concerns related to drainage structures near the pocket park, and uncertainty about how the trail would safely connect at 5000 W. Commissioner Wade agreed, stating that if the trail could not actually be built, the benefit to the City would be lost. Bryn MacDonald reminded the Commission that the applicant was only dedicating land, not building the trail. Mr. Murray responded that their title review showed no current easements affecting the slough area, and acknowledged the need to address safe trail crossings and stormwater safety through engineering and design measures such as grates and proper detention.

Commissioners also discussed stormwater discharge into the slough and whether it was used for irrigation. Mr. Loveridge stated that Davis County would require specific discharge and filtration standards if irrigation were involved. Commissioner Wade emphasized the importance of safety around detention areas, especially for children, and noted that Boyd Davis would review these issues more closely during later engineering phases. Commissioner Roubinet also questioned the proximity of the pocket park to the roadway and the depth of drainage inlets, expressing concern about vehicles leaving the road near the curve.

The Commission discussed fencing along the subdivision perimeter, with Commissioner King asking whether fencing would extend around the pocket park area. Staff noted that fencing parks and trails could reduce visibility and create safety concerns. Commissioner Taylor asked whether the trail and

easement issues were potential “showstoppers,” and Commissioner Roubinet stated he would want written guarantees that the trail was buildable. Mr. Murray suggested that approval could be conditioned on a title report and Boyd Davis’s confirmation that no easements would interfere. He also confirmed that adequate water shares were available and stated that engineering details such as cul-de-sac adjustments could be modified if needed.

Commissioner Farnsworth suggested exploring an alternative trail connection along 5000 W by replacing part of the required landscape buffer with an asphalt path, potentially creating a safer and more practical trail corridor. Staff noted this would require a development agreement or code change, but the applicant expressed openness to interconnected trail solutions. The discussion concluded with agreement that additional comments could be addressed during the general meeting following the public hearing.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH  
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

## WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 23, 2025

---

### GENERAL SESSION 7:00 PM

**Planning Commission Present:** Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Jeff Turner, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

**City Staff Present:** Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

**Visitors:** Hunter Murray, Trek Loveridge, Bill and Annette Lucas, Mike Flood

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer** - Commissioner King
4. **Disclosures from Planning Commissioners**

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

6. **Discussion and consideration of a request to rezone property located at approximately 2000 N 5000 W from A-5 to R-1 with a Planned Residential Unit Development Overlay Zone; *The Holland Group, Applicant***

Troy Moyes stated the Holland Group has submitted a request to rezone property located near 5000 W and 1800 N from A-5 Agricultural to R-1 PRUD Residential. The proposed subdivision, known as Sky Meadows, is intended to be a single-family residential development that incorporates a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) overlay. The PRUD overlay provides opportunities for a mix of lot sizes and configurations in exchange for community benefits such as enhanced architecture, landscaping, street trees, trails, or parks. The Planning Commission discussed this proposal during its September 25, 2025, and October 9, 2025, meetings.

Rezone requests, including application of a PRUD overlay, are legislative decisions. Unlike administrative approvals where the City must grant an application that meets objective standards, legislative matters give the Planning Commission and City Council broad discretion. The Commission is not required to recommend approval simply because the request is technically eligible. Instead, your recommendation should hinge on whether the proposal advances the community's health, safety, and welfare and aligns with the City's long-term planning goals.



The concept plan dated October 6, 2025 proposes 45 single-family lots at a calculated density of 2.3 units per acre.

Standard	R-1 Base Zone	PRUD Proposed
Density for R-1 Residential ( <i>units per acre</i> )	$\leq 2.2$	2.3 ( <i>max potential of 2.42</i> )
Maximum number of lots ( <i>on 19.92 acres</i> )	44	45 ( <i>max potential of 48</i> )
Minimum lot size ( <i>square feet</i> )	$\leq 12,000$	*10,000
Average lot size ( <i>square feet</i> )	N/A	*12,279
Minimum lot frontage	$\leq 85'$ ( <i>average of 100'</i> )	*90'
Minimum lot depth	$\leq 100'$	*100'
8' Landscape dedicated landscape strip required ( <i>along 5000 West</i> )	Yes	Yes
Landscape buffering required	No	No

*\*There is no minimum requirement*

The applicant's requested density of 2.3 units/acre, compared with the base R-1 maximum of 2.2 units/acre, represents approximately a 4.5% bonus density, which is within the range that may be authorized under the PRUD code if the Commission determines the amenities justify it.

