

PERRY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
PERRY CITY OFFICES
JUNE 4, 2026

7:02 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Paul White, Commissioner Beth Thompson,
Commissioner Jan Kerr and Commissioner Travis Moesser

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vice Chairman Stephen Moss and Commissioner Marcus
Wager

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator Bob Barnhill and Planning Secretary Tyra
Bischoff

OTHERS PRESENT: None

ONLINE: None

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING CEREMONIES

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

- A. Declare Conflict of Interest, if any**
None.

ITEM 2: ACTION ITEMS

A. Public Hearing: Ordinance 26-D Development Agreements

City Administrator Bob Barnhill presented Ordinance 26-D, which updates the city's code section (See 15.02.040) governing development agreements, including requirements and the approval process.

Key provisions of the ordinance include:

- Clarification that the City Council makes final decisions on development agreements after receiving a Planning Commission recommendation.
- A requirement that prior to placement on the Planning Commission agenda, a development agreement proposal must undergo an informal review by a designated planning commissioner, a designated city council member, the city administrator, and the city engineer.
- A requirement that the applicant submit a statement describing how their proposal conforms to city code and the adopted development agreement policies and priorities.
- A requirement that the applicant provide a conceptual development plan following current zoning standards for side-by-side comparison.
- A requirement that written feedback from reviewers be provided to both the applicant and the Planning Commission.
- Addition of consistency with adopted policies and established priorities as a criterion for consideration of development agreements.

Chairman White opened the Public Hearing.

The public hearing was opened at 7:05PM.

No public comments were made.

The public hearing was closed at 7:06PM.

The Commission discussed the proposed ordinance language and sought clarification on several procedural elements, including how a planning commissioner would be designated for informal reviews. Mr. Barnhill explained that the chair would typically serve as the designee, with the option to delegate that responsibility when appropriate.

After discussion and staff input, the Commission was comfortable with the proposed language and agreed that no amendments were necessary.

MOTION: Commissioner Thompson made a motion to recommend Ordinance 26-D Development Agreements. Commissioner Kerr seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Commissioner Thompson, Yes
Commissioner Moesser, Yes
Commissioner White, Yes
Commissioner Kerr, Yes
Commissioner Moss, Absent
Commissioner Wager, Absent

Motion Approved. 4 Yes, 0 No

B. Public Hearing: Ordinance 26-H Waterwise Landscaping

Note: Action Item 2C was addressed before 2B.

Mr. Barnhill presented Ordinance 26-H, which would update the city's landscaping standards to qualify Perry City for a state rebate program (administered through the "Slow the Flow" initiative) that reimburses property owners up to \$3.00 per square foot for converting existing lawn to water-wise landscaping. He noted the ordinance had previously come before the Commission approximately two years ago and was ultimately denied by City Council, with the exception of a provision prohibiting new lawn in park strips for new developments, which was adopted at that time.

The proposed ordinance would apply primarily to commercial and multifamily development and would:

- Limit turf/lawn to no more than 20% of total landscaped area (down from the current 70%), with an exception for areas designated for active recreation.
- Restrict front and side yard lawn in single-family residential developments to no more than 50% of those areas.

- Prohibit lawn in landscape strips narrower than 8 feet in width, including in single-family developments.

Mr. Barnhill also provided context on the steadily declining water allocations from Pineview Water, which supplies outdoor irrigation for most Perry City properties. He expressed concern that without updated landscaping standards, new homeowners would face frustration when allocations are exceeded, potentially leading to the misuse of culinary water for outdoor irrigation, cross-connection risks, and disrupted water planning for the city.

The public hearing was opened at 7:34PM.

No public comments were made.

The public hearing was closed at 7:34PM.

The Commission discussed the ordinance at length. Primary concerns centered on the significant reduction from 70% to 20% turf allowance, which several commissioners viewed as a large and potentially onerous jump. Mr. Barnhill offered reassurance that in practice, most recently approved multifamily developments appeared to be close to or already near the 20% threshold, and that the active recreation exception would provide meaningful flexibility — particularly for detention pond areas. Commissioner Moesser noted that several cities in northern Utah, including Tremonton and Farmington, had already adopted compatible ordinances. Commissioner Kerr raised the practical challenges of weed control in rock/xeriscape areas.

The Commission expressed a desire to table the item in order to gather more information, including an assessment by Mr. Barnhill of what percentage of lawn has been approved in recent multifamily developments and whether those projects would be materially affected by the 20% threshold. The Commission also noted the single-family provisions should be reorganized out of the site plan section and into the landscaping requirements section of the code for clarity.

The item was tabled to a future meeting for further review and discussion.

C. Development Agreement Policy

Mr. Barnhill presented the Development Agreement Policies and Priorities document, which outlines the city's priorities and expectations in negotiating development agreements. He noted the document had been refined over several prior meetings and would be formally adopted by City Council as a resolution.

The commission discussed the following:

Proportionality of Benefits: The Chair raised a question regarding the provision stating that competing benefits should be "proportional and roughly equivalent in value," noting the difficulty of assigning objective monetary value to quality-of-life considerations such as preserved orchards versus increased density. The Commission agreed that keeping the language subjective was preferable, as it preserves flexibility for future commissions and councils, and that the voluntary nature of development agreements provides adequate legal protection against claims of inequity.

Limiting and Scattering of High-Density Housing: The Chair expressed concern that a key reference to the city's multifamily policy regarding limiting and scattering of high-density housing was buried within a paragraph and insufficiently prominent. The Chair suggested it should be elevated in the document so that reviewers and applicants are more likely to take notice of it. Commissioner Kerr clarified the broader concept: that the general plan's density grid is intended to ensure multifamily units are distributed across the city rather than concentrated in one area. After discussion, the Commission agreed that the relevant language should be moved or restructured to stand as a more prominent, standalone reference — framed as an expectation of compliance with that policy rather than as a negotiable community benefit. Mr. Barnhill agreed to reorganize the document accordingly before it proceeds to City Council.

MOTION: Commissioner Kerr made a motion to recommend approval of the Development Agreement Policy as amended. Commissioner Moesser seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Commissioner Thompson, Yes
Commissioner Moesser, Yes
Commissioner White, Yes
Commissioner Kerr, Yes
Commissioner Moss, Absent
Commissioner Wager, Absent

Motion Approved. 4 Yes, 0 No

ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- A. May 7, 2026, Regular Planning Meeting**
- B. May 21, 2026, Work Session**

MOTION: Commissioner Moesser made a motion to approve the minutes for the May 7, 2026 Planning Commission meeting and May 21, 2026 Work Session. Commissioner Kerr seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Commissioner Thompson, Yes
Commissioner Moesser, Yes
Commissioner White, Yes
Commissioner Kerr, Yes
Commissioner Moss, Absent
Commissioner Wager, Absent

Motion Approved. 4 Yes, 0 No

ITEM 4: DISCUSSION

A. Future Projects

Mr. Barnhill noted that Ordinance 26-H (waterwise landscaping) would be revisited at a future meeting. The topic of conservation subdivisions was retained on the list to ensure it is not overlooked for future discussion.

B. Conservation Subdivisions

The item was acknowledged and deferred to a future meeting.

C. Field Trip

Commissioners Thompson and Moesser reported on the recent field trip to review existing multifamily developments within Perry City. Two members of the public also attended.

Key takeaways included:

- Architectural variety was identified as a significant factor in the perceived quality and desirability of developments. Projects with more varied and interesting exterior design appeared to be occupied more quickly than those with more uniform or plain facades.
- Highway proximity was noted as a detractor. Multifamily developments situated directly along Highway 89, particularly multi-story buildings, were viewed as awkward and out of place, especially where units faced the highway directly. The existing commercial buffer zone along the highway was seen as well-reasoned.
- Up-close observation changed some perceptions. Viewing developments from within, including interior courtyards, gave commissioners a better sense of what they did and did not appreciate compared to highway-level views.
- Specific design elements such as front porches, fencing, and landscaped entries were noted as meaningful contributors to livability and visual appeal.
- Material quality was discussed, with one commissioner noting that a brick veneer finish on one development was visually inferior to real brick, suggesting the need to be more specific in design standards.

Mr. Barnhill proposed two follow-up initiatives: first, inviting an architect to a future work session to help the Commission better articulate architectural preferences and translate them into code language; and second, asking all commissioners to photograph interesting multifamily developments they encounter in other communities, with images to be shared via a shared Google Drive folder for collective review at a future meeting.

D. Report on past-approved Planning Commission Items

Mr. Barnhill reported that the zone change application (Ordinance 26-F) had been approved by City Council without controversy.

Regarding the previously discussed beekeeping matter (Ordinance 26-E), it was reported that a review of state statute revealed that Utah law now substantially preempts local regulation of beekeeping, meaning the city's prior ordinance may have been in conflict with state law. The city

attorney recommended that the city simply defer to state statute rather than maintain local regulations. Commissioner Moesser noted that while mandatory registration is not required, voluntary registration with the state does offer benefits including training and hive inspections, which could help prevent aggressive colony behavior.

E. Report from Commissioners regarding previous Council Meetings

Commissioner Moesser reported attending the May 14th City Council meeting. No items directly pertinent to planning commission business were addressed, though a potential property tax rate adjustment was discussed. The Commission noted awareness of the beekeeping outcome from the subsequent council meeting.

F. Make assignments for representative(s) to attend City Council (April 16th)

It was agreed that commissioners would be contacted via email or text to identify who could attend the June 11th meeting.

- June 11th- TBD
- May 25th- Commissioner White

ITEM 5: TRAINING

A. Staff

Mr. Barnhill provided an informal educational overview of how property tax functions in Utah municipalities, noting key distinctions from sales tax. He explained that the state issues a certified tax rate each year calculated to collect the same total dollar amount as the prior year, meaning that as property values rise, the rate automatically declines. As a result, property tax revenue does not inherently scale with inflation or increased property values the way sales tax does. Growth through new development does generate additional revenue, but without periodic rate adjustments, cities can fall behind operationally over time. Mr. Barnhill noted that Perry City has adjusted its certified rate three times in eight years.

He also briefly highlighted the upcoming ribbon-cutting event for the Historic Orchard Pathway on June 13th at 8:30 AM, meeting at the Public Works building, followed at 10:00 AM by a ribbon-cutting at the Mountain View Bike Park (Kiwanis Gravity Bike Park). All commissioners were invited to attend.

ITEM 6: REVIEW NEXT ADGENDA AND ADJOURN

A. Items for July agenda (next meeting TBD)

Mr. Barnhill noted that two zone change applications had been submitted and that applicants had been advised a July meeting might not be held. The Commission discussed the possibility of scheduling a meeting on July 16th if the agenda becomes sufficiently full, but agreed that absent additional items, the July meeting would be cancelled and matters would be carried to the August 6th meeting. Mr. Barnhill agreed to notify the Commission if additional items warranted scheduling a July session.

B. Motion to Adjourn

MOTION: Commissioner Thompson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Moesser seconded.

All In Favor

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48PM.