



## WEST HAVEN PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

March 11, 2026 6:00 P.M.  
City Council Chambers  
4150 South 3900 West, West Haven, UT 84401

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT ON **Wednesday, March 11, 2026**, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF WEST HAVEN CITY WILL HOLD THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC MEETINGS:

JOIN US DIGITALLY FOR THE REGULAR PLANNING MEETING AT:  
[HTTPS://US06WEB.ZOOM.US/J/86539464549](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86539464549).

WATCH LIVE AT [HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/CHANNEL/UCEEQNQBTFZJWVGOPHMCNCBA](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCEEQNQBTFZJWVGOPHMCNCBA).

### **6:00 Regular Planning Commission Meeting**

1. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** Chairman Reed
2. **OPENING CEREMONIES**
  - a. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Commission member Stimpson
  - b. **PRAYER/MOMENT OF SILENCE** Vice Chairman Reyna
3. **ACTION ON MINUTES** - Approve minutes for the meeting of 02/25/2026.
4. **REPORTS** - Actions taken by City Council and other items
5. **DISCUSSION** – Discussion on Home Occupation Business Licensing Standards.
6. **ADJOURNMENT**

*Robyn Van Campen*

**Robyn Van Campen, Deputy Recorder**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing special accommodations, including auxiliary communicative aids and services, for this meeting should notify the city recorder at 731-4519 or by email: [robynv@westhavenut.gov](mailto:robynv@westhavenut.gov) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF POSTING**

The undersigned, duly appointed city recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda has been posted in the West Haven City Recorder's office; at the West Haven City Complex on the Notice Board and at [www.westhavenut.gov](http://www.westhavenut.gov); emailed to the Standard-Examiner with a request that it be posted in their Wednesday night meeting section; mailed and emailed to the West Haven City Mayor and each West Haven City Council Member who has email capacity and to the city attorney



5. **PRESENTATION ON PUBLIC HEARING** - To solicit public input on an amendment to the Sign Code Ordinance.

*Stephen Nelson said the draft of the sign code ordinance redefines what a Planned Commercial Center is in the code; it allows monument signs to be up to 120 square feet and pole signs to be 200 square feet, but up to 250 square feet if the sign states that the development is located within West Haven; it allows pole signs to increase in height to 30 feet; it adds language clarifying that a violation of the sign ordinance is a Class C Misdemeanor; it removes the word "small" from the Planned Commercial Center Definition; reduces the setbacks for pole signs within these centers; and requires that all property owners within Planned Commercial Center approval sign off on the signage plan. A Planned Commercial Center would be a regional center consisting of multiple large-scale commercial uses that sell a broad range of goods and/or services. These centers must have 10 acres and must contain at least one retail facility. It would allow for off premise signs and the applicant would be required to meet the city setbacks; it would also reduce the setbacks for signs to 10 feet and a maximum height of 30 feet. If you have an additional access point and your frontage is between 0 and 599 feet or between 600 and 1200 feet, you may have an additional sign. There was a concern at the last meeting about signs being kept in good condition; this has been added to the draft. We received a recommendation to add a time limit to the ordinance requiring violations to be addressed within 30 days of notice. Under the violations section of the ordinance, there is a clause regarding illegally placed signs (such as signs placed in the right of way). This would allow staff to provide notice, and if they remain out of compliance, they could be charged with a Class "C" Misdemeanor.*

*Commission member Streker asked for clarification on the 30-day notice. She asked if it was 30 days to respond back or have it fixed.*

*Stephen Nelson responded that it would be to fix this issue.*

*Commission member Streker suggested moving it 60 days, so they have time to respond.*

6. **PUBLIC HEARING** – To solicit public input on an amendment to the Sign Code Ordinance.

**Commission member Jenson made a motion** to enter into public hearing. **Chairman Reed** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

*Chairman Reed invited the public up for comment.*

*No one came up at this time.*

*James Carpentier from the International Sign Association and the Utah Sign Association via email suggested that the sign height needs to take into account when the sign location is below the street grade. He also suggested utilizing the .3-foot candle approach for electronic message centers.*

*Ryan Kimball from Kimball Investments via email suggested that pole signs have a clearance of 10 feet to the bottom of the lowest cabinet face, signs are setback 1 foot for each foot of sign height including supporting structures from any adjoining property line. He recommended allowing up to 300 square feet and a 45-foot height maximum for signs. He also suggested that the setback be 10 to 20 feet.*

**Commission member Streker made a motion** to leave public hearing. **Commission member LaMar** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

7. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING** - To solicit public input on an amendment to the Sign Code Ordinance.

*Chairman Reed said that he thinks the 45-foot-high signs are too high. He also mentioned that City Council member Saunders has a sign company, and staff solicited his input on this ordinance.*

*Stephen Nelson indicated that some of the concerns raised by Ryan Kimball had already been addressed in the ordinance. The only thing the ordinance didn't address was height and size. They are recommending allowing a 45-foot height and 300 square feet.*

*Commission member Jenson asked if we needed to look into the Lumens.*

*Vice Chairman Reyna wanted to know if the ordinance left room for a master development agreement to allow a 40-foot height if all parcels in the Planned Commercial Center were developed by Walmart.*

*Stephen Nelson indicated that there is currently no provision in our ordinance addressing that; however, you could address it if you were creating a new ordinance. He recommends not addressing it through a master development agreement.*

**Commission member LaMar made a motion** to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the sign regulations contained within West Haven City Code §157.755 - §157.761, as provided. **Commission member Stimpson** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

**The motion was modified -**

**Commission member LaMar made a motion** to recommend Approval of the proposed changes to the Sign Relations contained within West Haven City Code §157.755 - §157.761, as provided, and to allow staff to make the exception for the 30-day notice for violations of the sign ordinance.

**Commission member Stimpson** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION – DISCUSSION AND ACTION** – To consider a Preliminary Site Plan approval for a tire store located at approximately 3613 S Midland Drive (Parcel #080220101 & 080220104). Applicant Denny Kiely.

*Damian Rodriguez presented the Planning Commission with a brief description of the applicant's request. The applicant is requesting a reduction in parking based on an engineer's assessment provided to staff. The assessment shows that 33 parking stalls are sufficient for the proposed use of the site. He said there are some utility concerns. Right now, the property does not have a will-serve letter for culinary or secondary water, which is a code requirement for preliminary review; however, the water service providers have stated that an annexation is required for both culinary and secondary. They will also not entertain the annexation without some sort of proof that the project is moving forward. This approval will allow them to move forward with the annexation.*

*Stephen Nelson indicated he has talked to the water provider, who said there is not enough water flow/pressure in Taylor West Weber Water District boundaries to support this site. They want to de-annex from Taylor West Weber Water District to the West Haven Special Service District. He said they have been in communication with UDOT because, if they are going to annex into another water provider, it will need to be bored under the highway. They are also seeking approval to use an alternative material, such as tilt-up concrete panels, as the primary material. Concrete is currently listed as a secondary material. The City Engineer has also expressed some concerns about water retention on the site. The concern is that the proposed preliminary stormwater plan will not work; however, staff would like to remind the Planning Commission that this must be addressed before final site plan approval.*

*Chairman Reed asked if there would be a monument sign, as he could not locate one on the Site Plan. He also wanted to know if the parking on the North side will be for employees, and if the secondary material will look like the other Les Schwabs around the area.*

*Denny Kiely indicated that there would be a sign on the Midland Drive side only. He said there will be no designated area for employee parking. The newer Les Schwab buildings in the area also have tilt up concrete panels.*

**Commission member Streker made a motion** to grant approval of the proposed parking adjustment for unusual and unique conditions, reducing the minimum parking space requirements from 40 to 33, find that this reduction is based on accepted engineering principles, as provided by the parking memo by Zach Graham, PE, and unique circumstances relating to the operational characteristics of the use, and that such adjustment is equitable and warranted as required by §157.634. **Chairman Reed** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –  
**RECUSED** –

**Commission member Streker made a motion** to grant approval of the proposed alternative materials to allow the provided insulated concrete panels as a primary material, finding that the requested material is comparable to or superior to the listed and approved materials, as outlined within the staff report. **Commission member LaMar** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –  
**RECUSED** –

**Commission member Streker made a motion** to recommend granting the preliminary approval of the proposed site plan for the Les Schwab Tire Center at 3645 S Midland Drive, finding the general design of the proposed site and building is compliant with the applicable regulations of the ordinance when the following conditions of approval are applied. Conditions: 1) A conditional access permit is obtained by UDOT prior to final site plan approval, 2) The approval of the complete plan set is obtained from all Development Review Committee members prior to final site plan approval. 3) All staff comments and corrections in the attached report are satisfactorily addressed prior to final site plan approval, to include signage corrections. **Chairman Reed** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

9. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION** – For a Conditional Use Permit for a home occupation located at 4267 S 3450 W. (Parcel # 084520012). Applicant Russell Burton.

*The applicant was not present for this item.*

*Damian Rodriguez indicated that normally, this business license wouldn't need a conditional use permit. This particular business is using exterior space, which requires them to obtain a conditional use permit. The outdoor storage requires a parking pad in the side yard.*

*Commission member Streker wanted to confirm that the parking will be for a truck and trailer. She also asked how we could word it so that the applicant doesn't have to come back in front of the Planning Commission and can get approval through staff.*

*Chairman Reed stated that he went by the property, and the truck and trailer are already present.*

*Commission member LaMar was concerned that the parking pad would become problematic in the future.*

**Commission member LaMar made a motion** to table. **Commission member Jenson** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Commission member Stimpson, Commission member LaMar, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** – Vice Chairman Reyna; Commission member Streker

**RECUSED** –

10. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION** – To consider a recommendation to the City Council on amending the Planning Commission Policies and Procedures.

*Stephen Nelson went over the primary changes. Section 2, the conflict-of-interest section was replaced with a more simplified version that is more reliant on the state code definition and models the City Councils. Rules regarding public hearings have been added to section IV. Section 3, clarified when the regular meetings are scheduled, and designated work sessions would be held typically at 5 o'clock or as designated by the Planning Commission Chairman. Section 4 was added, and Section 5 through 9 removed. It is basically a consolidation of the general procedures of the Planning Commission. Changes made to the draft from the last meeting; are that Section G was added. Added Section K, deadlines for applications.*

Chairman Reed asked what circumstance section 4d addresses.

Stephen Nelson thinks this allows a Planning Commission member to call for a motion even if the chair does not agree.

**Commission member Jenson made a motion** to consider adoption and recommendation to the City Council on amending Planning Commission Policies and Procedures. **Chairman Reed** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chairman Reed, Vice Chairman Reyna, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Streker, and Commission member Jenson.

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** –

Commission member Stimpson left the meeting via Zoom at 7:03 PM.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Commission member Vice-Chair Reyna made a motion** to adjourn at 7:12 PM. **Commission member Jenson** seconded the motion.

**AYES** – Chair Reed, Vice-Chair Reyna, Commission member LaMar, Commission member Smith, Commission member Streker, and Commission Jenson

**NAYS** –

**RECUSED** -

*Robyn Van Campen*

Deputy City Recorder

Date Approved:

# Planning Commission Staff Review Memo

March 11, 2026

Damian Rodriguez, City Planner



## ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

<b>Proposal:</b>	Amend the standards and restrictions for Home Occupations
<b>Ordinance Section:</b>	<a href="#">§157.880</a> - <a href="#">§157.883</a>
<b>Applicant:</b>	The West Haven City Development Review Committee
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Legislative
<b>Staff Recommendation:</b>	Provide feedback on the draft.

### I. BACKGROUND

**Issue:** The primary concern that motivates the proposal is that in months past the city has received home occupation license requests that were reasonably presumed to be beyond the purpose and intent of the Home Occupation, to “allow persons residing in dwellings in residential and agricultural areas to provide a service, develop a product for sale and operate certain kinds of small businesses, while at the same time maintaining the peace, quiet, and domestic tranquility within all residential or agricultural areas of the city.”

A list of the questionable home occupation license requests would include:

1. Trucking and distribution business
2. Landscape business
3. Sports training facility
4. Event Center
5. Pet boarding
6. Trailer and equipment rentals

Staff believe that the above-listed land uses, either inherently or through site design choices, were not compatible with the residential communities that were proposed to host them, namely, they were not in keeping with the peace, quiet, and domestic tranquility that should prevail within their host district. Nevertheless, the language of the home occupation purpose and intent section of the code is largely subjective and difficult to enforce. Additionally, a lack of specified restrictions in the code prevented staff from adequately regulating previous requests and approvals.

**Changes:** The amendments that comprise this proposal include the following:

- A. The required conditions in the code are clarified and expanded upon to better ensure compatibility with the residential and agricultural communities within the city.
- B. A list of business types that are found to be inherently incompatible with the residential and agricultural communities of the city is provided and proposed for prohibition as a home occupation.
- C. The option to obtain a conditional use permit as an exception from the required conditions of this code is further limited in scope.

## **II. Planning Commission Commentary**

The proposed code amendment is now brought to the Planning Commission for a work session. Staff will present the proposal in its entirety and ask that the commission discuss the details and provide commentary; this is to refine the proposal so it better serves community health, safety, and welfare, and to prepare it for Planning Commission review and recommendation at a regular meeting.