



3200 WEST 300 NORTH  
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES  
WEST POINT CITY HALL  
April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026**

**Mayor:**  
Brian Vincent  
**City Council:**  
Trent Yarbrough, *Mayor Pro Tem*  
Jerry Chatterton  
Annette Judd  
Michele Swenson  
Jeremy Strong  
**City Manager:**  
Kyle Laws

**Administrative Session**  
**6:30 PM**

Minutes for the West Point City Council Administrative Session held on April 7, 2026, at 6:30 PM with Mayor Brian Vincent presiding. This meeting was held at West Point City Hall and livestreamed for the public to view via Zoom. The livestream of the meeting was accessible to view by entering Meeting ID# 865 6518 4545 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

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

**EXCUSED:** None

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

**EXCUSED:** None

**VISITORS PRESENT:** Rick Scadden, Kyle Norton, Ryan Wilde, and Tim Gooch. No sign-in is required for those viewing online.

**1. Discussion Regarding a Rezone Request for Property Located at Appx. 2650 N 5500 W from A-5 to R-1 (*Rick Scadden, Applicant*) – *Mrs. Bryn MacDonald***

Mrs. MacDonald presented the rezoning request and development agreement for the Ivy Meadows project, located at approximately 2650 North 5500 West. She stated that the Council had previously discussed the rezoning request and that the main item for this discussion was the draft development agreement. She explained that the agreement includes mostly the City's standard language, including the standard architectural requirements, and attaches the concept plan for the project. The concept plan shows a maximum of 84 units and requires the project to be substantially similar to the attached plan.

In addition, Mrs. MacDonald stated that the infrastructure requirements are the main substance of the agreement. She explained that the agreement identifies the infrastructure that must be constructed, who is responsible for paying for it, and when the improvements must be completed. She noted that Mr. Davis had prepared the infrastructure portion of the agreement and that it generally requires the applicant to construct and pay for the required improvements, with any potential reimbursement or funding assistance to be addressed separately if applicable.

Mr. Davis explained that the development agreement includes three primary infrastructure sections: storm drain infrastructure, road infrastructure, and sewer infrastructure. He stated that the applicant has agreed to pay 100% of the actual costs for the required improvements, not just estimated costs. He also explained that the agreement includes a map identifying the improvements that must be installed. If additional funding becomes available to help pay for any portion of the improvements, a separate agreement would be prepared at that time; however, if the project moves forward under the agreement as presented, the applicant is agreeing to pay the actual cost of the required improvements.

Mayor Vincent and Mr. Laws discussed potential funding from Davis County related to infrastructure in the annexation area. Mr. Laws explained that the County has committed approximately \$1 million toward work it had already planned in the area prior to annexation, while the overall infrastructure need for this project and the Parker project was estimated at approximately \$3 million. He stated that the City has submitted letters of intent for third quarter sales tax funding, which could potentially cover approximately \$1.5 million. If that funding is awarded, the remaining cost would be shared proportionally between the developments; if the grant is not awarded, the remaining approximately \$2 million would be shared proportionally between the developments. Mr. Davis noted that the letters of intent had been submitted.

Council Member Swenson asked whether all of the roads within the subdivision would be public roads. Staff confirmed that they would be. Council Members also confirmed that the applicant is not requesting additional density or exceptions, and that the proposed minimum lot sizes are larger than the City's minimum requirements for the requested zone. Council Member Swenson also asked about basements and the water table in the area. Mrs. MacDonald stated that the development agreement provides that basements may be allowed if they meet the applicable code requirements, and Staff noted that the specific water-table information would need to be evaluated for the area.

Mr. Scadden explained that the applicant is in the process of purchasing an additional half-acre from an adjacent property owner. He stated that the additional property is not included in the current concept plan, but may allow the project to increase from 84 lots to 85 lots. He clarified that the additional lot would be tied to the additional half-acre and was not intended to increase density on the property currently shown in the plan. Mrs. MacDonald indicated that the additional property could be addressed when it is added to the project.

The Council also discussed the prior Planning Commission process. Mrs. MacDonald explained that the Planning Commission had previously held a public hearing on the rezone request and recommended approval. She stated that the Planning Commission did not review the development agreement because the agreement does not include exceptions that would require Planning Commission review, nor does it require a separate public hearing.

The item is scheduled for public hearing and possible action during tonight's General Session. The Council will continue the discussion at that time.

