

**BRIGHAM CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
Tuesday, 7/21/2026 6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:	Roger Manning	Commissioner – Chair
	Garl Waldron	Commissioner – Vice Chair
	Jason Coppieters	Commissioner
	Isaac Herbert	Commissioner
	Vince Crane	Commissioner
	Rachel Ekman	Commissioner

EXCUSED:	Donny Constantineau	Commissioner
	Wayne McConkie	Commissioner
	Jake Barker	Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:	Mark Bradley	City Planner
	Tom Kotter	Community & Economic Development Director

AGENDA

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes

Public Hearing ¹ / Application #26-054 / Amend Brigham City Zoning Map / Land Associated with Annexation Petition / Zoning District Considerations are R-M-7 (Multiple Residential District), R-1-8 (Residential District), and R-1-10 (Residential District) / 1000 West between Highway 13 and 1500 North / Steward Land Co.

Continuation / Application #26-048 / Conditional Use Permit ¹ / Self-Service Enclosed Storage and Self-Service Outside Storage Facility / Aspen Springs Storage / 1177 West 100 South / Brinton Neff

Application #26-065 / Subdivision Amendment / Spring Creek Subdivision First Amendment / 500 South 1150 West / Brigham City Corporation

REGULAR MEETING

Regular session opened at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Manning and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Coppieters moved to approve the minutes for June 16, 2026, meeting. Commissioner Herbert seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Public Hearing ¹ / Application #26-054 / Amend Brigham City Zoning Map / Land Associated with Annexation Petition / Zoning District Considerations are R-M-7 (Multiple Residential District), R-1-8 (Residential District), and R-1-10 (Residential District) / 1000 West between Highway 13 and 1500 North / Steward Land Co.

City Planner Mark Bradley reminded the Commission that the property had previously received a General Plan Land Use Map amendment from industrial to low- and medium-density residential and that the City Council had accepted the annexation petition. He explained that the Planning Commission's role was to conduct a public hearing and provide a recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed zoning for the annexation area.

Using maps, Mr. Bradley reviewed the proposed annexation boundaries, which included the Stewart Land property and an additional parcel east of the railroad tracks owned by Taylor Roberts. He explained that staff recommended including the Roberts property to avoid creating an unincorporated gap and to facilitate future roadway and utility improvements. He also reviewed the proposed zoning, explaining that the southern portion would be zoned R-M-7, the majority of the property R-1-8, and the northern portion R-1-10, consistent with the amended General Plan.

Mr. Bradley reviewed the conceptual development plan, explaining that the proposed R-M-7 zoning would provide a transition from townhomes to smaller single-family lots before transitioning to larger lots to the north. He noted that staff supported the proposed zoning and recommended approval.

Representing Stewart Land, Targee Tomisin stated that the proposed annexation and zoning were intended to implement the previously approved General Plan amendment. He explained that the R-M-7 designation would provide greater design flexibility than R-1-6 while maintaining a gradual transition between townhomes and larger single-family lots. He expressed Stewart Land's support for the proposal and offered to answer questions.

Commissioner Coppieters asked whether Stewart Land had concerns with staff's review comments. Mr. Tomisin stated that he agreed with the staff recommendations and only preferred retaining the proposed R-M-7 zoning because it provided greater flexibility without substantially increasing density.

Commissioner Crane asked about ownership of the property. Mr. Tomisin explained that Stewart Land was under contract with the Reeder and Astle families and had no ownership interest in the Taylor Roberts property, which staff requested to be included to create a contiguous annexation area.

Motion: Commissioner Herbert moved to open the public hearing for Application #26-054. Commissioner Coppieters seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Taylor Roberts: Taylor Roberts, owner of the property east of the railroad tracks, expressed concern that the proposed R-1-8 zoning could affect his ability to continue keeping horses, goats, and other farm animals. He explained that he intended to maintain the property's agricultural use and preferred to remain in the County.

Mr. Bradley explained that existing animal rights could be documented and retained following annexation as long as the property remained a single parcel and was not further developed. Chairman Manning reiterated that the proposed zoning would not require Mr. Roberts to change the property's current use. Although Mr. Roberts acknowledged the explanation, he remained opposed because he wanted assurance that his agricultural use could continue indefinitely.

Motion: Commissioner Crane moved to close the public hearing for Application #26-054. Commissioner Herbert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Following the public hearing, Commissioner Coppieters asked whether the proposed R-1-8 zoning would alter Mr. Roberts' existing property rights. Mr. Bradley explained that existing rights could continue if properly documented but noted that future development or subdivision could affect those rights. He further explained that other requirements, such as connecting to City utilities as development occurred, could differ between County and City regulations. Mr. Bradley also stated that the Commission could recommend either the proposed R-1-8 zoning or Rural Residential (RR-1), noting that the General Plan identifies the Roberts property as Rural Residential and that staff had recommended including the property to create a consistent city boundary and accommodate future roadway and utility improvements.

Commissioner Coppieters observed that R-1-8 would be more consistent with surrounding properties, while RR-1 would leave the parcel as a separate zoning designation. Chairman Manning confirmed that either zoning would still accommodate future infrastructure improvements. At Chairman Manning's request, Mr. Roberts confirmed the property already received City culinary water through an existing easement. Mr. Bradley noted that other annexed properties had successfully retained existing animal rights for many years.

Natalie Taylor addressed the Commission and requested additional time for the family to review the proposal, explaining that they had only recently learned of the meeting after the mailed notice was returned. Mr. Bradley explained that staff had hand-delivered the notice and that the Roberts family would have another opportunity to participate during the City Council's public hearing. He reminded the Commission that its role was limited to making a zoning recommendation.

Commissioner Coppieters reiterated that the City Council would make the final decision regarding both annexation and zoning. Mr. Bradley stated that staff had received no additional public comments. Commissioner Herbert asked about the property's current designation, and Mr. Bradley clarified that it is in unincorporated Box Elder County, with Rural Residential shown only as the future General Plan designation. Commissioner Ekman stated that her primary concern was hearing from the property owner.

Chairman Manning summarized that the Commission's recommendation would be whether to recommend R-1-8 or RR-1 zoning for the Roberts property before forwarding the application to the City Council.

Motion: Commissioner Coppieters moved that the Planning Commission, acting as the recommending body to the City, recommend approval of application #26-054 as presented, including zoning the Roberts property east of the railroad tracks as R-1-8 to remain consistent with the surrounding zoning, based on the staff recommendations, stipulations, and findings of fact. Commissioner Crane requested clarification that Mr. Roberts would retain his existing animal rights so long as the property was not sold or subdivided and Commissioner Coppieters commented that the proposed zoning would have no effect if the property were not annexed. Mr. Bradley confirmed both statements, after which Commissioner Crane seconded the motion. The motion passed **3-2**.

Aye: Commissioners Coppieters, Crane and Waldron

Nay Votes:

- Commissioner Herbert: stated that property owners should retain the ability to decide whether to participate in annexation and referenced the Olson property as an example.
- Commissioner Ekman: stated that while she supported the annexation and future improvements along 1500 North, she believed an RR-1 designation would provide greater flexibility and better preserve the existing property rights.

Following the vote, Commissioner Crane reiterated that his support was based on Mr. Roberts retaining his existing use of the property, including animal rights, as long as the property was not sold or subdivided. Mr. Bradley confirmed that understanding, citing another annexed property that had retained documented animal rights.

Continuation / Application #26-048 / Conditional Use Permit ¹ / Self-Service Enclosed Storage and Self-Service Outside Storage Facility / Aspen Springs Storage / 1177 West 100 South / Brinton Neff

City Planner Mark Bradley reminded the Commission that the application had been continued from the June 2, 2026, meeting to allow revisions addressing staff comments and clarifying that the proposal included outdoor storage. He explained that the outdoor storage area would remain until additional enclosed storage buildings were constructed as demand warranted. Mr. Bradley also noted that the application had vested prior to the recent zoning changes affecting storage facilities.

Mr. Bradley reviewed the revised site plan, explaining that access had been relocated to the east side of the property, with the office and customer parking near the entrance and two gated access points serving the storage areas. He stated that the applicant had addressed staff comments, including measures to contain fluids that could leak from stored vehicles.

Mr. Bradley explained that revisions to site access, stormwater facilities, perimeter walls, and the site layout resulted in updated project phasing. He noted that stormwater detention areas would be located along the west and north property lines, buildings would remain outside the public utility easement, and a solid masonry wall would be installed along 1200 West before transitioning to an iron fence along 100 South, allowing the storage buildings to remain visible from that frontage.

Mr. Bradley stated that Phase One would include three storage buildings, with the remaining area initially used for outdoor storage before being converted to enclosed storage as demand increased. In response to Commissioner Coppieters, he explained that staff supported replacing the large recreational vehicle storage building with two smaller buildings, provided required drive aisles and fire access were maintained. He also noted that the Historic Orchard Trail and associated landscaping would be constructed along 1200 West.

Applicant Brinton Neff explained that the site had been redesigned to satisfy access requirements and accommodate future development of adjoining property. He stated that the revised plans addressed previous staff comments, although additional engineering review would refine the water line design and stormwater calculations, which could reduce the size of the detention basin.

At Commissioner Coppieters' request, Mr. Neff explained that the proposed change from one large building to two smaller buildings better reflected anticipated demand for smaller storage units and would improve the overall site layout.

Chairman Manning asked how long the outdoor storage area would remain. Mr. Neff explained that the timing would depend on demand for enclosed storage units, noting that additional buildings would be constructed as occupancy justified expansion. Mr. Bradley added that future residential growth, including Avian Shores, could increase demand for the facility.

Mr. Neff clarified that the masonry wall would screen the site from 1200 West, although portions of taller vehicles in the outdoor storage area could remain visible above the six-foot wall. Chairman Manning emphasized the importance of maintaining an attractive appearance along a major entrance into the City. Mr. Neff explained that the wall would transition to a six-foot iron fence along 100 South.

Commissioner Coppieters asked about an Engineering Department comment regarding truck turning movements near the southern parking stalls. Mr. Neff explained that one gate would serve only as an emergency backup entrance, while the primary automatic gate would provide normal access, leaving adequate turning space for vehicles with trailers.

Chairman Manning asked about fencing along the south property line. Mr. Neff stated that chain-link fencing with privacy slats would be installed until the adjoining property

develops, at which time permanent fencing would likely be provided by future development.

Commissioner Coppieters thanked Mr. Neff for working with staff to address the previous review comments, and Mr. Neff expressed appreciation for staff's assistance throughout the process.

Motion: Commissioner Herbert moved that the Planning Commission, acting as the Land Use Authority, approve application #26-048 subject to Staff comments, Findings of Fact, and stipulations as noted. Commissioner Coppieters seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Application #26-065 / Subdivision Amendment / Spring Creek Subdivision First Amendment / 500 South 1150 West / Brigham City Corporation

City Planner Mark Bradley explained that the proposed subdivision amendment resulted from earlier planning for the sports complex, including a decision to avoid residential lots fronting directly onto the park. He stated that the City had since acquired additional property and worked with adjoining owners to reconfigure lots along 1150 West and 1100 West.

Commissioner Coppieters asked whether Lot 42-R was included in the amendment. Mr. Bradley explained that while the lot's size and configuration would remain unchanged, the plat would be amended to address an existing utility easement and turnaround. He noted that culinary and secondary water lines crossed the east side of the lot within a fifteen-foot easement serving the development and park.

Mr. Bradley explained that two narrow lots along 1150 West would be reconfigured into wider lots while maintaining the same number of buildable lots, with excess property added to adjoining parcels along 1100 West. He also noted that Habitat for Humanity had exchanged its lot west of 1150 West for another lot closer to 1200 West, allowing the City to retain one lot that could be sold to help fund future improvements to 1150 West.

Mr. Bradley stated that the City hopes to complete roadway improvements during the current construction season, making the affected lots buildable and improving access to the sports complex. He explained that the current sports complex roadway between 1150 West and 1200 West would be removed as part of the 1200 West improvements, with access maintained through the remaining road connections until the future school and surrounding streets are constructed.

Commissioner Coppieters asked whether any property owners objected to the amendment. Mr. Bradley stated that the City Administrator had contacted each affected owner, all had expressed support, and each would be required to sign the amended plat.

At Chairman Manning's request, Mr. Bradley identified the future elementary school site. Commissioner Crane confirmed the proposed school would be an elementary school. Mr. Bradley added that property west of the school site was planned for future residential development, while land east of 1100 West was intended for future park expansion.

Chairman Manning expressed concern about preserving adequate park space as the area develops. Mr. Bradley noted that the City's park priorities have evolved over time, that the General Plan identifies a future park in the northwest area of the City, and that staff has discussed a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and City Council to review long-term recreation needs. Chairman Manning acknowledged the City's limited funding for park development but emphasized the long-term value of recreational facilities.

Motion: Commissioner Crane moved that the Planning Commission, acting as the recommending body to the City Council, recommend approval of application #26-065 subject to Staff comments, Findings of Fact, and stipulations as noted. Commissioner Waldron seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn

Motion: Commissioner Ekman moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Herbert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

This certifies that the regular meeting minutes of July 21, 2026, is a true and accurate copy as approved by the Planning Commission on August 4, 2026.

Signed: Destry Larsen

Destry Larsen, Administrative Assistant