Two amenities are identified to support this request:

1. Trail Dedication (1.80 acres): A 10-foot-wide corridor along the west and south boundaries that aligns with the City's adopted Master Trails Plan. This amenity corresponds directly with WPCC 17.60.160(F)(4)(c)(v) "Dedication of land to the City for the development of a regional trail system." The applicant proposes to dedicate the corridor but not construct the trail.
2. Pocket Park (0.36 acres): A small neighborhood open space located near 1800 N and 5000 W. Because it is not identified as a regional park and would ultimately be improved by the City, it qualifies under WPCC 17.60.160(F)(4)(f) as an "Other Amenity."

Commissioner Roubinet noted that, despite the applicant's updates, 28 of the 45 lots were still measuring 10,000 square feet and that this had not changed. Commissioner Farnsworth stated that the Commission initially believed only one additional home would be gained through the density increase, but questioned whether the proposal was now maximizing the full 10% bonus density due to acreage changes. Troy Moyes confirmed that the project was reaching the 10% maximum, largely because the slough was omitted from the gross acreage calculation. Commissioner Farnsworth acknowledged that this meant the increase was now being valued at the full 10% rather than the smaller increase originally expected.

Commissioner Turner asked about the slope and buildability of the rear lots near the slough and future trail. Bryn MacDonald stated the trail would be located on the flat, buildable area at the top of the bank. Commissioner Turner expressed concern that the PRUD design did not feel consistent with a true R-1 development, noting the trail mainly benefited the city and that county confirmation

was needed for the easement. He also questioned the lot size mix and supported Commissioner Farnsworth's suggestion to extend the trail down 5000 W.

a. Public Hearing

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to close the public hearing

Commissioner Turner seconded the motion

All voted aye.

b. Action

Commissioner Farnsworth stated that after the adjustments, she did not feel the changes justified four additional homes, suggesting two might be more reasonable. She also felt the lots on the west and north sides were still too small and recommended widening them to better match the neighboring property and provide a more open, balanced feel around the edge of the subdivision.

Commissioner Wade stated that he understood Commissioner Turner's concerns about ensuring the land was safe for residents and suitable for building a legitimate trail. He noted that if the trail area was not truly buildable, the development would feel more like an R-2 or R-3 development rather than R-1. He added that the trail could provide benefit and appeal, especially with the adjacent property to the north. Commissioner Wade agreed with Commissioner Farnsworth that the development seemed slightly denser than expected for R-1, but felt that if all the benefits were confirmed, it would be a nice development.

Commissioner Roubinet asked the commission if there was some flexibility, would that be better. Commissioner Turner stated he is in agreement with Commissioner Farnsworth in having some bigger lots.

Trek Loveridge introduced himself as a representative of the Holland Group and stated that they had worked closely with staff to create a sustainable, polished development. He explained that one of their objectives was to remain as close as possible to R-1 setbacks so the neighborhood would not feel too tight and would appear consistent from the street despite having additional units. He expressed strong support for walking trails and said they were willing to work with the City on extending a trail along 5000 W, as discussed in the work session. Commissioner Taylor asked about the possibility of dropping two lots, and Mr. Loveridge responded that it would be difficult because without the PRUD the project would only yield 38 lots, making the 45 lots important for the development's viability. He added that while they could contribute improvements such as additional asphalt along 5000 W, donating two acres became less appealing without comparable density.

Hunter Murray another representative for the Holland Group echoed support for extending the trail, stating that if the 45 units were maintained, they would be happy to extend the trail system to benefit the community and improve access, especially near the pocket park.

Commissioner Roubinet asked whether the trail could be placed within the required landscape

buffer area. Bryn MacDonald explained that while it could potentially be within the same property, an agreement would be needed because the buffer required specific landscaping. Commissioner Roubinet noted that coordinating trail construction during road paving could be efficient and mentioned asphalt is typically less expensive than concrete for trail construction.