**2. Discussion Regarding a Site Plan Amendment for the Salt Grass Townhomes – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald**

Mrs. MacDonald presented the proposed site plan amendment for the Salt Grass Townhomes. She explained that the project had been approved several years earlier for up to 132 units, but because there were potential wetlands on the west side of the property, the developer initially proceeded with 116 units and removed the units from the area in question. Since that time, the wetland review has been completed and it was determined that there are no jurisdictional wetlands. As a result, the applicant is requesting to add the remaining 16 units allowed under the existing development agreement, bringing the project back to the previously approved maximum of 132 units.

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed the changes to the plan. She explained that the entrance road has been shifted farther south and is more centered on the site, which provides better separation from the subdivision to the north. She also stated that the original plan anticipated realigning 4500 West on the west side of the property and included approximately three acres to be dedicated for that realignment. Because the Council has since determined that 4500 West will be realigned on the south side instead, the applicant no longer needs to dedicate that property for the road realignment. The number of units remains the same as the development agreement allows, but the revised plan provides more open space. A new landscaping plan was submitted to show how the additional open space would be landscaped. Mrs. MacDonald stated that the amenities remain the same and that the Planning Commission recommended approval without concerns.

Mrs. MacDonald clarified that the item is a site plan amendment and would not require a public hearing. She stated that if the Council was comfortable with the proposed changes, the item would be brought back for consideration at the next meeting. The Council discussed that the development would be maintained by an HOA, while the roads within the development would be public roads.

Council Member Swenson asked whether the City has anything in writing from UDOT confirming that the road would be realigned on the other side. Mrs. MacDonald stated that Staff has a copy of the plan that could be shown to the Council. Mr. Laws stated that although the City does not have a separate written agreement, Staff has been working with UDOT on signed plans.

The Council discussed visitor parking within the project, particularly on the west side where the additional units are proposed. Mrs. MacDonald explained that there are some parking areas shown on the plan and that the public streets would also allow on-street parking, although there may not be much room between driveways in some areas. The applicant noted that the townhomes have two-car garages and driveways, and Staff discussed the driveway lengths and parking requirements.

Mrs. MacDonald also explained that because 4500 West is no longer being realigned in the way originally anticipated, the applicant will now be required to install the landscaping buffer along 4500 West instead of paying a fee in lieu of that landscaping. Council Member Swenson clarified that this would include the sidewalk, fence, and landscaping. Council Members noted that the revised plan is an improvement from the prior condition because the area will be landscaped and maintained rather than remaining unimproved or weedy.

Council Members asked whether additional visitor parking could be added near the west end of the development to reduce the likelihood that visitors would try to park along 4500 West or along curved portions of the internal road. The applicant indicated that he could look at adding additional parking before the item returned for consideration. Mrs. MacDonald stated that any added parking should be placed as far back from the curve as possible and generally behind the units in a lower-traffic area.

The Council indicated that it was comfortable having the site plan amendment return for consideration at the next meeting, with the applicant looking at whether additional visitor parking could be added.

### **3. Other Items**

No other items were discussed.

The Administrative Session adjourned.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH  
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
WEST POINT CITY HALL  
**April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026**

**Mayor:**  
Brian Vincent  
**City Council:**  
Trent Yarbrough, *Mayor Pro Tem*  
Jerry Chatterton  
Annette Judd  
Michele Swenson  
Jeremy Strong  
**City Manager:**  
Kyle Laws

---

**General Session**  
**7:00 PM**

Minutes for the West Point City Council General Session held on April 7, 2026, at 7:00 PM with Mayor Brian Vincent presiding. This meeting was held at West Point City Hall and livestreamed for the public to view via Zoom. The livestream of the meeting was accessible to view by entering Meeting ID# 865 6518 4545 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

**MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Brian Vincent, Council Member Chatterton, Council Member Annette Judd, Council Member Michele Swenson, Council Member Trent Yarbrough, and Council Member Jeremy Strong

**EXCUSED:** None

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

**EXCUSED:** None

**VISITORS PRESENT:** Ryan Wilde, Rick Scadden, Kyle Norton, Tim Gooch, Kurt Fowers, Marsha Fowers, Jared Hancock, Mark & Mary Montgomery, Travis Montgomery, Taz Montgomery, Tim & Amy Koster, Jennifer Struhs, Randee Bereece, Lee Brown, Edith Brown, Tami Yeoman, and Javier Sosa. No sign-in is required for those viewing online.

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

Council Member Yarbrough – None

Council Member Judd – None

Council Member Swenson – Reported that mosquito abatement cannot begin spraying until morning temperatures consistently remain above 50 degrees. She explained that the large mosquitoes residents are seeing are adult mosquitoes that came out of hibernation after the mild winter, and that spraying does not work effectively until temperatures are warmer. She stated that Mosquito Abatement is aware of the issue and will spray when conditions allow.

Council Member Chatterton – None

Council Member Strong – None

Mayor Vincent – None

5. **Communications from Staff**

Mr. Laws stated reported on the City's Easter Egg Scramble held the previous Saturday. He stated that there was a great turnout, good weather, and that the event lasted about one minute. Mayor Vincent noted how quickly approximately 14,000 eggs were picked up. Staff also discussed video footage taken from the North Davis Fire District ladder truck during the event.

**6. Citizen Comment**

No comments received.

**7. Recognition of Tim Koster, Marching Muskrats Band Director – Mayor Brian Vincent**

Mayor Vincent invited Tim Koster to the podium and recognized him for his service as the director of the West Point City Marching Muskrats Band. He stated that Mr. Koster had served in that role for approximately nine to ten years, had been the band's first director, and had helped the program grow year after year. Mayor Vincent expressed the City's appreciation for Mr. Koster's work and stated that the City wanted to thank him for everything he has done as he steps away from the director role. Mr. Koster stated that he would continue to help as much as he could.

Randee Bereece, West Point City Arts Council Chair, also thanked Mr. Koster and stated that Mr. Koster and his wife had helped promote the arts in West Point before the Arts Council was formed. She stated that the Arts Council would continue carrying that work forward. Mayor Vincent presented Mr. Koster with a gift of appreciation, and the Council took a photo with him.

**8. Consideration of Approval of West Point City Council Meeting Minutes:**

**a. January 20, 2026**

**b. February 17, 2026**

Council Member Swenson motioned to approve the minutes from the above listed meeting dates

Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously approved

**9. Public Hearing Regarding a Rezone Request for Property Located at 2650 N 5500 W from A-5 to R-1 (Scadden, Applicant) – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald**

Mayor Vincent opened the item with an explanation that the request before the Council was a rezone, or a change in land use, rather than approval of a final subdivision plat. He stated that the public hearing was intended to receive information the Council should consider regarding the proposed rezone.

Mrs. MacDonald presented the rezone request for the Ivy Meadows subdivision, located at approximately 2650 North 5500 West. She stated that the property is approximately 38 acres, is located in the newly annexed area of the City between 5000 West and 5500 West north of 2425 North, and is currently zoned A-5. The applicant is requesting R-1 zoning. Mrs. MacDonald explained that the application is vested under the General Plan that was in place when the application was submitted, which designated the property for R-1 development.

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed the concept plan, which showed 84 lots. She stated that the R-1 zone allows a density of 2.2 units per acre and that the proposed plan is approximately 2.19 units per acre. The R-1 zone requires a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet, and the smallest proposed lots are approximately 13,000 square feet. She stated that the proposed concept plan meets the requirements of the R-1 zone.

Mrs. MacDonald explained that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application more than a year earlier. At that time, there were significant public comments and concerns regarding infrastructure in the newly annexed area. The applicant asked to be tabled while the City moved forward with infrastructure studies. After those studies were completed, the item returned to the Planning Commission in February, and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone request based on that information.

Mrs. MacDonald also reviewed the associated development agreement. She stated that the agreement attaches the concept plan and requires the development to be similar in layout to that plan, with a maximum of 84 units. The agreement also includes the

City's standard architectural standards for the homes and does not include any exceptions for setbacks, density, or similar requirements. She explained that the main substantive portion of the agreement relates to infrastructure, including stormwater, sewer, and road improvements. The developer is responsible to construct all required onsite and offsite infrastructure, although there may be future reimbursement through impact fees or Davis County funds if those funds become available.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing. He invited West Point City residents to speak first and then invited comments from those living in the surrounding county area.

Jared Hancock – 5262 W 2425 N: Stated that his property is adjacent to the proposed development. He explained that although the hearing is about the rezone, the subdivision process has changed so that the Council may not see the detailed subdivision plan again. He stated that, in his opinion, the proposed layout is not a good fit for the area because the existing properties on the road have much larger lots and the area has historically been developed with larger parcels. He said he believes the proposed density is too high for the area and that West Point is running out of areas where larger lots can be preserved. Mr. Hancock also raised concerns regarding his irrigation ditch, which runs along the north side and across the middle of the area shown on the plan, and stated that he had not seen a plan for how it would be accommodated. He also stated that the proposed stub street to the south may not be in the best location for future connectivity and noted that UDOT access-spacing requirements on 5000 West could limit future access points.

Tammy Yeoman – Unincorporated Davis County: Stated that she lives in the unincorporated area near the proposed development and asked the Council to deny or table the rezone request. She stated that new development should be safe, fit with nearby homes, and have adequate roads, water, and services. She said the proposed R-1 zoning does not fit the surrounding rural and agricultural area, where many homes are on one-acre or larger lots, and that smaller lots would limit agricultural opportunities such as animals or farming. She also stated that the City's updated General Plan better matches the area and supports lower-density housing, and she asked the Council to consider A-20 zoning for a portion of the property and R-1 for the upper portion. Ms. Yeoman also raised concerns regarding culinary water capacity, road and traffic improvements, and whether the required roads and services would be in place before additional homes are built. She noted that she is not against development, but just wants it done the right way and urged the Council to choose carefully and thoughtfully.

Council Member Swenson motioned to close the public hearing

Council Member Strong seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

Council Member Swenson asked whether the required roads, sewer, water, and other improvements would be completed before building permits are issued. Mr. Davis stated that Staff anticipates all required work will be completed before any building permits are issued, although the schedule may be affected by the timing of any outside funding. Mr. Davis also stated that Hooper Water had indicated there is enough culinary water for the project.

Council Member Strong asked about the irrigation ditch and stub street concerns raised by Mr. Hancock. Mr. Davis stated that those were good points, but that the detailed design issues had not yet been addressed because the project was still at the rezone stage. He stated that irrigation, road locations, and access to neighboring properties would be reviewed during the preliminary plan process, and that some road locations may be adjusted as part of that review. Mr. Laws noted that developers often do not spend the time and money to fully engineer those details until they know the rezone has been approved.

The Council also discussed UDOT access spacing on 5000 West. Mr. Davis stated that the applicant will need a UDOT permit for the connection to 5000 West and that the connection must meet UDOT spacing requirements. He stated that Staff had reviewed the location and believed the proposed access met the 660-foot spacing requirement from 2425 North. Council Member Chatterton noted that because of State law changes, the Council does not see subdivision plats in the same way it previously did, and that the concept plan is used to help the Council understand how the property could develop under the requested zoning.

Council Member Swenson also discussed the question of the current General Plan designation. Staff explained that the application is being reviewed under the General Plan designation in place when the application was originally submitted because of the timing of the application and the infrastructure-related delay.

**9.1. Consideration of Resolution No. 04-07-2026A, Approving a Development Agreement for 2650 N 5500 W**

Council Member Swenson noted that the resolution included an incorrect reference to Matthew Levitt and stated that the name should be corrected to the appropriate applicant/developer for Ivy Meadows. Staff confirmed that the reference was a template error and could be corrected in the motion.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Resolution No. 04-07-2026A, with the correction to the developer name as noted  
Council Member Judd seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

**9.2. Consideration of Ordinance No. 04-07-2026A, Approving a Rezone of Property Located at 2650 N 5500 W from A-5 to R-1**

Council Member Judd motioned to approve Ordinance No. 04-07-2026A

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

Roll Call:

Council Member Swenson – Aye

Council Member Chatterton – Aye

Council Member Judd – Aye

Council Member Strong – Aye

Council Member Yarbrough – Aye

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

**10. Public Hearing Regarding a Rezone Request for Property Located at 4762 W 700 S from A-40 to R-1 (*Gardner Sunset Ridge, Applicant*) – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald**

Mrs. MacDonald presented the rezone request for approximately 17 acres located at 4762 West 700 South. She stated that the property is currently zoned agricultural, the General Plan designation is R-1, and the applicant is requesting R-1 zoning. She reviewed the concept plan, which showed 37 lots at approximately 2.17 units per acre, just under the 2.2 units per acre allowed in the R-1 zone.

Mrs. MacDonald explained that more than 30 lots require a second access. The concept plan shows a future connection through the adjacent Carlisi property to the east, which Staff has also been discussing for development. She stated that until the second access is available through that adjacent property, the Gardner Sunset Ridge development would be limited to 30 lots in the first phase. She also reviewed stub streets to the north and west for future connections as adjacent properties develop.

Mrs. MacDonald stated that one of the significant issues for the project has been 700 South and whether it is a public road. She explained that a court recently determined that 700 South is a 66-foot-wide public right-of-way, which allows the project to move forward. She stated that 700 South would need to be improved before homes are built, and Mr. Davis would work with the applicant's engineers on the exact road design and how to make the improvements as manageable as possible for the property owners along the road.

Mr. Davis explained that the applicant would be required to install full improvements on the north side of 700 South, including curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and at least 28 feet of asphalt. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the south side would not be installed until the south property develops. He stated that the improvements would extend from 4500 West to the end of the applicant's developed lots, depending on phasing.

Council Members asked questions regarding the existing width of 700 South, the timing of improvements, and whether any concessions had been made for the Montgomery property near the corner. Mr. Davis stated that the existing road is approximately

15 to 20 feet wide and that detailed design considerations, including the area near the Montgomery property, would be addressed during the preliminary plan stage.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing.

Mary Montgomery – 696 South 4500 West: Stated that she had concerns about 700 South and the effect of the court finding that the road is part of the West Point City public road system. She stated that she believed the City has responsibilities for the road because of the court ruling and expressed frustration that Staff had not met with her about the lane. She also stated that a neighboring property had reportedly received a tax reduction from the County because it was on an undeveloped non-public access road. Ms. Montgomery further expressed concern that the City has been unfair to her family in prior road or drainage matters and that improvement of 700 South would affect trees and improvements that have been in place for many years.

Travis Montgomery – 696 South 4500 West: Raised concerns about the number of homes that could access 700 South and asked why Staff had previously discussed different lot limits. He also raised concerns about water, flooding, and the Great Salt Lake rising in the future. He stated that homes in nearby areas have experienced drainage problems during major rain events and asked what would be done to prevent flooding. Mr. Montgomery also asked about housing affordability, the effect of density on home values, road alignment, potential impacts to the family driveway and trees, fire access, and whether police services would be able to keep up with additional homes and traffic.

Tash Montgomery – 696 South 4500 West: Stated that he is concerned the area is being overdeveloped and that additional homes are creating sewer-related odors and other impacts. He expressed concern about development in an area he believes may flood if the Great Salt Lake rises and asked the Council to slow down and consider the natural conditions of the area.

Jennifer Struhs – 4630 West 700 South: Stated that she wanted her concerns on the record. She described the project and the adjacent Carlisi property as creating a “funnel” effect, with potentially 77 homes using one dirt lane and one dead-end access at 4500 West and 700 South until future connections are built. She stated that if an accident occurs at the top of the road, all of those families could be trapped. Ms. Struhs asked for a copy of any written alternative means and methods request required to justify the fire access determination. She also raised concerns about additional vehicle trips, the width of the road, sidewalk requirements, safety for nearby schools, and potential City liability if safety concerns are ignored. She asked the Council to table the item until a secondary remote access is approved.

Council Member Yarbrough motioned to close the public hearing

Council Member Strong seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

Council Member Yarbrough stated that he shared the concern regarding access. He acknowledged that the development would be limited to 30 homes until the Carlisi property connection is available, but stated that even then, the overall area would still have only one access point to 4500 West. Mr. Davis explained that Staff is relying on a letter from North Davis Fire District Fire Marshal, who determined that 700 South is considered a collector road and that 30 lots may be counted from each access point. Mr. Davis stated that the Fire Marshal is the authority who makes that determination.

Council Members discussed whether 700 South would function as a full collector road if only part of the roadway is improved at this stage. Council Member Strong stated that he was concerned about allowing that many lots to access a partially improved collector road. Council Member Swenson agreed and questioned whether the Fire Marshal’s determination would change if 700 South is not built to its full width. Mr. Davis stated that this was a good question and recommended that it be referred back to the Fire Marshal for clarification. Council Members also discussed examples of other partially improved roads in the City and whether construction, accidents, or utility breaks could block access without a detour.

Mayor Vincent asked about the statement that the Fire Marshal’s letter required fire sprinklers in each home. Mr. Davis explained that the language is a standard statement indicating that sprinklers are required if fire flow cannot meet 1,500 gallons per minute, but that Staff anticipates the development will be able to meet the fire flow requirement. A fire flow test would still need to be completed to verify that requirement.

**10.1. Consideration of Resolution No. 04-07-2026B, Approving a Development Agreement for 4762 W 700 S**

Council Member Chatterton motioned to table approval of the Development Agreement and Rezone until additional information is received from the Fire Marshal regarding fire safety and access.

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

**10.2. Consideration of Ordinance No. 04-07-2026B, Approving a Rezone of Property Located at 4762 W 700 S from A-40 to R-1**

Approval of the rezone was tabled in conjunction with previous motion to table the development agreement.

**11. Public Hearing Regarding a Rezone Request for Property Located at 3381 W 300 N from A-40 to R-2 (Norton, Applicant) – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald**

Mrs. MacDonald presented the rezone request for property located at 3381 West 300 North, diagonally across 300 North from City Hall. She stated that the property is approximately 1.1 acres and that the front portion of the lot is already zoned R-2, while the rear portion is zoned A-40. The applicant is requesting that the rear portion be rezoned to R-2 to match the front portion.

Mrs. MacDonald explained that the property is located within the Main Street Small Area Plan. She stated that the code requires the Council to determine whether the proposed rezone is consistent with the General Plan and the Main Street Small Area Plan. She reviewed the conceptual plan and stated that the applicant's intent is to create a flag lot in the future. She also stated that the Planning Commission had discussed whether the rezone would interfere with a future road shown in the Main Street plan and recommended approval because the proposal does not prevent the future road from being aligned in that area.

Council Members discussed the future road concept shown in the Main Street Small Area Plan. Mrs. MacDonald explained that because there are already existing homes along 300 North, the future road is unlikely to follow the conceptual plan exactly and could curve around existing development if needed.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing.

No comments were received.

Council Member Swenson motioned to close the public hearing

Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

Council Member Swenson asked the applicant about the existing structure on the rear portion of the property. Kyle Norton, applicant, addressed the Council and stated that the structure is a metal shop and that his hope is to keep the shop and build a house to the north of it. Council Member Swenson asked about access to the future flag lot and whether there would be adequate spacing for the shop and future home. Mr. Norton explained that the existing front home has a driveway on the west side of the property, while the future flag lot would use an existing dirt driveway on the east side, which would be improved according to code. He also stated that there is a fire hydrant on the property to the east and that the proposed home would be within the required distance of that hydrant. Council Member Swenson also asked about a large tree on the property, and Mr. Norton stated that the tree is struggling and may be removed in the future.

**11.1. Consideration of Ordinance No. 04-07-2026C, Approving a Rezone of Property at 3381 W 300 N from A-40 to R-2**

The Council had no further questions or discussions.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Ordinance No. 04-07-2026C

Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion

Roll Call:

Council Member Strong – Aye

Council Member Swenson – Aye

Council Member Chatterton – Aye

Council Member Judd – Aye

Council Member Yarbrough – Aye

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

**12. Consideration of Resolution No. 04-07-2026C, Approving an Interlocal Agreement for the Davis County Stormwater Coalition– Mr. Boyd Davis**

Mr. Davis presented the interlocal agreement for the Davis County Stormwater Coalition. He explained that the agreement is renewed every five years and that West Point City has participated in the coalition for approximately 20 years. He stated that the cities in Davis County and Davis County work together through the coalition on stormwater permit requirements.

Mr. Davis explained that the coalition creates advertisements, produces flyers, provides training, and hires a teacher to provide stormwater presentations to fourth grade classes throughout the county. He stated that West Point City receives permit credit for the work performed by the coalition. The cost for West Point City to participate is approximately \$1,800, which has been budgeted. He stated that each participating city and the County will approve the interlocal agreement individually, and that the agreement does not create a new political entity.

The Council had no further discussion. Mayor Vincent clarified that Davis County is also part of the coalition, along with the cities.

Council Member Swenson motioned to approve Resolution No. 04-07-2026C

Council Member Strong seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed

**13. Motion to Adjourn the General Session**

Council Member Chatterton motioned to adjourn

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

The Council unanimously agreed.



APPROVED THIS 2 DAY OF JUNE, 2026:

BRIAN VINCENT, MAYOR

CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER