3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES

WEST POINT CITY HALL

May 19th, 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

6:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council Administrative Session held on May 19, 2026, at 6:00 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# 821 9941 1733 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 Trent Yarbrough, and Council Member Jeremy Strong

EXCUSED: Council Member Michele Swenson

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Kenny England, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder. Also present – Michael Sabin, Administrative Intern

EXCUSED: Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director

VISITORS PRESENT: Lacy Richards, Kelly Sparks, Matt Meyer, Rena Hunt, an PJ Roubinet. No sign-in is required for those viewing online.

1. **Discussion Regarding the FY26 Amended Budget and Proposed FY2027 Tentative Budget – *Mr. Kyle Laws***
Mr. Laws explained that he will be leading the budget discussions this meeting, as Ryan Harvey (Administrative Services Director) is out of town.

Mr. Laws continued the budget presentation and discussion that was first introduced at the prior meeting on May 5. He reviewed the Special Revenue Fund, Capital Projects Fund, selected enterprise-fund items, and the final proposed changes to the FY2026 Amended Budget. He reminded the Council that the FY2027 Tentative Budget includes a proposed property-tax increase and that the City has declared its intent to proceed through the truth-in-taxation process. The preliminary proposal would generate an additional $50,000 to help offset an approximately $150,000 increase in the City's law-enforcement contract. The certified tax rate will not be available from Davis County until mid-June, so the impact schedule and figures remain preliminary.
(A copy of the preliminary proposed property tax impact schedule presented is attached hereto and incorporated with these written minutes).

Mr. Laws explained that the Special Revenue Fund amendment increases expenditures by approximately $380,000, for a total of approximately $765,000, primarily for the bond associated with the junior-high gym expansion. The ongoing annual payment is expected to be approximately $425,000. The remaining amount reflects the use of accumulated park-impact-fee revenue that was intentionally retained to fund part of the project. In response to Council Member Chatterton, Mr. Laws stated that the bond has a 20-year term, with payments weighted more heavily toward the final ten years and a potential opportunity to refinance or restructure after approximately ten years.

Mr. Laws reviewed the five-year Capital Improvement Plan and the proposed FY2027 funding changes. Street-maintenance funding would increase to $290,000 from Class C Road revenue. The City would continue its regular $20,000 sidewalk-maintenance program for grinding trip hazards and replacing damaged panels and would add $50,000 in local-option sales-tax revenue for the proposed temporary sidewalk along 3500 West. The budget also includes funding for vehicle and equipment replacement, SCADA upgrades, updates to the stormwater, water-source-protection, and stormwater-management plans, and scheduled replacement of three vehicles.

Council Member Chatterton asked whether diesel vehicles could remain in service longer. Mr. England explained that plow trucks are generally replaced on a five-year rotation because of the wear associated with plowing, while trucks that do not carry plows are generally retained for approximately eight years. Staff also explained that the equipment-replacement allocation may be used for items such as mowers, trailers, or major unexpected repairs and that the Council would be advised before significant purchases are made.

Mr. Laws described reserve-style capital accounts for unexpected opportunities and future park improvements. He reviewed proposed or continuing projects including 700 South between 4000 West and 4500 West; annual tree replacement and 9/11 Day of Service plantings; the planned roundabout at 300 North and 4500 West, which may be delayed to coordinate with future 300 North improvements and changing traffic patterns after the West Davis Highway extension; the Arts Council's annual $5,000 City contribution; the possible roundabout at 4000 West and 700 South; and completion of Cold Springs Road.

The Council also reviewed capital funding for the 4000 West Canal Bypass and related stormwater work, the future Public Works facility, park and trail projects, recreation improvements, and utility projects.

Mr. Laws summarized the FY2026 amendments, including amounts previously discussed for a management analyst position, expanded America 250 Independence Day activities, employee market adjustments, the junior-high gym project, road and stormwater work, and transfers among funds. He stated that the General Fund would remain balanced and within the City's fund-balance policy after the amendments.

No action was taken during the Administrative Session. The amended budget and compensation adjustments are scheduled for public hearings and action during tonight's General Session.

2. **Discussion Regarding an Amendment to the Agreement for Law Enforcement Services – *Mr. Kyle Laws***

Mr. Laws reviewed Amendment No. 7 to the City's interlocal agreement with Davis County for law enforcement services. The City's contract provides one dedicated deputy within West Point City twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week, which requires the equivalent of five deputies. The City has received phased discounts during the current agreement to allow it to gradually reach the full cost of service. Under the proposed amendment, the discount would end and the City would pay the full contracted amount for FY2027, increasing the annual cost by approximately $150,000.

The amendment extends the current agreement through June 30, 2027. Staff and the Sheriff's Office will begin negotiating a new multi-year agreement that accounts for the additional service needs created by the City's growth. Sheriff Sparks and Staff discussed calls for service, staffing demands, and the distinction between the City patrol contract and school-resource-officer services, which are funded jointly through the School District and Sheriff's Office.

The Council expressed appreciation for the Sheriff's Office and will consider approval of the amendment in tonight's General Session.

3. **Discussion Regarding the 3500 W Sidewalk Project – *Mr. Boyd Davis***

Mr. Davis presented updated information regarding the Council's prior direction to install a pedestrian connection along 3500 West between 800 North and Lloyd Blake Park. A permanent sidewalk would eventually be reconstructed as part of the future widening of 3500 West; therefore, Staff proposed a temporary sidewalk on the west side of the road, where fewer utility conflicts and driveway connections would reduce costs.

Staff estimated the temporary sidewalk at approximately $50,000. The sidewalk would connect the existing sidewalk near Loy Blake Park to 800 North and provide a safer route for students and other pedestrians. Mr. Davis recommended concrete rather than asphalt because it would hold up better and require less maintenance, although the temporary walk could be reduced to approximately four feet in width. Thicker concrete would be installed where necessary to accommodate agricultural or driveway traffic.

The Council reached consensus to proceed with a four-foot-wide concrete sidewalk on the west side of 3500 West. Council Member Chatterton requested that any asphalt-versus-concrete comparison include anticipated maintenance costs. Staff confirmed that the $50,000 allocation and funding for an additional crossing guard has been included in the proposed budget for FY27.

4. Discussion Regarding a Development Agreement & Rezone Request for 2084 N 4500 W (*Applicant, Nilson Land*) – *Mrs. Bryn MacDonald*

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed a proposed development agreement and rezone for the property at approximately 2084 North 4500 West, sometimes referred to as the Weaver parcel. The General Plan designation had recently been amended to medium-density residential, and the applicant proposed an R-4 zoning designation consistent with that amendment.

The preliminary concept included smaller residential lots and a mix of housing styles, including single-level patio homes intended for residents seeking fewer stairs and less yard maintenance. The applicant requested flexibility to reduce certain side-yard setbacks from six feet to five feet to accommodate wider one-story homes. Council Member Chatterton questioned whether reducing setbacks would make the narrow lots feel more constrained and asked what benefit the modification would provide. The applicant explained that the adjustment would allow a different housing type without increasing the number of lots and would provide an alternative to narrower two-story homes.

The Council and Staff discussed setbacks, building separation, product variety, and how the development agreement could address the requested exceptions. The item was presented for discussion only and will return for further discussion, before being scheduled for a public hearing and consideration of approval.

5. 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
May 19th, 2026

General Session
7:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council General Session held on May 19, 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# 821 9941 1733 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 Trent Yarbrough, and Council Member Jeremy Strong

EXCUSED: Council Member Michele Swenson

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Kenny England, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder. Also present – Michael Sabin, Administrative Intern

EXCUSED: Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director

VISITORS PRESENT: Lacy Richards, Kelly Sparks, Matt Meyer, Rena Hunt, PJ Roubinet, BP Bailey, Alan & JoAnn Parker, Suzanne Wood, Scott Carlson, Roger & Vicki Graham, Nate Wycherley, Sharon Hansen, Tami & Jeff Yeoman, Tauni & Stan Fowers, Cole Tubbs, Ronald Lee Brown, Michelle Day, Dixie Bunot, David Hawkes, Scott Winters, John Wiesner, and Michael Rolow. 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 Strong
4. **Communications and Disclosures from City Council and Mayor**

Council Member Yarbrough – None

Council Member Judd – None

Council Member Swenson – Absent

Council Member Chatterton – None

Council Member Strong – None

Mayor Vincent – None

5. **Communications from Staff**

Mr. Laws announced that the next Senior Lunch would be held June 9 at Loy Blake Park. He also reminded the Council and public of this year's first Movie in the Park on June 12, which is being held on the same day as the Farmers Market. Both of these will be at Loy Blake Park.

The Miss West Point Pageant at Horizon Jr. High will be held on June 13 and invited all to attend. He also noted that preparations are well underway for the upcoming Party at the Point Independence Day Celebration, and some great activities commemorating the 250th anniversary of the United States are planned.

6. Citizen Comment

Rena Hunt –Hooper: Stated that she had attempted to email written comments to be read aloud for the April 7 meeting after being given an incorrect email address. Her first message was returned as undeliverable, and she later learned that the City Recorder was out of the office. She recommended publishing email addresses more prominently and using a shared mailbox so that emailed comments are not dependent upon one employee's availability.

Mayor Vincent clarified that written comments received by the deadline are distributed to the Council but are not read aloud during the meeting.

Cole Tubbs –Hooper: Spoke as a nearby resident and member of the Hooper Water Improvement District Board of Trustees. He expressed concern regarding increasing residential density in western Davis County and the long-term availability of culinary-water rights. He stated that the District has to continue issuing connections while there is current capacity, but at some point the water is going to run out and that time is only going to come sooner with all the new houses. He asked the Council to carefully consider the limited water resources when making density decisions.

7. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026A, Approving the Appointment of the Appeal Authority – *Mayor Brian Vincent*

Mayor Vincent stated that State Code requires cities to appoint an independent appeal authority for pending land-use matters. The City's land-use counsel recommended Daniel MacDonald of McDonald & Fielding Law Firm, who has substantial land-use experience and has served in similar appeal and arbitration roles.

The Council had no further questions or concerns.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Resolution No. 05-19-2026A, appointing Daniel McDonald as the City's Appeal Authority
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

8. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026B, Approving an Interlocal Agreement w/ Davis County for the CDBG Grant – *Mr. Boyd Davis*

Mr. Davis explained that this agreement allows West Point City to continue participating in Davis County's Community Development Block Grant program. A current agreement is already in place, but the agreement is renewed every three years. CDBG funds may be used for capital improvements benefiting low- and moderate-income or underserved populations. The City has received funding through the program in the past, including for sidewalk and retaining-wall improvements along 300 North near West Point Elementary.

He noted that this is a renewal of the current agreement and no specific project application was pending at this time. No further questions or concerns were raised.

Council Member Yarbrough motioned to approve Resolution No. 05-19-2026B
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

9. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026C, Approving Amendment #7 to the Interlocal Agreement for Law Enforcement Services – *Mr. Kyle Laws*

Mr. Laws reviewed this final amendment to the City's current law enforcement agreement. The agreement allowed the city to gradually increase the annual cost paid over a five-year period to reach the full contract cost of around $900,000. The City receives one dedicated deputy twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week for patrol, and access to the full range of services of provided by the Sheriff's Office (investigations, crime scene processing, evidence, emergency response, SWAT, etc.). Amendment No. 7 is the final phase of the agreement and is an increase of approximately $144,000 to the budget for FY27. The amendment extends the agreement through June 30, 2027, while the City and County negotiate a new multi-year contract.

The Council had no questions or concerns on this scheduled amendment to the agreement.

Council Member Strong motioned to approve Resolution No. 05-19-2026C.
Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

10. Public Hearing Regarding FY2026 Compensation Adjustments – *Mr. Kyle Laws*

Mr. Laws presented the proposed FY2026 employee compensation market adjustments resulting from the City's market study conducted in March/April. The adjustments address positions found to be more below the market average, up to a maximum increase of 4.5%, and have an estimated FY2026 impact of approximately $5,994

He explained that these market adjustments are to address positions whose current wage is below the market and are separate from the proposed cost-of-living adjustments and merit increases for FY2027.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing.

No comments were received.

Council Member Judd motioned to close the public hearing
Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

11. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026D, Approving the FY2026 Amended Budget for West Point City – *Mr. Kyle Laws*

Mr. Laws summarized the proposed FY2026 amendments, including personnel and compensation changes; expanded America 250 Independence Day activities; the transfer to use park impact fee funds for the junior-high gym bond payment; road, sidewalk, utility, and stormwater capital projects; the 4000 West Canal Bypass; and transfers among the Water, Wastewater, and Capital Projects Funds to account for how funds were received and expended.

Mr. Laws reiterated that all of the amendments formalize expenditures previously reviewed by the Council, and that the transfers across funds are to maintain a balanced budget at the end of the fiscal year.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing.

a. Public Hearing

Michelle Day – 1800 N, West Point: stated that she had brought a list of questions and concerns, but Staff's presentation had addressed the items she intended to raise. She remained unhappy with some of the changes but understood that many of the amendments involved reallocating or moving funds among accounts.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to close the public hearing
Council Member Strong seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

b. Action

Council Member Strong motioned to approve Resolution No. 05-19-2026D
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

12. Public Hearing Regarding a Development Agreement for Property Located at Appx. 1800 N 4300 W (*Foothill Ditch, Applicant*) – *Mrs. Bryn MacDonald*

Mrs. MacDonald reviewed the proposed development agreement for the Foothill Ditch property at approximately 1800 North 4300 West. The agreement accompanied a request to rezone the property from A-40 to R-4 and established the proposed concept, housing mix, development standards, and owner-occupancy requirements. The Council discussed the percentage of owner-occupied units and the relationship between the restricted units and the overall project.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing.

No comments received.

Council Member Strong motioned to close the public hearing
Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

12.1. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026E, Approving the Development Agreement for 1800 N 4300 W

Mrs. MacDonald presented this item ahead of the public hearing in the previous item.

Mayor Vincent asked whether the agreement could be adjusted so that owner-occupied units represented approximately one-half of the applicable aggregate. The applicant's representative stated that increasing the owner-occupancy restriction to 33% of the project, or approximately 18 units, would accomplish that objective.

The Council agreed with this adjustment and had no further comments.

Council Member Judd motioned to approve Resolution No. 05-19-2026E with an amendment increasing the owner-occupancy requirement to 33%.
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: Judd, Yarbrough, Chatterton
Opposed: Strong
The Council passed the motion by majority vote

12.2. Consideration of Ordinance No. 05-19-2026A, Approving the Rezone of Property at 1800 N 4300 W from A-40 to R-4

Mrs. MacDonald presented this item ahead of the public hearing in item 12 and the Council had no further discussion.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Ordinance No. 05-19-2026A
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
Roll Call
Council Member Judd – Aye
Council Member Yarbrough – Aye
Council Member Chatterton – Aye

Council Member Strong – Nay
Council Member Swenson - Absent

In Favor: Judd, Yarbrough, Chatterton
Opposed: Strong
The Council passed the motion by majority vote

13. Public Hearing Regarding a Rezone Request for Property Located at Appx. 5750 W 2425 N from A-5 to R-1 (*Parker Farms, Applicant*) – *Mrs. Bryn MacDonald*

Mrs. MacDonald introduced the Parker Farms rezone request and associated development agreement. The concept proposed approximately 76 residential lots. Staff reviewed the property's annexation history, the applicable General Plan and zoning designations, proposed road and utility improvements, stormwater requirements, and the remaining subdivision-review process.

Scott Carlson, representing the applicant, stated that the property owners had worked on the project for several years, beginning under Davis County before pursuing annexation into West Point City. He explained that development under the County would have resulted in larger lots but would not have provided municipal sewer, storm-drain, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and other improvements. He described the proposal as a planned and serviced residential development.

Mayor Vincent opened the public hearing and asked that West Point residents provide comment first to ensure they had the opportunity to be heard.

No comments from West Point residents were received.

Mayor Vincent then invited comments from other persons there to provide input.

Stan Fowers – Hooper: Asked whether secondary-water shares would be turned in for the subdivision and, if so, to whom. He stated that he is a full-time farmer and opposed higher-density development. He was particularly concerned that curb and gutter along 5500 West would allow vehicles to park along the roadway and make it impossible to move large agricultural machinery through the area. He stated that his combine is approximately 26 feet wide and his seedbed maker is approximately 20 feet wide, and that those widths cannot be accommodated when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. As Vice President of Hooper Irrigation Company, he also stated that representatives of Ivy Meadows had indicated that secondary-water shares would be turned over to West Point City rather than Hooper Irrigation. He said Hooper Irrigation had met with its water attorney that day and, if that were the arrangement, Hooper Irrigation would be unable to provide secondary water for the subdivisions. He recommended tabling the matter until the City and the irrigation company could resolve the issue.

Rena Hunt – Hooper: Identified her main three concerns of density, irrigation, and detention ponds. She quoted recommendations from the City's 2024 General Plan Citizens Guide concerning buffering incompatible uses, preserving quality of life, and protecting agricultural areas from development pressure. She stated that the property is surrounded by one-acre, three-acre, and larger agricultural parcels and that tractors regularly travel the surrounding roads. In her view, the proposed development did not provide an adequate buffer or preserve the area's agricultural character. She stated that many people still want acre-sized properties for horses, cows, and similar uses. Regarding irrigation, she said the prior Parker phase received pressurized, unmetered secondary water after giving up a half-share, while agricultural users are limited to specific watering times and days, which she believed was unfair, particularly during drought conditions when agricultural users were beginning the season on half-shares. Regarding detention ponds, she stated that none were identified on the map and asked how they would function, how existing runoff and a land drain crossing the Parker property would be handled, and who would be responsible for maintaining detention facilities located on private property.

Jeff Yeoman – Hooper: Stated that he lives at the far west end of 2425 North, where the proposed drainage and irrigation improvements would be located. He asked whether the developer would be responsible for preserving separate headgates for the numerous properties downstream so each owner could continue to flood-irrigate as they do now. He echoed the concern regarding road width and the need to move agricultural machinery along 2425 North. Mr. Yeoman stated that he is a builder and understands that development is coming, but the smallest surrounding parcel is approximately one acre and the property immediately north in Hooper City is planned for half-acre minimum lots. He was not opposed to homes being built but believed the proposed density did not fit the surrounding area.

Cole Tubbs – Hooper: Stated he is speaking as a nearby resident and member of the Hooper Water Improvement District Board of Trustees. He clarified that the District could currently provide culinary water, but stated that Parker Farms, Salt Grass, and Foothill Ditch all exceed the approximately two units per acre the District had projected for growth in the western area. He emphasized that the concern involved clean drinking water for homes, not irrigation water, and that the District is continually trying to catch up with higher-than-projected demand. Speaking personally, he described moving cattle and agricultural equipment along 2425 North and stated that the area's agricultural character was important to him. He said developer acquaintances had told him smaller, higher-density homes were easier and quicker to sell, but there remains a market for larger lots and custom homes. He asked the Council to consider the continued westward increase in density and its effects on both culinary-water capacity and the agricultural community.

Dave Hawks – Hooper: Stated that his principal concern was density. He and his wife purchased an acre lot because they wanted to live in the country rather than the city, and he felt that urban development was being brought around them. He acknowledged that the Parkers have a right to develop their property and stated that he had originally suggested the idea of development to the family while surveying the property. However, he believed that approximately 2.2 lots per acre was too dense for this location and that smaller lots should be placed elsewhere.

Dixie Bunot – Hooper: Provided photographs and discussed the language in the proposed agreement requiring the cleaning and upgrading of existing open drainage ditches along 6000 West. She stated that the ditch shown in the photographs is her irrigation ditch, has existed for many years, and is not connected to drainage infrastructure. She explained that runoff flowing west along 2425 North crosses her property through a combination of an 18-inch pipe, open ditch, and a 24-inch pipe near the Yeoman property. She asked whether a separate parallel pipe could be installed for subdivision runoff rather than removing existing irrigation pipe, enlarging it, or commingling irrigation and stormwater. She also requested clarification of what 'cleaning and upgrading' an open ditch would require and whether it meant only removing vegetation or widening and deepening the ditch. Ms. Bunot questioned where detention-pond discharge would go because she believed there was no open or piped drainage west of the subdivision along 6000 West. She stated that a pipe previously discussed near the northwest corner of the property dead-ended in a field and served irrigation rather than drainage. She said the agreement's wording did not accurately describe existing conditions and should not be approved without correction and additional information.

Tammy Yeoman – Hooper: First stated that she was saddened by the distinction made by the Mayor between West Point residents and nearby residents of unincorporated Davis County. She said she viewed the Council as representing the broader community because its decisions directly affect her property, even though she cannot vote in West Point elections. *Mayor Vincent apologized and explained that the Council must make decisions for West Point residents while also recognizing the direct effects on surrounding neighbors.* Ms. Yeoman stated that the western area is new territory for everyone and asked the Council not to disregard the concerns of people who may eventually become West Point residents. She then recommended denial of the R-1 rezone because the proposed density did not match the surrounding area. She stated that 26 developed parcels in the surrounding area comprise approximately 132 acres, while the applicant proposed 76 lots on a much smaller amount of land. She cited City Code provisions concerning compatibility and continuity and argued that approval of Ivy Meadows should not become the new standard used to justify additional density. She stated that only a small percentage of the proposed Parker Farms lots would be one-half acre or larger, while nearly all surrounding parcels are one-half acre or larger and most are one acre or more. She also quoted prior Council minutes in which the R-1 General Plan designation for the annexed area was described as a placeholder pending further analysis. She stated that the General Plan had since been amended to A-20, which she believed was a better fit, and asked the Council to deny the R-1 request and require an A-20 proposal. At her request, members of the audience who opposed the R-1 rezone stood to demonstrate their opposition.

Roger Graham – Hooper: Described observing an eight-inch water-main break shortly after sewer construction near 5500 West and 2425 North. He stated that the break filled storm drains with sand and left a large pile of dirt in the road for approximately two weeks. He observed speeding vehicles hit the dirt, become airborne, and lose items from their truck beds. He warned that adding the proposed density and more children to the area would increase the risk of a serious accident and asked the Council to consider public safety.

Nate Wycherley – Hooper: Stated that the ditch section near his property was not shown as being piped or filled. He expressed concern that a child entering the ditch or culvert could be carried a significant distance and be difficult to rescue. He also described 2425 North as unsafe for pedestrians because vehicles travel at high speeds and walkers must move out of the roadway. He believed the proposed development would add substantial traffic and worsen those conditions. Mr. Wycherley also echoed the concerns regarding moving livestock along the road and stated that complaints associated with nearby development had already caused one agricultural operator to move or begin moving a feedlot.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to close the public hearing
Council Member Strong seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

13.1. Consideration of Resolution No. 05-19-2026F, Approving a Development Agreement for 5750 W 2425 N

Following the public hearing, Mr. Davis addressed the proposed stormwater system. He explained that the City's master plan anticipates use of open ditches where adjacent property remains undeveloped, with ditches piped as development occurs. Any ditch used for stormwater would be required to have sufficient width and depth to carry the modeled flow and would be reviewed during subdivision engineering. If an existing ditch is used to convey irrigation supply water, a separate stormwater ditch may be necessary to avoid improper commingling. He stated that adequate right-of-way appeared to exist along 6000 West, but final design details, head gates, ditch capacity, and related improvements would be determined during subdivision review.

Mr. Laws cautioned that many engineering and utility details are not known, much less resolved, at the rezone stage and that the City should avoid imposing requirements on this applicant that are not required of other applicants. He explained that unresolved issues could still prevent later preliminary or final subdivision approval if adequate solutions are not provided.

Beverly Parker Bailey, trustee and manager for the applicant, stated that the family owns sufficient irrigation shares, had communicated with Hooper Irrigation Company, and had previously paid to extend pressurized secondary-water infrastructure to the area. Mr. Davis stated that the ownership and delivery arrangement would need to be coordinated because the City's agreement with Davis and Weber Canal Company differs from the service structure in this area. Mr. Fowers explained that Hooper Irrigation and Davis and Weber Canal Company have historically divided service territory near Howard Slough and that additional facilities could be required depending upon where shares are assigned.

Council Member Chatterton stated that the public hearing raised enough questions regarding culinary and secondary water, irrigation and stormwater ditches, drainage, detention ponds, and roadway impacts that additional information should be obtained before the Council acted.

Mr. Laws reiterated that some questions would not be fully answerable until the subdivision-design stage and asked that the Council consider the need to apply a consistent rezone process for all applicants to avoid liability, especially as the language of this proposed development agreement is almost exactly what is in the development agreement for an adjoining project (Ivy Meadows) that was just approved by the Council in April.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to table approval of the development agreement and related rezone request pending additional information regarding the identified water, irrigation, drainage, ditch, detention, and roadway issues
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

13.2. Consideration of Ordinance No. 05-19-2026B, Approving the Rezone of Property at 5750 W 2425 N from A-5 to R-1

This item was included in the motion to table approved in the previous item.

14. Consideration of Approval of the Bid Award to Post Asphalt for 2026 City Road Asphalt Patching – *Mr. Kenny England*

Mr. England stated that this project includes repair patches associated with prior water leaks and substantial repairs along 1525 West, which Staff identified as one of the City's poorest road sections. The amount is within the Council's approved annual street-maintenance budget. Mr. England recommended awarding the contract to Post Asphalt in the amount of $119,844.50.

In response to Council Member Yarbrough, Mr. England explained that Post Asphalt holds a competitively bid State contract, allowing the City to use the State pricing without conducting a separate local bid process. The Council had no further questions or concerns.

Council Member Yarbrough motioned to award the bid to Post Asphalt in the amount of $119,844.50
Council Member Strong seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

15. Consideration of Approval to Place the Hall Haven Subdivision on One-Year Warranty – *Mr. Boyd Davis*

Mr. Davis reported that the Hall Haven Subdivision, located west of City Hall, had completed the required public improvements and landscaping and was ready to begin the one-year warranty period. Staff recommended approval.

The Council had no comments or concerns.

Council Member Judd motioned to place Hall Haven Subdivision on one-year warranty
Council Member Chatterton seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

16. Consideration of Approval to Remove the Harvest Fields Subdivision Phase 1B from Warranty – *Mr. Boyd Davis*

Mr. Davis reported that Harvest Fields Subdivision Phase 1B, located south of West Point Junior High School, had successfully completed its warranty period. He stated that all required improvements have been inspected and no issues were found. Staff recommends it be released from warranty.

The Council had no comments or concerns.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to remove Phase 1B from warranty
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed

17. Motion to Adjourn the General Session

Council Member Chatterton motioned to adjourn
Council Member Yarbrough seconded the motion
In Favor: All
Opposed: None
The Council Members present unanimously agreed.

WEST POINT CITY
INCORPORATED 1935
CORPORATE SEAL
DAVIS COUNTY · UTAH

APPROVED THIS 4 **DAY OF** August **, 2026:**

BRIAN VINCENT, MAYOR

CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER

Proposed Property Tax Impact Schedule

(Preliminary)

West Point City will consider an increase to its property tax rate from .000730 to .000773 (estimated) to generate an additional $50,000. The following information is intended to provide decision makers and the public with an explanation of how the City's operations would be affected if the proposed property tax increase is adopted.

West Point City's Current Property Tax Rate	0.000730
West Point City's Current Property Tax Revenue	$858,223
Proposed Revenue with Tax Change	$908,223
New Property Tax Revenue to West Point City	$50,000

Estimated Increase to West Point City's Property Tax Revenue 5.83%

Estimated Annual Increase to a primary residence of $500,000	$11.70
Estimated Annual Increase to a business valued at $500,000	$21.26

Affected Department	Proposed Budget	Budget without Tax Change	Budget Change
Police	$900,000	$850,000	$50,000

Impact of Tax Increase – The contract with the Sherriff's Department has increased to $900,000 to cover the cost of providing sufficient police services to West Point City