Commissioner Turner questioned whether a pocket park provided meaningful value, especially given its small size and location near the slough, and asked whether other amenities could be considered instead. Mr. Murray explained that the pocket park was approximately 0.36 acres, while Commissioner Roubinet noted that because it extended across the slough, it would function more as open space with benches rather than a traditional park with playground equipment. Bryn MacDonald agreed, viewing it more as open space or a potential trailhead rather than an active park, and clarified that the developer was dedicating the land rather than building park improvements. Commissioner Turner raised concern that the development was receiving additional density in exchange for land that may not be buildable.

Mr. Murray emphasized that newer PRUD requirements included stronger landscaping and fencing standards that raised the overall quality of the community, which supported their request to maintain 45 lots. Commissioner Wade considered whether the density increase was significant, questioning what truly defines high density and whether 10,000-square-foot lots were still consistent with an R-1 feel. He noted that perceptions vary and suggested the development could still appear like an R-1 neighborhood. Bryn MacDonald stated that this would not be considered high density under City code, noting that high density is technically 14 units per acre, and added that trails were the top priority in the City's parks survey.

Commissioner Turner expressed concern that 10,000-square-foot lots did not preserve the larger-lot character expected as development moves west, even though he acknowledged the trail benefit. Commissioners Roubinet and Wade also discussed the surrounding context, including nearby commercial areas, the high school, and freeway access, suggesting this location might be appropriate for slightly smaller lots. Commissioner Roubinet emphasized the need for assurance that the trail would be buildable, and Mr. Loveridge offered to provide a title report showing easements prior to City Council. Commissioner King supported the lot sizes and trail concept, and Commissioner Taylor added that the plan complemented nearby development and could help provide a lower price point for younger homebuyers.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to recommend approval for the rezone request for 19.92 acres for the property located at approximately 5000 W 1800 N from A-5 to R-1 PRUD Residential with condition of insuring or confirming there is no easement on the proposed trail area along the slough with review by Boyd Davis to make sure it is safe and buildable with another condition of consideration of an asphalt trail along 5000 W in the landscape buffer with the addition of all engineering comments being addressed.

Mr. Loveridge sought clarification that some of Mr. Davis' comments are things that need to be addressed at final plat. They would have to do fully engineered drawings to meet all of Mr. Davis' comments and they would prefer not to do that at rezone. Commissioner Taylor amended the motion so that all engineering concerns pertaining to the rezone are addressed.

Commissioner King seconded the motion.



Commissioner Turner stated he has concerns with some of the flex items, pocket park, and the value of a fence. Bryn MacDonald sought clarification from the Planning Commission on the timing of clearing up the easement.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to rescind the first motion  
Commissioner King seconded the motion  
All voted aye.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to recommend approval for the rezone request for 19.92 acres of property located approximately 5000 W 1800 N from A-5 Agriculture to R-1 PRUD Residential with the conditions of verification from Davis County that there is no easement on the proposed trail, that it would be safe and buildable as well as consideration of an asphalt trail along 5000 W in the landscape buffer as well as addressing engineering concerns related to the rezone request and verify those before this item is added to a City Council agenda.  
Commissioner King seconded the motion.

Commissioner Wade – Aye  
Commissioner Farnsworth – No  
Commissioner Taylor – Aye  
Commissioner King – Aye  
Commissioner Turner – No  
Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

The motion passed 4:2.

**7. Discussion and consideration of a request to amend the General Plan for property located at 39 S 2000 W from R-3 (Residential) to C-C (Commercial); *Don Mendenhall, applicant***

Donald Mendenhall, representing the property owner Clint Shaw, has submitted a request for a General Plan amendment for property located at 39 S 2000 W (Parcel 12-023-0046), containing approximately one acre. The property is currently designated R-3 Residential on the City's General Plan Map. The applicant is requesting that the General Plan Map designation be changed to "C-C (Community Commercial), consistent with the properties to the north." General Plan amendment requests are legislative decisions. In legislative matters, the Planning Commission and City Council have broad discretion, provided that it can be demonstrated that their action will promote or protect the community's overall welfare. Changes to the General Plan require a public hearing and recommendation from the Planning Commission before a final decision can be made by the City Council. Big-O Tires is not C-C commercial. It's L-C (Limited Commercial) due to the use. The following are allowed uses in the C-C zone:

