



**Minutes of the  
Millcreek Planning Commission  
August 19, 2026  
5:00 p.m.  
Regular Meeting**

The Planning Commission of Millcreek, Utah, met in a regular public meeting on Wednesday, August 19, 2026, at City Hall, located at 1330 E. Chambers Avenue, Millcreek, Utah 84106. The meeting was conducted electronically and live streamed via the city's website with an option for online public comment.

**PRESENT:**

**Commissioners**

Shawn LaMar, Chair  
Christian Larsen, Vice Chair (excused)  
Steven Anderson  
Jenny Burgess  
Robert Peterson  
Jacob Richardson  
Victoria Reid  
Diane Soule  
Ian Wright

**City Staff**

Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder  
Francis Lilly, Planning Director  
Brad Sanderson, Current Planning Manager  
Sean Murray, Planner  
Jake Green, Dev. Review Specialist

**Attendees:** Brad Reynolds, Kim Keisker, Nick and Marci Harris

**REGULAR MEETING – 5:00 p.m.**

**TIME COMMENCED – 5:03 p.m.**

Chair LaMar called the meeting to order and briefly explained the duties of the planning commission.

**1. Public Hearing**

**1.1 Consideration of ZM-26-014, Request to Rezone from the R-1-8 and R-2-8 Zones to the R-1-5 and R-2-6.5 Zones Location: 3496 & 3500 S 1300 E Applicant: Ryan Reynolds with Brad Reynolds Construction Planner: Brad Sanderson**

Brad Sanderson presented the proposed third phase of development of this property consisting of approximately 1.6 acres on the east side of 1300 East and comprising several parcels, including two existing homes and a long, narrow parcel that presents development challenges due to its configuration. He explained that the property is designated Neighborhood 1 in the General Plan and is currently zoned R-2-8 and R-1-8. The proposal would rezone the portion along 1300 East to R-2-6.5, consistent with the zoning approved across the street as part of Phase Two, while the remaining portion would be rezoned to R-1-5 to accommodate smaller, approximately 5,000-square-foot single-family lots. Sanderson reviewed several conceptual layouts illustrating potential combinations of single-family homes, duplexes, and twin homes, emphasizing that the concepts were illustrative and that the Commission was considering the

zoning rather than a specific site plan. He noted that staff had evaluated several access configurations due to driveway and intersection spacing concerns along 1300 East, including an option providing access from Lorraine Drive.

Sanderson also reviewed the dimensional and development standards for the proposed R-1-5 and R-2-6.5 zones, including lot widths, setbacks, and building height requirements. He explained that the maximum building height would remain 30 feet, although the applicable height-envelope requirements would provide greater flexibility on narrower lots. Conceptual architectural renderings were presented to demonstrate the type and scale of single-family and duplex development that could occur on the property. Sanderson reported that comments received during the public open house were overwhelmingly positive, with some concerns expressed regarding building height, trees, and other development details that are generally addressed through existing code standards. He asked the Commission to consider whether a development agreement would be warranted if it recommended approval of the rezone. He also noted that no comments had been received from the community council despite multiple outreach attempts.

Commissioner Reid asked about items for a development agreement. Brad Sanderson expressed his general preference to avoid development agreements when existing zoning regulations adequately govern development, noting that frequent reliance on such agreements may indicate deficiencies in the code. However, he acknowledged that the application is somewhat unique because it involves two proposed zoning classifications and that a development agreement could be appropriate if the Commission wished to impose standards more restrictive than the underlying code, such as requiring specific architectural elevations. Sanderson also suggested considering a pedestrian connection between the proposed development and the existing dead-end street to the west, which could provide walking and bicycle access between neighborhoods and improve connectivity to 1300 East. He noted that such a connection would further General Plan goals and policies related to neighborhood connectivity. Sanderson encouraged the Commission to identify any additional conditions or recommendations it believed the City Council should consider.

Commissioner Reid asked about adding a condition of having a connecting sidewalk without having a development agreement. Sanderson noted the application was not conditional use. Francis Lilly added that zone conditions can only deal with height and design, not necessarily site improvements.

Brad Reynolds, applicant, expressed appreciation for the Commission's consideration of the rezone and explained that the phase 3 concept was revised in response to feedback received at a previous community meeting, where residents strongly favored additional single-family homes rather than the greater number of duplexes originally contemplated for the western parcel. He noted that the narrow configuration of the property presents development challenges and that the proposed R-1-5 zoning would allow single-family homes while accommodating required street, sidewalk, and other city standards. Reynolds stated that the proposed homes would be similar to projects his company has previously constructed and would complement the surrounding neighborhoods. He added that the smaller homes could provide a comparatively more attainable homeownership option while maintaining high-quality design and finishes. Reynolds supported the proposed pedestrian connection to the neighborhood to the west and indicated a willingness to incorporate it into the project.

In response to Commission questions, Reynolds estimated that the single-family homes could begin in approximately the \$800,000 range, although final pricing had not yet been determined. He stated that all proposed units, including the twin homes or duplexes along 1300 East, are intended to be sold as owner-occupied units rather than retained as rentals. Reynolds further explained that the requested zoning would provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the various conceptual site plans presented. He noted that the primary unresolved issue involves determining the most appropriate roadway access due to the proximity of existing and proposed intersections along 1300 East. The applicant and city engineers are continuing to evaluate potential configurations to minimize traffic conflicts, including the possibility of providing access from Lorraine Drive if necessary.

*Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.*

Kim Keisker identified her property as adjacent to the proposed development and expressed support for the proposed pedestrian walkway. She explained that the neighboring property to the west and the duplex across the street share a private lane and noted that coordination with the property owner may be necessary to maintain access. Keisker stated that pedestrian connections through the area are currently limited, resulting in people informally cutting through Ash Tree Cove and the vacant property behind her home. She believed the proposed walkway would provide a beneficial connection between the neighborhood and 1200 East.

*Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.*

Commissioner Reid felt the proposal was a good option for the neighborhood. Chair LaMar requested pedestrian access and preservation of mature trees. Commissioner Anderson asked if the owners of the private road would want pedestrian access. Reynolds was unsure but was willing to add a trail under HOA maintenance. Commissioner Richardson asked about development agreement implications of a trail. Sanderson explained that establishing the proposed pedestrian connection would not negatively affect the development, even if a neighboring property owner later restricted access on the adjoining property. He noted that although the subdivision road would likely be privately owned, a public access easement could be established to ensure continued pedestrian access through the development and to the proposed pathway. Sanderson stated that the easement could be limited to pedestrian use and would prevent a future homeowners association from restricting public access. He added that these provisions could be addressed through the subdivision approval process.

Commissioner Burgess asked if a traffic study was conducted. Reynolds noted there was not a study, that traffic had not been a concern. Jake Green, representing city engineering, explained that city code is driving the roadway access considerations for the proposed development. He stated that opposing intersections may not be offset by more than eight feet in order to avoid conflicting left-turn movements and that a minimum separation of 150 feet is required between rights-of-way. Due to the limited property dimensions, the proposed development cannot meet these standards along 1300 East, which may necessitate relocating access to Lorraine Drive. Green also noted that a traffic study is required for developments anticipated to generate more than 50 vehicle trips per day; however, the proposed development does not meet that threshold.

Commissioner Soule moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZM-26-014, a request to rezone property generally located between 3496 and 3500 South, along 1300 East, from the R-1-8 and R-2-8 zones to the R-1-5 and R-2-6.5 zones based on the findings and conclusions presented by staff. Commissioner Burgess seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted no, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Peterson voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed. Chair LaMar explained his no vote was due to the lack of a development agreement.

## **2. Commission Business**

### **2.1 Approval of July 15, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Chair LaMar moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Richardson seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Peterson voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

### **2.2 Housing Subcommittee Report**

Commissioner Richardson said the subcommittee reviewed Francis Lilly's presentation.

### **2.3 Updates from the Planning Director**

Francis Lilly provided an overview of Millcreek's General Plan goals and existing strategies for increasing the supply of affordable housing and sought Planning Commission feedback on potential policy options prior to presenting the topic to the City Council. He referenced a 2024 Zions Bank Public Finance housing study identifying an overall shortage of affordable housing for households earning below 80% of area median income (AMI), with the greatest deficit occurring among households at the lowest income levels. Lilly also noted the disparity between Millcreek's median home value, \$615,000, and the State's benchmark for an affordable single-family home, emphasizing the challenges facing prospective homebuyers.

Lilly reviewed affordable housing strategies contained in the General Plan and the city's progress in implementing them. He highlighted approximately 300 affordable units approved through transit-oriented development projects, including the Howick, Morrissey, and Moda Meadowbrook developments, as well as projects where affordability requirements were established through development agreements, including Capri Park and MC29. He discussed the General Plan recommendation to consider requiring residential developments exceeding 50 units to provide at least 10% affordable housing and noted that the city could structure its regulations to prevent projects from being divided into smaller phases to avoid such requirements.

Lilly also discussed efforts to encourage smaller lots, increased residential densities, and alternative housing types, noting that the city has approved several rezones and recently amended residential zoning standards to facilitate these housing forms. He further explained that affordable housing has been established as a permitted use in residential zones, creating a more streamlined approval process. As an example, he described a proposed Housing Connect development on Park Hill Drive that would include approximately 70 units of permanent

supportive housing serving households at approximately 30–35% AMI, along with a future subdivision of approximately 10–15 affordable, owner-occupied townhomes. Lilly indicated that additional policy options, including potential implementation of recommendations from the 900 East corridor study, would be presented for Commission discussion and feedback.

Lilly continued his review of the city's General Plan strategies for affordable housing and summarized progress made in implementing those goals. He noted that the city has reduced off-street parking requirements for affordable housing, initiated planning efforts to accommodate higher densities near centers and corridors, established density bonuses for affordable developments, expanded opportunities for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and created zoning within areas such as the City Center and Meadowbrook that supports a broader variety of housing types. He explained that the city's ADU regulations exceed state requirements by permitting detached ADUs on lots of at least 8,000 square feet and discussed how recent zoning amendments to building envelopes, setbacks, lot coverage, and private street standards have helped make additions, infill development, and smaller housing projects more feasible. Lilly also discussed the importance of balancing increased housing opportunities with General Plan policies intended to maintain compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

Lilly highlighted the city's efforts to support housing for older adults, people with disabilities, and other populations needing supportive services, including age-restricted affordable housing, the Switchpoint Canyon Rim permanent supportive housing development, the Morrissey senior housing project, and Housing Connect's proposed deeply affordable development. He stated that Millcreek has made significant progress through targeted affordable housing initiatives but continues to face a substantial housing affordability gap, with many households unable to find suitable housing within the city.

Lilly then introduced potential policy options for further consideration, beginning with allowing detached ADUs to be subdivided into separate, individually owned lots. He noted that communities including Heber City, Ogden, and Farmington have considered or implemented similar approaches and explained that the concept could create smaller, comparatively affordable homeownership opportunities through a market-driven approach without requiring direct public subsidy. He contrasted this with subsidized affordable housing projects, noting that high land and construction costs can require substantial public investment to achieve affordable sales prices. Lilly acknowledged that allowing separately owned ADUs would represent a significant policy change for traditional single-family neighborhoods and would warrant substantial public discussion. Implementation would also require standards addressing subordinate lot sizes, deed restrictions, easements, parking, utilities, and potentially owner-occupancy requirements.

Commissioners raised questions and concerns about unintended consequences, including property owners constructing ADUs solely to increase resale value, the need for separate utility connections, and how to avoid abuse of the program. Suggestions included possible time-based owner-occupancy requirements before subdivision, deed restrictions, and ensuring any code changes are carefully designed and supported by strong public engagement and data from other cities. The Commission next considered whether to require an affordability component when applicants seek rezonings for higher density, similar to Farmington and Salt Lake City; members generally favored further study but noted feasibility concerns for small

projects. The group then discussed “school-oriented development,” an emerging concept in which higher residential densities (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes) could be allowed within a defined radius of public schools to help bolster school enrollment and provide family-sized housing near open space and playgrounds. Commissioners were interested in this idea, especially given its proximity to school amenities, but emphasized the need for design studies to test whether such housing types can fit within existing building envelopes, setbacks, and parking requirements, as well as legal review of any incentives tied to households with school-age children.

The Commission and staff focused on housing preservation, “missing middle” zoning, and how to sequence upcoming planning work. Lilly raised the question of whether Millcreek should adopt a policy similar to Salt Lake City’s, which requires replacement of housing demolished for commercial parking lots or payment into a housing fund. He noted that the St. Mark’s Hospital parking expansion highlighted the tension between preserving naturally occurring affordable housing and accommodating tax-generating institutional growth. Commissioners discussed concerns about incentivizing demolition of modest homes in poor condition, the risk of disincentivizing reinvestment if demolition is tightly restricted, and the difference between housing demolished for more housing versus housing demolished for parking. Some members argued that preserving existing affordable units, especially when they are replaced only with surface parking, should be a priority, suggesting that Millcreek could at least adopt a narrow rule targeting “housing to parking lot” conversions. Others cautioned that hospitals and key community institutions also provide vital services and jobs, so any preservation policy must be nuanced and consider increment generated for the city’s affordable housing fund.

Lilly suggested that the General Plan’s existing Neighborhood 1, 2, and 3 density categories may be too broad and that additional categories with narrower density ranges could provide clearer guidance for future rezoning decisions. He noted that although Millcreek has approved substantial townhome development, current townhome prices do not necessarily address the city’s affordable housing needs, suggesting that smaller-scale housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes may help fill an unmet housing gap. Lilly discussed the city’s ongoing evaluation of its zoning and Future Land Use Map, noting that staff is using GIS analysis to identify areas where existing land uses, zoning, and future land use designations do not align. He explained that many Millcreek neighborhoods contain a historic mix of single-family homes and duplexes due to previous zoning patterns and that a more detailed understanding of these areas could support more nuanced future land use decisions. Lilly acknowledged that although some neighborhoods may already function as mixed housing areas, previous decisions to convert R-2 neighborhoods to R-1 zoning reflected community preferences that should also be considered.

Lilly noted that the General Plan supports thoughtful increases in housing opportunities while also emphasizing preservation of established single-family neighborhoods. Lilly identified potential areas for targeted changes, including the 900 East corridor and portions of the area between 700 East and 900 East, where existing lot sizes and development patterns do not consistently align with current zoning. He cited other cities that have accommodated gradual increases in density without substantially changing neighborhood character but emphasized that any similar changes in Millcreek would require significant study and community engagement.

Lilly asked the Commission to consider the timing of these policy decisions in relation to the upcoming General Plan update. He questioned whether recently completed planning efforts, including the 900 East corridor study and the small area plan, should be adopted independently in the near term or incorporated into the comprehensive General Plan revision so that future land use policies can be evaluated consistently on a citywide basis. The Commission stressed the need to manage staff capacity and to use outside expertise effectively. Lilly proposed hiring a consultant early in the General Plan process to prepare concise policy briefs/white papers on each of the major housing options, conduct design and massing studies (e.g., for school-area density and missing-middle forms), and assist with targeted public outreach. Commissioners supported that approach and encouraged parallel developer outreach, such as inviting builders experienced in missing-middle and affordable projects, to ensure that any new policies are both practical and attractive to the market. The discussion closed with general consensus that these housing tools are promising but represent significant shifts that should be advanced deliberately, with clear analysis and community input, rather than rushed as stand-alone code changes.

### 3. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings

- City Council Mtg. 8/24/26, 7:00 p.m.
- Historic Preservation Commission Mtg. 9/10/26, 6:00 p.m.
- City Council Mtg. 9/14/26, 7:00 p.m.
- Planning Commission Mtg. 9/16/26, 5:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNED:** Commissioner Richardson moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:24 p.m. Chair LaMar seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Peterson voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED: Shawn LaMar Date 9/16/26  
 Shawn LaMar, Chair

Attest: Elyse Sullivan  
 Elyse Sullivan, Recorder