

Payson City
Planning Commission Meeting
Payson City Center, 439 W Utah Avenue, Payson UT 84651
Wednesday, July 22, 2026, 6:00 p.m.

Conducting: Kirk Beecher, Planning Commission Chair

Commissioners: Perry Adams, Camarie Brinkerhoff, Ryan Frisby, Robert Gedeberg, Kepi Heimuli

Absent:

Staff: Michael Bryant, Planner II
Marty Dargel, Planning Technician
Jeffrey Seawell, Assistant City Attorney/Prosecutor
Jill Spencer, Development Services Director
Travis Jockumsen, Public Works Director
Robert Mills, Assistant City Manager

Others

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the Planning Commission of Payson, Utah, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Invocation/Inspirational Thought – Commissioner Adams

3. Consent Agenda

3.1 Approval of minutes for the regular meeting of June 24, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Heimuli - To approve the minutes of June 24. Motion seconded by Commissioner Gedeberg. Those voting yes – Perry Adams, Kirk Beecher, Camarie Brinkerhoff, Ryan Frisby, Robert Gedeberg, Kepi Heimuli. Those voting no: none. The motion carried.

4. Public Forum

Jeremy Smith raised questions about the relationship between the General Plan and the East Side Comprehensive Plan, expressing concerns about aligning the two plans. Commissioners Beecher and Frisby addressed some of his concerns and explained the reasons for wanting to align the two plans.

5. Action Items

5.1 REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION – Mina Creek Annexation: Request by Randy Smith to annex Utah County Parcels 30:009:0041 and 30:009:0108 into Payson City. The properties are located at approximately 8955 S Arrowhead Trail and total 102.3 acres. The applicant is requesting R-2-7.5, Residential zoning upon annexation.

Staff Presentation:

Planning Staff reviewed the request by the applicant to annex Utah County Parcels #30:009:0041 and 30:009:0108 which total approximately 102.16 acres and a Master Development Agreement to include:

- R-2-7.5 zoning.
- The right to develop townhomes within the R-2-7.5 zone.
- Smaller lot single-family homes within the R-2-7.5 zone.
- Reduced frontage (as narrow as 45 feet).
- Reduced setbacks (as small as 5 feet on corner street-side lots).
- The use of wetlands, detention ponds, and non-usable space to be counted towards open space requirement.
- Delay of collector road and construction.
- 618 entitled housing units (344 townhomes, 274 single-family homes).

Staff reviewed the roles of Planning Commission, City Council, and staff for annexation requests, stating that this meeting is not a public hearing. A public hearing will happen at City Council. Staff reminded the Commissioners that annexations are a legislative action of the City Council. During this meeting, Planning Commission's role is to make a recommendation of approval or denial to City Council for this annexation request.

Staff reviewed the location of the proposed annexation area and explained that some adjacent parcels shown as part of the development concept are already within city boundaries but would be incorporated into the overall development plan.

Staff provided an overview of the annexation timeline, including the applicant's previous request to have the property included within the city's expansion area map and explained that the City Council previously removed the property from the expansion area map but later voted on June 5, 2024, to return the property to the expansion area map. Staff stated that the timeline provided in the staff report was intended to identify significant meetings, discussions, communications, and actions related to the annexation request, but was not intended to be a complete record of every interaction.

Staff have several concerns with the requested annexation, some of which have not been fully addressed by the annexation sponsor. These include:

- Utility infrastructure (regional lift station, sewer trunk line, upsizing of sewer lines).
- Transportation network, traffic circulation, block length, and city grid system for roads.
- Open space requirements.
- Amenity requirements.
- Lot sizes and frontage.
- Zoning (R-2-7.5 for townhomes and smaller lots than the zone requires).
- Housing placement/housing product.
- Eminent domain.
- Timing of improvements.

Staff explained that the proposed development includes a larger number of townhomes than they originally anticipated and noted concerns that the proposed housing mix does not represent a predominantly single-family development when considering the total number of housing units.

Staff discussed concerns with reduced lot widths and setbacks, noting that previous developments with smaller lots and reduced frontages have created challenges related to parking, snow removal, garbage collection, and overall neighborhood functionality. Staff also reviewed examples provided by the applicant showing proposed residential layouts. Staff noted concerns regarding corner lot setbacks and potential impacts to sight triangles, as well as inconsistencies between the written standards and examples provided. Concerns were reviewed regarding townhome driveway widths, explaining that staff recommended 25-foot driveway depths to provide adequate parking space and reduce conflicts with sidewalks, pedestrian areas, and street parking.

Staff discussed concerns regarding the proposed street network and stated that some portions of the proposed layout did not appear consistent with the city's preferred grid pattern and connectivity standards.

Staff emphasized that one of the largest concerns was utility infrastructure, particularly sewer service and explained that the area currently does not have sufficient infrastructure to serve the proposed development and that a regional lift station would be required.

Staff stated that language within the proposed Master Development Agreement regarding construction of the lift station and defining a "reasonable distance" for connections needed additional clarification. Staff expressed concern that existing Payson City residents should not be responsible for infrastructure costs necessary to support new development.

Staff also discussed concerns regarding the timing of certificates of occupancy in relation to completion of required infrastructure, explaining that new homeowners should not purchase homes and later discover they cannot occupy them because required infrastructure has not been completed.

Staff discussed concerns regarding the proposed collector road and the applicant's request to delay construction until a certain number of certificates of occupancy had been issued. Staff stated that the collector road is intended to primarily serve the proposed development and should be completed in a timely manner to ensure safe and appropriate circulation.

Staff further explained that the applicant's proposal regarding reimbursement for a proportional share of transportation improvements was problematic because the city does not currently have a transportation impact fee mechanism that would allow reimbursement for those improvements.

Staff noted that the applicant had removed certain language related to street standards, block lengths, grid systems, traffic circulation, and connectivity from the proposed Master Development Agreement. Staff stated that removing these items create inconsistencies with City Code and General Plan policies.

Staff reviewed open space concerns, explaining that the city's preference is for usable, active recreation areas rather than counting areas such as wetlands, detention facilities, or other undevelopable areas toward required open space.

Staff also noted concerns that the applicant had removed language regarding trails, connectivity, private property landscaping requirements, clubhouse amenities, and amenity completion schedules. Staff explained that recent changes by the State Legislature have limited the city's ability to require landscaping on private property, making it important that such requirements be clearly included in development agreements when appropriate.

Staff reviewed proposed lot sizes, frontages, and setbacks. Staff noted that the applicant is requesting:

- Minimum lot sizes of approximately 4,000 square feet.
- Minimum lot frontage of 45 feet.
- Five-foot interior setbacks on certain lots.
- Reduced setbacks compared to current R-275 zoning standards.

Staff explained that current R-275 zoning standards generally require:

- Eight-foot interior side setbacks.
- Twenty-foot corner setbacks.
- Twenty-five-foot front and rear setbacks.

Staff stated that while deviations can sometimes be appropriate, the requested reductions raised concerns regarding future impacts to city services, including snow removal, garbage collection, and public safety.

Staff also reviewed concerns regarding eminent domain. Staff explained that the applicant's proposed Master Development Agreement included language requesting that the city potentially assist with obtaining easements through eminent domain for infrastructure associated with the private development. Staff stated that the city is not interested in exercising eminent domain authority for the benefit of private development and noted that Utah law places significant limitations on the use of eminent domain for private purposes.

Staff concluded the presentation by discussing timing concerns. Staff stated that the city currently does not have sufficient water, sewer, or power infrastructure in the area to serve the proposed development and explained that if the property were annexed into Payson City, all required infrastructure improvements would need to be constructed, extended, or upgraded to fully serve the development without negatively impacting existing Payson City residents.

Based on the outstanding concerns, staff recommended denial of the annexation request at this time. Staff stated that possible motions available to the Planning Commission included approval, denial, or remand back to staff for additional review and discussion.

Applicant Presentation:

Brent Bateman introduced himself as legal counsel representing Fieldstone Homes. Mr. Bateman explained that he was attending as a spokesperson for Fieldstone Homes rather than to make legal arguments. Mr. Bateman expressed appreciation for the work completed by city staff but stated that Fieldstone Homes believed some of the information in the staff report and presentation did not accurately represent the applicant's position. Mr. Bateman explained that he believed the concerns identified by staff fell into three categories:

1. Items that were accurate but represented areas where the applicant and City were still negotiating.
2. Items that the applicant believed were inaccurate.
3. Items the applicant felt were presented negatively.

Mr. Bateman stated that Fieldstone Homes did not intend to disregard staff concerns and believed negotiations had included productive discussions. He stated that Fieldstone Homes remained willing to continue working through outstanding issues.

Mr. Bateman addressed the sewer lift station concerns specifically. He stated that the applicant has always been committed to constructing a regional sewer lift station and that the disagreement involved the location and implementation details rather than whether a lift station was needed.

Mr. Bateman also addressed comments regarding the applicant's willingness to work with staff. He stated that Fieldstone Homes had responded to staff feedback and made adjustments throughout the process. He stated that Fieldstone Homes wanted to develop in Payson City and believed the project would provide significant benefits to the community. Fieldstone Homes strives to create quality developments and values working with communities.

Applicant, Randy Smith, discussed several proposed benefits associated with the Mina Creek development, including regional infrastructure improvements. Mr. Smith explained that Fieldstone Homes had committed to constructing a regional sewer lift station designed to serve a larger area beyond only the proposed development. He stated that engineering studies indicated the lift station could serve approximately 3,162 units, while the current proposal includes approximately 618 units. Mr. Smith stated that the project would provide infrastructure improvements benefiting the surrounding area, including:

- Extension of culinary water lines.
- Extension of pressurized irrigation lines.
- Improved system redundancy.
- Additional regional utility capacity.

He explained that existing development in the area currently relies on infrastructure along Arrowhead Trail and that the proposed project would extend utilities south toward SR-198 to improve reliability.

Mr. Smith also discussed a proposed power substation. He stated that Fieldstone Homes had worked with the city's power department regarding the location of a future substation. He explained that Fieldstone Homes had secured an agreement involving property needed for the substation and stated that the substation would provide benefits beyond the proposed development by supporting additional growth in the area.

Mr. Smith estimated that the proposed off-site infrastructure improvements represented approximately \$10 million in improvements beyond the internal development costs and stated that Fieldstone Homes was willing to continue working with the city and that the proposal was intended to create a development that benefited both the applicant and the community.

Scott Oberhansley introduced himself as one of the property owners involved in the annexation request. Mr. Oberhansley provided historical background regarding the property and his family's connection to Payson. He explained that the property has been in his family for generations and that the project name, Mina Creek, honors his grandmother, Mina Spencer. Mr. Oberhansley described his family's history of agriculture, ranching, and community involvement in Payson. He stated that development has surrounded the property over time and that surrounding properties have already been developed with higher-density residential uses, including townhomes and smaller-lot developments. Mr. Oberhansley explained that when determining the future of the property, his family chose to partner with Fieldstone Homes because they believed the proposal provided additional amenities and benefits compared to other surrounding developments. He highlighted proposed features such as:

- Trails.
- Open space.

- A clubhouse.
- Pool amenities.
- Additional community features.

Mr. Oberhansley expressed frustration that the project was receiving opposition despite what he viewed as a commitment to providing a quality development. He stated that the property represented his family's retirement and legacy and requested that the Planning Commission consider the proposal fairly. Mr. Oberhansley stated that the applicant team remained willing to work with the city and requested that the Planning Commission recommend approval or allow additional time for negotiations to continue.

Mr. Bateman concluded the applicant presentation stating that the applicant would prefer approval of the annexation and continued negotiations on remaining development agreement issues. However, he acknowledged that the proposal was not complete, and that additional work remained. Mr. Bateman stated that another option would be for the Planning Commission to deny the request, allowing Fieldstone Homes to pursue development opportunities elsewhere. He requested that the Planning Commission provide clear direction regarding whether continued discussions were appropriate.

Commission Discussion:

The Planning Commission asked questions regarding the history of the property's inclusion in the city's expansion area. Staff and the applicant explained that the property had previously been removed from the city's expansion area map but was later returned after a request from the property owner.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed eminent domain language. The applicant explained that the language in the Master Development Agreement would not require the city to use eminent domain but would allow the applicant to request city assistance if necessary. The applicant stated that the issue primarily related to obtaining easements for water and irrigation infrastructure connections. The applicant acknowledged that if eminent domain was a concern for the city, that language could be removed.

The applicant also clarified that the proposed corner lot setback shown in some materials was an error and that the intended setback was 15 feet rather than 5 feet.

Staff clarified that the purpose of bringing the item before the Planning Commission was to determine whether additional discussion should continue or whether the parties had reached an impasse. Staff emphasized that the city's concerns were not related to the applicant or property owners personally but were focused on ensuring that future Payson residents are served by quality development standards and adequate infrastructure. Staff stated that Payson City welcomes development partnerships but must ensure that projects are consistent with city standards and do not create burdens for existing residents.

Staff Comments:

Assistant City Manager, Robert Mills, reiterated appreciation to the applicant team for attending and participating in the discussion. Robert stated that continued negotiations between the city and applicant would be acceptable if the Planning Commission desired additional discussion. He clarified that the city's concerns were not related to Fieldstone Homes or the property owners personally and explained that the city's responsibility is to ensure that development approved within

Payson City provides long-term benefits and does not create challenges for future residents or existing city systems.

Robert identified one of the primary concerns as the language regarding a “reasonable distance” for sewer infrastructure connections within the proposed Master Development Agreement. He explained that this language created uncertainty because the city must know exactly where infrastructure will connect and who will be responsible for completing necessary improvements.

Robert stated that if the Planning Commission desired additional negotiations, staff was willing to continue working with the applicant to address outstanding issues.

He reiterated that the purpose of bringing the item before the Planning Commission was not to indicate that the city was unwilling to work with the applicant, but rather to obtain direction regarding whether additional negotiations should continue or whether the item should proceed to a recommendation. Payson City values development partnerships and recognizes that private developers are necessary partners in community growth. He stated that the city’s role is to establish standards that protect the long-term interests of the community.

Public Works Director, Travis Jockumsen, expressed concerns regarding the proposed smaller lot sizes and reduced frontage requirements. He explained that the primary concern with 45-foot-wide lots is related to practical impacts on public safety, parking, snow removal, garbage collection, and pedestrian access. Travis also explained that corner lots require additional consideration because sight triangles and visibility requirements may be impacted by reduced setbacks. He noted that with 45-foot-wide lots and 20-foot-wide driveways, there would be limited space remaining between adjacent driveways, and expressed concern that residents with larger vehicles, trucks, trailers, or recreational equipment may park in ways that obstruct sidewalks or create conflicts within the roadway. Many homeowners use garages for storage, resulting in additional vehicles being parked in driveways or on streets. Smaller driveways could create ongoing enforcement challenges because there may not be sufficient space to accommodate vehicles. Travis recommended that lot widths not be reduced below approximately 60 feet to avoid these issues. He explained that many utility-related issues could potentially be addressed through continued engineering review, including water, sewer, and other infrastructure needs, and noted that additional studies and details would be required as the development progresses.

Further Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Adams stated that his primary concern involved the proposed sewer lift station and how the infrastructure would ultimately connect to the city’s sewer system. He questioned whether the proposal included completion of all necessary trunk lines and infrastructure needed to connect the lift station to the wastewater treatment system prior to homes being occupied.

The applicant responded that the intent was for the lift station and associated infrastructure to be operational before homes would be occupied.

Commissioner Beecher clarified that the current discussion before the Planning Commission was related to annexation and zoning recommendations, while detailed infrastructure requirements would continue to be addressed through the development agreement process.

Commissioner Gedeberg stated that he believed the proposal still had significant items that needed to be addressed before moving forward. He expressed that the proposal was not acceptable in its current form but also did not believe it should necessarily be rejected. He stated that both parties should continue working through the outstanding issues. He liked the overall concept and believed the development could provide value to the community if the concerns regarding infrastructure, safety, and standards were resolved.

Commissioner Heimuli indicated he agreed with the commissioner's comments.

Commissioner Frisby stated that he had several concerns regarding the proposal and explained that while the item before the Commission was annexation, the annexation request was closely tied to the proposed Master Development Agreement. He stated that he believed the development agreement needed to reach an acceptable level before annexation should occur.

Commissioner Frisby thanked the applicant for attending and presenting their perspective and stated that he appreciated the willingness shown by the applicant to continue discussions. He identified several areas of concern:

1. Lot Frontage and Driveways – While not opposed to smaller lots in general, Commissioner Frisby expressed concern that 45-foot frontage creates practical challenges. He explained that with a 20-foot driveway on a 45-foot lot, there would be limited space available for parking large vehicles without blocking sidewalks or adjacent driveways. Commissioner Frisbee stated that he would prefer a minimum 25-foot driveway depth to provide adequate parking and reduce conflicts.
2. Housing Design - Commissioner Frisby stated that he would like to see more information regarding the proposed housing products, including designs that provide additional visual interest and avoid developments consisting primarily of large garage doors facing the street. He noted that architectural design elements such as porches and varied building fronts could help create a more desirable neighborhood appearance.
3. Open Space - Commissioner Frisby expressed concern regarding counting wetlands, detention ponds, and other unusable areas toward required open space. He stated that open space should provide meaningful recreational opportunities for residents and that additional details were needed regarding trails, parks, amenities, and overall open space calculations.
4. Amenities - Commissioner Frisby expressed concern regarding the timing of amenities. He stated that amenities should be phased throughout development rather than delayed until complete buildout. He suggested that the development agreement establish specific milestones for completion of amenities as phases are constructed.
5. Density - Commissioner Frisby discussed concerns regarding the proposed entitlement of 618 residential units. He stated that density calculations should be based on net buildable acreage rather than gross acreage and that additional information was needed before committing to a specific number of units.
6. Infrastructure Improvements and Impact Fees - Commissioner Frisby stated that he appreciated the applicant's willingness to provide regional improvements but expressed a preference for reimbursement or deferral agreements that ensure future development contributes to infrastructure costs rather than placing those costs on the city.

Commissioner Frisby requested additional information regarding:

- Coordination with Salem City regarding adjacent roadway improvements.
- Location and funding of the proposed power substation.

- Details regarding any proposed Public Infrastructure District (PID).
- Proposed zoning designations across the property.
- Utility agreements and reimbursement structures.

Commissioner Frisby stated that he believed there were positive aspects of the proposal but that additional details needed to be resolved before recommending annexation.

Commissioner Beecher agreed and expressed support for remanding the item back for further review and negotiation.

MOTION: Commissioner Gedeberg – To remand back to staff for further discussion and review.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Heimuli. A roll call vote was taken. Those voting yes: Perry Adams, Kirk Beecher, Camarie Brinkerhoff, Ryan Frisby, Robert Gedeberg, Kepi Heimuli. Those voting no: none. The motion carried.

6. Commission and Staff Reports and Training

None.

7. Adjournment

MOTION: Commissioner Heimuli – To adjourn. Motion seconded by Commissioner Frisby.

Those voting yes: Perry Adams, Kirk Beecher, Camarie Brinkerhoff, Ryan Frisby, Robert Gedeberg, Kepi Heimuli. Those voting no: none. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

/s/ Marty Dargel

Marty Dargel, Planning Technician