Use	C-C Zone
Crop Production	P
Accessory Building (small ≤ 1,200 sq ft)	P
Accessory Building (medium 1,201 – 1,449 sq ft on lot < 15,000 sq ft)	AC
Religious Places of Worship and Support Facilities	P
Commercial Day Care Center / Preschool	AC
Senior Care Facilities / Nursing Homes	PC
Private / Quasi-Public / Charter School	P
Utility Buildings & Structures (Electric Substations)	PC
Telecommunication Towers / Small Cell Installations	PC
Public Utilities (including substations, shops, storage yards, public buildings)	P
Public Water Reservoir / Storage Tank	P
Convenience Store	PC
Retail Shops / Services (< 10,000 sq ft)	PC
Mid-Box Retail (10,001 – 80,000 sq ft)	PC
Financial Institutions	PC
Restaurants / Bars (including fast food)	PC
Professional Offices (business, medical, dental, optical, labs)	PC
Private Instructional Studios (art, music, dance, etc.)	PC
Commercial Complex	PC
Commercial / Industrial Subdivision	P
Signs (see WPC 17.110)	P
Firework Stands (temporary)	P
Animal Clinic	PC

*P=Permitted PC=Planning Commission CUP AC=Administrative CUP*

a. Public Hearing

There were no comments made.

Commissioner King motioned to close the meeting

Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion

All voted aye.

b. Action

Commissioner Roubinet stated that he had concerns about the rezone, noting that the packet suggested the property had no practical use other than commercial, which he did not necessarily agree with. He acknowledged that commercial rezones often occur before a tenant is identified, but said his main concern was the potential impact on the homes bordering 75 South depending on the future use. He added that these were questions he would have asked the applicant if they had been present.

Commissioner King asked whether staff knew what the applicant intended to build there.

Commissioner Farnsworth explained that although there was a sign indicating retail, this was only a General Plan amendment and the applicant would need to return with a specific proposal. She felt the location made sense and was an appropriate place for commercial use.

Commissioner Wade agreed with Commissioner Farnsworth and stated that he had no issue with the amendment.

Commissioner King acknowledged Commissioner Roubinet's concerns about commercial encroaching on nearby homes but stated that commercial use generally seemed suitable for that area. The Commission also discussed whether to table the item due to the applicant's absence, and Commissioner Roubinet expressed interest in hearing how surrounding homeowners felt about the potential commercial development.

Commissioner King motioned to table any action on the rezone request of the General Plan amendment request for approximately one acre of property located 39 S 2000 W changing the designation from R-3 Residential to C-C (Community Commercial) until the next meeting. Commissioner Roubinet seconded the motion.

Commissioner Farnsworth and Turner stated that they saw no reason to table the item and felt it should move forward.

Commissioner Farnsworth – No  
Commissioner King – Aye  
Commissioner Turner – No  
Commissioner Wade – No  
Commissioner Taylor – No  
Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

Motioned denied tabling the request 4:2.

Commissioner Wade recommended approval of the General Plan amendment request for approximately one acre of property located at 39 S 2000 W, changing the designation from R-3 Residential to C-C (Community Commercial), and forward this item to the City Council for consideration. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion.

Commissioner King – Aye  
Commissioner Wade – Aye  
Commissioner Turner – Aye  
Commissioner Taylor – Aye  
Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye  
Commissioner Roubinet – No

Motion passed 5:1.

**8. Discussion and consideration of a request to amend the General Plan for property located at 2084 N 4500 W from R-1 (Residential, 2.2 units per acre) to R-4 (Residential, 6 units per acre); *Nilson Land Development, applicant***

Nilson Land Development has submitted a request for a General Plan amendment for property located at approximately 1900 N 4500 W (Parcel 14-165-0001), containing approximately 4.42 acres. The parcel is currently designated R-1 Residential (up to 2.2 units per acre) on the City's General Plan Map. The applicant is requesting to amend the General Plan Map designation to R-4

Residential (up to 6.0 units per acre) to allow the property to be incorporated into the larger Trail's Edge subdivision area, which includes land in both West Point City and Clinton City.

Commissioner Roubinet noted that he appreciated the discussion questions included in the packet, stating that they prompted him to think more carefully about whether the proposed amendment aligned with the existing residential pattern, supported the City's housing and growth goals, and fit within the long-term land use vision for the area.

a. Public Hearing

Mike Flood: Nilson Homes, South Ogden: Mr. Flood stated the General Plan amendment proposal found in the packet had been written by one of his colleagues to address the questions typically asked and reviewed when considering a General Plan amendment. He noted that the request had been discussed at length during the work session they attended a few weeks earlier. He respectfully requested that the Commission make a recommendation to the City Council for a General Plan amendment to R-4. Mr. Flood explained that while the property directly to the south was currently zoned R-1, the two properties below were zoned R-4. He added that the property to the east was R-4, and the property south of that was believed to be R-10. He stated that the request was consistent with the future General Plan and with how zoning had developed in the area. He pointed out that an extension of the West Davis Corridor would be located not far away, and that higher density was more suitable near corridor-type transportation routes than more rural routes. He concluded by requesting that the Commission forward the amendment with a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Turner motioned to close the public hearing  
Commissioner King seconded the motion  
All voted aye.

b. Action

Commissioner Turner acknowledged that there was higher density zoning to the south and east, but expressed concern that if development continued in that direction, high density could eventually extend further north to neighbor cities. He noted that this corner had been planned with the intent of being close to access routes, but emphasized that there were also established residential properties in the area zoned R-1 and agricultural that would likely remain unchanged for a long time. He stated that he would prefer to reduce the density and better match the development pattern of the properties to the north.

Commissioner Wade said he partly agreed with Commissioner Turner, noting that nearby zoning is not always a strong justification for higher density. He added that there comes a point where the City must decide where increased density should stop, and he noted there was no interest from the property owner directly south in rezoning or amending the General Plan to R-4.

Commissioner Farnsworth agreed with Commissioner Turner, stating that there comes a point where the City must decide where increased density should stop. She noted that just because surrounding areas may be more dense does not mean development should continue

indefinitely, and suggested that adjustments such as lot width and depth through the PRUD process could provide a compromise, but emphasized that boundaries need to be set.

Commissioner King stated that he tended to agree that the development was extending higher density too far and that it was becoming excessive.

Commissioner Roubinet asked the applicant, Mike Flood of Nilson Homes, whether they would consider a lower-density designation such as R-3 instead of R-4, noting that many Commissioners were not comfortable with the R-4 request and that the property's shape and lot width could limit development. Mr. Flood responded that the applicant was still seeking a recommendation for R-4, as discussed in the earlier work session, and explained that part of the assembled property in Clinton carried a density of eight units per acre, creating a disconnect if this portion remained at a lower density. He acknowledged the Commission's role in recommending for or against the request and said they understood the matter could be sent back for a smaller density, but stated he could not commit to anything other than R-4 at that time. Commissioner Roubinet noted that if the Council denied the request, the applicant would have to wait another year before reapplying, and Mr. Flood reiterated that their current recommendation remained R-4.

Commissioner King asked Mr. Flood whether the property in Clinton he referenced was associated with Nilson Homes. Mr. Flood confirmed that it was and stated that Clinton City Council had unanimously approved a revision to the MDA about three to four weeks earlier. Commissioner King noted his understanding that a nearby property had previously been highly contested. Mr. Flood explained that the controversy involved a prior applicant, not Nilson Homes, and said that Nilson had since taken over the project and reduced the overall density by about 75 units while working on a different development approach. Commissioner King clarified that the prior developer's application had caused the dispute and asked whether Nilson purchased the property afterward. Mr. Flood responded that the prior developer had received an MDA with higher density, which led to a lawsuit and ongoing issues. He stated that Nilson approached Clinton with a more acceptable plan, reduced the unit count, adjusted building orientation, and received unanimous approval for the revised MDA, which replaced the previous agreement if the project moved forward.

Commissioner Taylor raised a broader question about the surrounding area, noting nearby Salt Grass zoning is R-5 and the previously approved R-4. He discussed the idea of stepping down density in that location and questioned whether it made sense to pull back completely to lower density, especially since Clinton's development would already include higher density. He asked whether maintaining similar density was more appropriate or whether stepping down remained the better principle.

Commissioner Farnsworth explained that the Salt Grass approval had been tied to securing the elementary school, and although not everyone fully supported it, the Commission accepted it because the community benefit was greater and it was expected that density would step down afterward. She noted she did not anticipate the push for higher density would come so quickly, making it more difficult to manage. She emphasized that the Commission's responsibility was to uphold the General Plan shaped by resident input and to evaluate what added benefit a

proposal brings to the community. She stated that West Point's character includes a mix of one-acre lots and neighborhoods, and that diversity in housing types can strengthen the community. However, she questioned what benefit this particular request provided, noting it did not offer parks, trails, or other improvements, and instead would only add more residents and potential strain without clear community gain.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to recommend denial of the General Plan amendment request for approximately 4.42 acres of property located at 1900 N 4500 W, changing the designation from R-1 Residential to R-4 Residential, due to the fact that this is a farming community with mixed homes, so the recommendation based on this fitting the community does not fit, because there is more benefit to the community to have diversity of who lives in each type of community, the different types of people and ages that this can bring. We have a planned vision with the General Plan from our residents and it is our job to uphold what the residents have as their input and the developer has not brought any added benefits to the community so as to uphold to the residents and what they would say there is no added benefit to the community so there should be no changes to this area. Commissioner Wade seconded the motion.

Commissioner Turner stated that he felt more comfortable if the applicant were willing to consider other density options, but noted that they were not.

Commissioner Turner – Aye  
Commissioner Taylor – Aye  
Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye  
Commissioner King – Aye  
Commissioner Wade – Aye  
Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

The motion passed unanimously to recommend denial to the City Council.

## **9. Staff Update**

Bryn MacDonald noted that most of the updates had been discussed during the work session. Commissioner Taylor asked whether the Matt Leavitt development was still on hold, and she confirmed that it was and would be on the next City Council agenda.

## **10. Planning Commission Comments**

Commissioner Turner stated that the first PRUD process had been interesting and suggested that, if time allowed during a future work session, it might be worthwhile to spend 15-20 minutes discussing how it went. He noted there were only a few minor issues but questioned whether this PRUD outcome was unique or if future PRUDs would result in developments that still appear R-1 in character. He expressed curiosity about whether a follow-up discussion would help clarify how PRUDs are intended to function moving forward.



Commissioner Wade stated that they agreed with Commissioner Turner's concerns and felt it would be helpful to better understand what types of amenities or community benefits developers might be willing to provide in exchange for additional density. He noted that decisions often feel rushed, with limited time to evaluate trade-offs such as trails or other contributions. He reflected on recent public comments about high density, questioned what high density truly means, and acknowledged that even a few additional homes can raise important considerations. They ultimately felt the PRUD that was approved was a good decision and worth it, but supported Commissioner Turner's idea of further discussion about how density and lot size expectations should be handled moving forward.

Commissioner Farnsworth expressed appreciation for the thoughtful comments and discussions, noting that hearing different perspectives helped the Commission consider issues from every angle. She stated that she valued the strong input from fellow Commissioners and emphasized the importance of sharing honest opinions, especially given the limited time available, to ensure decisions were made more thoroughly.

Commissioner Taylor noted that based on recent social media discussions, he expected a much larger public turnout and was surprised that few residents attended to share their opinions on density and growth in West Point. He remarked that it seemed to be partly an education issue, with many people not fully understanding the planning process. He added that he was still learning himself and expressed appreciation for the guidance and support from staff.

Commissioner King echoed the comments made by the other Commissioners and expressed his agreement with what had been said.

Commissioner Roubinet stated that he agreed with Commissioner Turner and suggested placing a general discussion on a future agenda to review how the Commission felt about the PRUD overlay. He noted that the code was somewhat vague regarding bonus density and felt it would be helpful to discuss expectations, review examples, and better define how bonus density should be evaluated. He added that having this discussion in advance could help streamline future decision-making and provide clearer guidance to staff and applicants before similar proposals were brought forward.

Commissioner Turner suggested that alongside a future PRUD discussion, the Commission could also explore alternative housing concepts he had heard about, such as "mansion homes," where a building appears as a single large home from the street but may include multiple units with features like rear driveways. He noted that ideas like this could provide different options beyond simply increasing lot sizes, while still maintaining the appearance of larger homes and preserving neighborhood character.

## **11. Adjournment**

Commissioner Wade motioned to adjourn at 9:15 pm. Commissioner King seconded the motion. All voted aye.

  
Chairperson – PJ Roubinet

  
Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen