



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 22, 2026

WORK SESSION 6:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Joe Taylor, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Spencer Wade, Commissioner Ryan Hymas, and Commissioner Kyle Norton

Planning Commission Excused: None

City Staff Present: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Casey Arnold, City Recorder

Visitors: None

1. Introduction of newly appointed Planning Commissioners

During the work session, the newly appointed Planning Commissioners introduced themselves, and existing commissioners and staff also shared brief introductions. Commissioner Roubinet welcomed the new members and emphasized the importance of reviewing meeting materials and providing thoughtful, well-reasoned recommendations to the City Council, noting that the Commission plays an important role in focusing closely on planning issues and considering a variety of community perspectives.

2. Training

Bryn MacDonald, the Community Development Director, provided a brief training and orientation for the new commissioners, encouraging them to ask questions and continue learning. She reviewed the Planning Commission's role as an advisory body to the City Council, the importance of the General Plan and state land use law, and the distinction between legislative and administrative decisions. She also outlined meeting procedures, public hearing expectations, and transparency requirements, and noted that additional training opportunities would be available throughout the year.

3. Discussion of election process for Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair

Bryn MacDonald explained that the Planning Commission elects a chair and vice chair each January, noting that the same person could be re-elected annually. She stated that the chair serves a one-year term and plays an important role in coordinating with staff, reviewing agendas, and attending City Council meetings to provide feedback and stay informed on related planning matters. Commissioner Roubinet added that he rarely missed meetings and typically attended Council

sessions, especially for major zoning items, to help communicate the Commission's discussions and recommendations. Bryn MacDonald noted that attending Council meetings could be helpful in understanding the Council's decision-making process, and she emphasized the collaborative role of staff in supporting both the Commission and Council.

4. Discussion of proposed rezone for property at 3381 W 300 N (Norton)

Troy Moyes introduced a discussion item regarding an application from Kyle Norton for his property, which was split-zoned R-2 in the front and A-40 in the back. He explained that the updated General Plan adopted in August 2025 placed the property within the Main Street small area plan overlay district. Troy Moyes stated that city code required zoning requests to be consistent with the General Plan and noted that the overlay envisioned "small residential" development at a density of four to six units per acre. He explained that Norton proposed subdividing the property to create a future flag lot under R-2 zoning, which would allow a lower density of approximately 2.7 units per acre. Troy Moyes noted that because the small area plan was conceptual, this created a gray area in determining consistency. He asked the Commission to consider whether the proposal aligned with the overall intent of the small area plan.

Commissioners discussed how the small area plan should guide future development, acknowledging that the plan was conceptual and might not be implemented exactly as drawn, especially where existing homes were already present. Commissioner Roubinet suggested the overlay was designed to be more flexible, while Commissioner Taylor noted that the long-term vision might not perfectly match current realities. Troy Moyes emphasized that any decision could affect how similar requests from neighboring properties would be handled.

The Commission also discussed the feasibility of the proposed flag lot subdivision and whether it would create additional driveways or impact the broader plan. Bryn MacDonald and Commissioner King noted that while consistency was important, each property could have unique circumstances and the overall small area plan could still function even if corner lots developed differently. Several commissioners expressed that the request appeared to modestly increase density without significantly undermining the long-term vision, especially since full redevelopment could be many years away.

Troy Moyes advised that if the Commission chose to move forward, they would need to clearly articulate how the request aligned with the General Plan's intent. The discussion concluded with interest in continuing the process and bringing the item forward for a public hearing.

5. Review of agenda items

Time had expired in the work session and this item was not discussed.

6. Other items

Time had expired and no other items were discussed.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 22, 2026

GENERAL SESSION 7:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Joe Taylor, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Spencer Wade, Commissioner Ryan Hymas, and Commissioner Kyle Norton

Planning Commission Excused: None

City Staff Present: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; Casey Arnold, City Recorder

Visitors: Brent & Kitty Stoddard, Terry Wilberg, Tim Gooch, Rulon Gardner, Jennifer Struhs, Chantyl Staheli, Mary & Mark Montgomery, DeeAnn Montgomery, Doug Rich, Guy Williams, Jeff Macfarlane, Michael Speth

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

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

6. **Approval of minutes from the October 9, 2025 Planning Commission meeting**

Commissioner Taylor motioned to approve the minutes from the October 9, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion. All voted aye.

7. **Approval of minutes from the December 11, 2025, Planning Commission meeting**

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner King seconded the motion. All voted aye.

8. **Election of the Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair**

Commissioner King nominated Commissioner Roubinet for position of Planning Commission Chair. There were no other nominations.

Commissioner Wade motioned to elect Commissioner Roubinet as Planning Commission chair for a one-year term. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. All voted aye.

Commissioner King nominated Commissioner Farnsworth for position of Planning Commission Vice-Chair. There were no other nominations.

Commissioner King motioned to elect Commissioner Farnsworth as Planning Commission Vice-Chair for a one-year term. Commissioner Wade seconded the motion. All voted aye.

9. Discussion and consideration for a rezone of 17.04 acres located at approximately 4750 W 700 S from A-40 to R-1 (Residential, 2.2 units/acre); *Gardner Sunset Ridge LLC, applicant*

The applicant, Rulon Gardner, representing Gardner Sunset Ridge, LLC, is requesting a rezone of 17.04 acres located at approximately 4750 W 700 S from A-40 Agricultural (1 unit/acre) to R-1 Residential (2.2 units/acre). The property is designated R-1 Residential in the West Point City General Plan.

Rezoning is a legislative action, giving both the Planning Commission and City Council broad discretion in determining whether the request promotes the public welfare. Concept plans are typically reviewed concurrently with a rezone application to evaluate General Plan consistency, access, and overall development feasibility. Preliminary and final subdivision design and engineering are reviewed through a subdivision application process. This item is before the Planning Commission for a public hearing and recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will then hold a public hearing and make the final decision.

This property was previously under consideration for a rezone in 2022, but the proposal at that time included more acreage and a higher-density request than what is being presented now. The current application is limited to the 17-acre portion identified in the General Plan as R-1 Residential and proposes a traditional single-family layout of 37 lots that aligns more closely with the intended land use.

A key issue during the earlier review was the question of whether 700 S was a public or private road, since subdivision access could not be granted without that determination. Subdivisions must have access onto a public road. Since then, a court decision has established that 700 S is a 66-foot wide public street, which allows the applicant to rely on it for access. As part of the subdivision, 700 S will need to be improved to City public-street standards. Body Davis, the City Engineer, is reviewing the required roadway cross-section and improvements needed to bring the road up to code.

City Code allows up to 30 lots to be served by a single access. Because the concept plan includes 37 lots, a second access will be required for the entire project to move forward. That second access is anticipated to be provided through the Carlisi property to the east, which is expected to develop and connect back to 700 S in the future. The North Davis Fire District has reviewed the proposed access layout and has indicated that with both access points in place the development would meet Fire Code requirements for emergency response.

a. Public hearing

Terry Wilberg, West Point: Mr. Wilberg stated that he had lived in his home since the early 1980s. His mailbox had been destroyed about four times, making it difficult to keep his address numbers on it due to his house number as 666. He explained that he had moved to the area because he loved the country setting, but he felt that continued building and development were taking that away and turning the city into something more metropolitan. He said he had struggled with the construction of the junior high school, describing the noise, commotion, and dumping that had occurred during the project. He expressed frustration that the country atmosphere and dark skies had been lost and stated that he believed the city was being ruined by ongoing development. He urged the Commission to reconsider these changes, noting that people chose to live in the country for a reason. He also questioned why the junior high school lights were on 24 hours a day, seven days a week, suggesting that security was the only explanation he could think of based on his experience as a licensed armed security officer. He concluded that the constant lighting had taken away the dark skies and nighttime viewing.

Jennifer Struhs, West Point: Ms. Struhs stated that she understood change was inevitable and noted that they had just gone through a three-year court case in which the road had been deemed a public road. She pointed out that it was still a dead-end street, and that the proposal included 37 additional houses, along with 18 more from the Carlisi development. She said that would result in a total of 58 homes on a dead-end street with only one exit. Unless another exit was planned, she explained that the traffic would pass by Mark and Mary Montgomery's property on the corner, and that when the road was taken, they would have only nine feet remaining in their front yard. She stated that this did not appear to meet city code and was anxious to see how that issue would be satisfied. Ms. Struhs also noted that the Planning Commission frequently discussed traffic concerns on 4500 W, and she estimated that the additional homes could result in 100 to 120 more cars traveling down the dead-end street. She encouraged the Commission to visit the area when the junior high and elementary schools were releasing students to see the traffic conditions firsthand. She concluded by saying that while she understood change was inevitable, it was difficult for residents to accept when it was happening around them.

Chantyl Staheli, West Point: Mrs. Staheli stated that she was curious whether a traffic impact study had been completed for the subdivision, noting that the general plan required one for every development. She asked if it had been done or how that requirement would be satisfied. She concluded by thanking the Commission.

Mary Montgomery, West Point: Mrs. Montgomery stated that for those who did not know her, she was known as the "West Point Witch," and she lived on the corner of 745 S. She explained that, as Ms. Struhs had mentioned, they had fought the road issue through the court system for three years, and the courts had determined that it was owned by the city. She noted that she had lived there for 32 years and said that city trucks have not maintained or plowed the road. She stated that she and others had been responsible for maintaining the rocks and potholes on the road and emphasized that it is a dirt road. She added that in the 32 years she had lived there, she believed her family had planted only one tree, and that most of the trees around her property had been there for 60 years or more. She shared that her house had been rolled from Hooper by horses about 150 years ago to the corner of 700 S, and she emphasized that her

home and the family name she had married into had been there for a very long time. She expressed hope that this history would carry weight, as she did not want a road directly in front of her front door as across the street was a large field. She stated that she had spoken with the Commission about this issue before. She said that when she brought her concerns forward, the city told her that the Mannings needed to be on board, but she pointed out that none of the Mannings had attended the meeting, even though they had received the same letter as everyone else. She concluded by thanking the Commission.

Vanna Montgomery, West Point: Mrs. Montgomery stated that when Mr. Wilberg stated his house numbers were 666, she had picked that address out and had no idea what it meant at the time. She said she thought it would be an easy address for her kids to remember, and noted that it had been 666 since 1964. She concluded by thanking the Commission.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to close the public hearing
Commissioner Wade seconded the motion
All voted aye.

b. Action

Commissioner Roubinet asked for clarification on when a traffic study would be required, and Troy Moyes confirmed that it would be required at the preliminary plat approval stage. Commissioner Roubinet also stated that the City Engineer, Boyd Davis, would need to be consulted regarding the road distance from Mrs. Montgomery's front door, and Bryn MacDonald noted that Boyd Davis was already aware of the issue and was working on how it would be addressed.

Commissioner Farnsworth explained for the benefit of the newer Planning Commission members that, at this stage, the Commission's role was largely to ensure the proposal aligned with the General Plan, since the City Council ultimately determines whether to change the vision for the area through General Plan approval. She added that the City has previously expressed a desire not to allow additional driveways on collector roads, and she believed 700 S should be considered a collector road despite ending in a dead-end, making the proposal potentially inconsistent with City standards. Commissioner Roubinet agreed and asked whether Boyd Davis was aware of that concern. Troy Moyes responded that while the code does include such a standard, it also provides discretion to the Planning Commission, and noted that driveway access issues would be addressed more directly during preliminary plat approval rather than at the rezone stage. Commissioner Roubinet remarked that although the concept plan is tied to the rezone, there are usually minor adjustments that occur. Bryn MacDonald agreed, stating that while the applicant could not increase density, the layout could be reconfigured as needed.

Rulon Gardner, applicant: Mr. Gardner introduced himself and explained that although he no longer lived in West Point, he had grown up in the community near 1500 W and 300 N. He stated that he had been working with city staff on the project and understood the concerns related to density, noting that the proposal would not exceed what had been presented. He also acknowledged the issues associated with 700 S and said they would need to meet with the Montgomery's to work through how the nine-foot concern would fit into the plan. Mr. Gardner

noted that he had over 45 years of development experience and emphasized the importance of quality architecture and community design. He expressed excitement about the proposal and stated that, through coordination with staff, they believed the necessary rezone submittals had been met and they would continue working through the remaining process.

Commissioner Taylor asked whether 700 S would ever connect in the future and whether doing so could impact the homes located along the street. Troy Moyes explained that it was not currently shown on the City's long-range plan, though he could not say it would never happen, and any impacts to the homes along 700 S would be for the Planning Commission to determine. Commissioner Roubinet remarked that while 700 S may be considered a collector road, he did not believe it would ever truly function as a collector road and would mainly serve the surrounding homes.

Commissioner Farnsworth added that recent legislative pressure regarding density approvals could limit city rights, and approving this rezone now could help lock in the current density before being forced into higher density in the future.

Commissioner Wade stated that he had concerns regarding the street and access issue, noting that although Boyd Davis was working on it, he wanted the matter to be more clearly resolved since the entire neighborhood would be exiting at that location. He also sought clarification if fire code would be an issue. Bryn MacDonald stated that fire had cleared it. Commissioner Wade also raised concerns about lot spacing and asked about lot 33, which Troy Moyes explained was zoned A-5. Commissioner Wade acknowledged respecting property owner rights and did not view the subdivision as entirely negative, but emphasized that road and access concerns should be addressed first.

Troy Moyes clarified that the Carlisi property located to the east was already zoned R-1 and moving forward in the plat process, with road issues being addressed. Bryn MacDonald noted that stubbed roads to the north could eventually connect with an extension of SR-193 to improve traffic flow. Commissioner Roubinet and Commissioner King both stated that while the proposal aligned with the General Plan, they had concerns about road placement and access that would need to be resolved during plat approval, though Commissioner Roubinet expressed confidence that staff would ensure standards were met. Commissioner Taylor echoed similar concerns, emphasizing the importance of working out the road issues.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to table any action on the rezone request for approximately 17.04 acres of property located at approximately 4750 W 700 S from A-40 Agricultural to R-1 Residential, until the next meeting, February 12, to allow more discussion about the concerns on the road, driveways on 700 S, and allow the new Planning Commissioners time to learn more about the project and offer their input.

Commissioner King seconded the motion.

All voted aye.

10. Discussion and consideration for a rezone of 7.66 acres located at approximately 4200 W 800 N from R-1 to R-2 (Residential, 2.7 units/acre); *George Wright, applicant*

The applicant, George Wright, who represents the property owner Crystal Court Luminary LP, is requesting a rezone of the property located at approximately 4200 W 800 N from R-1 Residential (2.2 units per acre) to R-2 Residential (2.7 units per acre). The subject property is 7.66 acres in size and consists of two separate parcels. The West Point City General Plan has this property designated as R-2 Residential.

The General Plan has this and other properties in the area, located just east of the future West Davis Corridor, designated as R-2 Residential. The R-2 zone allows 2.7 units per acre with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and minimum lot width of 85 feet. This density would allow up to 20 lots on the subject property. The concept plan shows a total of 13 lots (1.7 units/acre) ranging from 10,000 to 20,000 sq ft with a minimum lot width of 86 feet. All of the lots will be located on the east side of a newly constructed road. The applicant has not requested any exceptions to the zoning ordinance for lot size, width, or setbacks. The property remains at a density of 1.7 units per acre, and the applicant requested a change from R-1 to allow narrower lot widths. The total number of lots would stay at 13, and earlier concerns about homes facing 800 N were addressed by reorienting all homes to face the new internal road.

In August of 2020 this property was discussed with the Planning Commission in consideration of a similar project. No decision at the time was made, due to concerns regarding a lack of a plan for storm water discharge. During the work session held on March 9, 2023, the Planning Commission asked the applicant to provide additional information to address the storm water discharge issue on the property. The applicant agreed to provide information regarding the discharge of storm water into that ditch. The City Engineer and the applicant have been working to address the storm water discharge in this area. The applicant has been working with UDOT and has secured an easement to discharge storm water to the west and down to 300 N. The City Engineer is satisfied with this solution.

Commissioner Roubinet discussed the timing of the West Davis Corridor construction and asked when the drainage connection would actually be available for the development to tie into. He stated that his main concern was ensuring the drainage system would be in place before homes were built, so there would be a proper outlet for stormwater. He noted that the connection should exist within the next year or two.

a. Public hearing

Chantyl Staheli West Point: Mrs. Staheli asked whether the section being discussed was considering townhomes or what type of houses were being proposed. She also asked if the area flooded would the applicant have any responsibility for that, or if it would become the responsibility of the homeowners and their insurance. She noted that traffic concerns had been discussed as something to be addressed later. Referring to the pressure on cities to approve more development under Governor Cox, she expressed curiosity about whether the city had a threshold at which it would stop approving applications, or if it would continue approving development. She stated that there was a significant amount of development currently underway and more in the pipeline, and she shared concern even with moderate-density housing. She said she appreciated the low-density housing being proposed but questioned whether a threshold existed and how the city's planning and improvements factored into that

process. She added that the lots appeared very long and did not seem like an appropriate fit for the surrounding area, especially near the West Davis Corridor.

Brent Stoddard, West Point: Mr. Stoddard stated that he lived just above the property being discussed, right on top of the bluff. He explained that he could look down from his backyard onto the property and could see standing water there. He said the Commission had talked about a drainage system, but he was not sure he understood what was being discussed. He noted that water sat on top of the ground on that property for at least six to seven months out of the year. He stated that he could not see why anyone would want to build a home there and take a chance on it being flooded. He added that the Commission was probably aware that on the north side of 1300 N, in that same area just off the bluff, some homes had flooded two or three years ago. He explained that while the slope there was gentle, the area being discussed had a steep hillside leading directly into the property, and he questioned where the water would run. He also mentioned that a few years earlier there had been plans to build homes straight south of that property, but it never moved forward because of the standing water and because a way to drain it could not be figured out. He reiterated that he did not understand the drainage discussion but believed something had to be done about the water before any homes were built there. He suggested that no action should be taken until the issue was resolved and emphasized the need to ensure that future homeowners would not have water in their houses.

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

b. Action

Guy Williams, the civil engineer representing the owner, explained that drainage concerns for the property had been a major focus and that he had worked with UDOT for about a year to satisfy stormwater requirements. He stated that UDOT had agreed to the proposed pipe system and had provided final plans approximately three weeks earlier, which were intended to alleviate the stormwater issues in the swampy area. He noted that while the solution was expected to address the problem, the results would not be fully known until construction was completed.

Commissioner Roubinet referenced a small detention pond on the plan, which would collect runoff and release it through a restrictor plate to buffer heavy rain events. Mr. Williams confirmed this and added that Boyd Davis had requested the dedication of a 10-foot public utility easement for drainage so that future properties to the east and south could connect into the system and discharge under UDOT for future development. Commissioner Norton asked about a pipe along the east side of the lots, and Mr. Williams explained that area drains were included because the site was low and prone to standing water, with the goal of preventing flooding in future homes.

Commissioner Norton also questioned whether basements would be allowed given the high water table, and Mr. Williams stated his understanding was that the homes would be slab-on-grade with no basements, though an official decision had not been finalized. Troy Moyes added

that city maps and zoning requirements near the bluff likely required slab-on-grade construction and clarified that the proposal was for single-family homes, not townhomes. Commissioner Wade raised a question about potential city liability if flooding occurred, and Troy Moyes noted that UDOT had its own storm drain system, with the new pipe intended to remove standing groundwater from the area.

Bryn MacDonald stated that the stormwater solution had been the primary hold-up for nearly three years, but Boyd Davis was now comfortable with the UDOT-approved design. Bryn MacDonald confirmed the lots were 85 feet wide and nearly half-acre in size, appearing narrow but still substantial. Commissioner King acknowledged the water concerns but expressed trust in the civil engineers' design to address the issues, and Commissioner Taylor added that it was reassuring that Boyd Davis was comfortable with the drainage plan.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to recommend approval of the rezone of 7.66 acres located at approximately 4200 W 800 N from R-1 to R-2 and lock it in at 13-units density. Commissioner King seconded the motion.

Commissioner Taylor – Aye
Commissioner King – Aye
Commissioner Wade – Aye
Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye
Commissioner Hymas – Aye
Commissioner Norton – Aye
Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

11. Staff Update

Bryn MacDonald provided a staff update on several upcoming items at both the City Council and Planning Commission levels. She stated that the Nilson General Plan Amendment, which the Planning Commission had recommended for denial, was discussed by the City Council and a public hearing is scheduled for February 17, 2026. She noted that the Parker Place project had been tabled for several months while infrastructure studies were completed, but Boyd Davis had presented those studies to the Council and they would consider approval at their next meeting. She added that the Ivy Meadows subdivision remained at the Planning Commission stage, and Boyd Davis would attend the next meeting to present the studies so the Commission could move forward with taking action, as the public hearing had already been held.

Bryn MacDonald mentioned at the Planning Commission level the sign code would return at a later date for further consideration, the Stoddard property continued to be worked on by the applicant, and the Carlisi property application was still in progress. She added that Matt Levitt's preliminary plat for West View Park might be on the next agenda, as staff was currently working through the engineering review.

12. Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner King thanked those in attendance for their comments and perspectives and stated that the Planning Commission listened and cared about public input, despite perceptions shared on social media. He explained that the Commission had to weigh differing viewpoints while also supporting landowner rights to develop their property, noting that development was often part of family inheritance and a common way communities had grown over time. He emphasized that the Commission's goal was to ensure development occurred responsibly and aligned with the city's vision, acknowledging that finding the right balance was sometimes difficult. He concluded by reiterating his appreciation to everyone for attending.

Commissioner Taylor welcomed Commissioner Norton and Commissioner Hymas to the Commission and stated that he looked forward to working with them. He also expressed appreciation for Staff and for their assistance.

Commissioner Hymas thanked everyone for attending and stated that public participation and input were essential to making government work. He echoed Commissioner King's remarks that there were many factors to consider in these decisions, and that the process was not always fully understood. He noted that he also did not always understand everything, which was part of why he served on the Planning Commission, to make a difference and do good for the city. He concluded by again thanking everyone for being present.

Commissioner Farnsworth stated that she had appreciated the recent increase in public attendance and input, noting that it was difficult to make decisions when meetings were held in an empty room. She explained that community participation helped guide both the Planning Commission and City Council in understanding the direction to take, within the limits of state laws. She expressed excitement about working with the new commissioners and gaining new perspectives, and she thanked staff for their continued hard work. She also acknowledged that the city could not always plan for when land was sold or for the number of homes and regulations required by the state, but emphasized that the Commission would continue working to invest their time and balance the needs of all residents as best they could.

Commissioner Norton stated that he was grateful to be part of the Commission and looked forward to serving. He expressed appreciation for staff, noting their professionalism and support. He also thanked those who provided comments and shared that he valued the community's long-term involvement and love for West Point and the area.

Commissioner Wade agreed that the junior high lights should be turned down and suggested those in attendance contact the school district. He welcomed the new commissioners and expressed gratitude to everyone for attending. He also shared appreciation for living in West Point, describing it as a great place, and noted that he valued when friends and neighbors participated as the Commission worked to do what was best for the city.

Commissioner Roubinet welcomed the new commissioners and echoed earlier remarks, noting that although many public hearings had been contentious, they had remained productive. He explained that the Commission faced difficult decisions in balancing landowner rights to develop with the impacts development could have on others, emphasizing that no project came without some impact

and that growth was part of a city's natural progression. He stated that the Commission's role was to guide that growth as responsibly as possible.

He also expressed appreciation for the respectful and thoughtful manner in which residents participated, even when they disagreed, and noted that not everyone would always be satisfied with the outcomes. He encouraged the new commissioners to feel comfortable disagreeing when necessary, as split votes and differing perspectives were a normal and healthy part of the process, so long as comments and decisions were well considered. He concluded by thanking the public for their time and praising staff for their strong work and support.

13. Adjournment

Commissioner King motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. All voted aye.



Chairperson – PJ Roubinet



Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen