PAYSON CITY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Payson City Center, 439 W Utah Avenue, Payson UT 84651
Wednesday, October 7, 2026

CONDUCTING	Councilmember Lacee Smith
ELECTED OFFICIALS	Brian Hulet, Anne Moss, Bob Provstgaard, Ryan Rowley, Lacee Smith
EXCUSED	Mayor William R. Wright
STAFF PRESENT	David Tuckett, City Manager Cathy Jensen, Finance Director Amalie Ottley, City Recorder Brandon Dalley, City Attorney Brad Bishop, Police Chief Robert Mills, Assistant City Manager Travis Jockumsen, Public Works Director/City Engineer Scott Spencer, Fire Chief Anders Bake, Senior Planner Michael Bryant, Planner II Janeen Dean, Community Events Coordinator Tracy Zobell, Parks & Golf Director Karl Teemant, Community Services Director Shawn Black, Power Director Shelby Bohling, Communities that Care Coordinator Melanie Marsh, Human Resources Jill Spencer, Development Services Director

A. CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Smith called this meeting of the City Council of Payson City, Utah, to order at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was properly noticed.

MOTION: Councilmember Rowley– To approve mayor pro tem Council Member Lacee Smith. Motion seconded by Councilmember Smith A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

B. PRAYER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

A prayer was offered by Councilmember Rowley

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember Moss

C. CONSENT AGENDA (6:00 p.m.)

1. Approval of the September 16, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes
2. Proclamation: National Community Planning Month

MOTION: Councilmember Moss– To approve the consent agenda. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

D. PETITIONS, REMONSTRANCES & COMMUNICATIONS

1. CTC Mayor's Youth Recognition (6:02 p.m.)

Shelby Bohling introduced the Communities that Care Mayor's Youth Recognitions for October

Mt. Nebo Middle School - Lily Rawson. Lily is in 7th grade and her favorite dessert is eclairs.

Payson Jr. High School - Kendra Broderick. Kendra is in 9th grade and her favorite dessert is cheesecake.

2. Payson Youth City Council Mayor Election – item not addressed

3. Public Forum (6:05 p.m.)

Coralee Wilson stated that her grandmother was born in the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers (DUP) cabin, which her mother had donated to the city. She expressed concern about the City's plans for the building and whether it would be torn down. Councilmember Provstgaard reassured her that the City Council had no plans to take any action that would negatively affect the cabin. He reported that he had met with the DUP the previous week to discuss installing a permanent roof to protect the cabin from winter storms. Designs were being developed for presentations to the DUP, the Historic Preservation Board, and the City Council. Coralee also expressed concern about maintaining the Memorial Rose Garden at Peteetneet and asked for volunteers to help care for it. Councilmember Provstgaard, who chaired the Beautification Committee, stated that he would work with Coralee regarding both the DUP cabin and the Memorial Garden.

4. Staff and Council Reports (6:16 p.m.)

Staff Reports

FIRE AND AMBULANCE – Chief Spencer invited councilmembers to the upcoming groundbreaking ceremony for the new fire station building. He stated that the annual coloring contest ended earlier that day. Lastly, he reported that the department has stayed busy in the last weeks with many calls.

Council Reports
Councilmember Hulet had nothing to report.

Councilmember Rowley reported that he had toured the wastewater facility and reviewed state compliance requirements. He stated that testing would take place before the end of the year.

Councilmember Moss asked whether the stream near the Walmart area belonged to the city and expressed concern about the many dead trees along the channel. Staff identified the area as Dry Creek and stated that they would follow up. Councilmember Moss thanked staff for their assistance.

Councilmember Provstgaard provided an update on the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers (DUP) cabin, reporting that designs were being developed for a possible roof and other protective measures. He also reported that the Beautification Committee was still accepting nominations for the Halloween Yard of the Month. The committee's road trip to select the Yard of the Month was scheduled for October 28.

Councilmember Smith asked about enforcement of trailer parking on city streets, expressing concerns about safety and multiple trailers obstructing visibility. She also asked about City requirements for leaving open holes in roads during construction or repair work. Regarding the holes on 600 East, Travis stated that the holes should be paved within 10 days. Councilmember Smith expressed concern for the safety of drivers, bicyclists, and children around the open holes. Councilmember Rowley asked for clarification regarding the ordinance governing trailer parking. Chief Bishop stated that the ordinance allowed unhitched trailers to be parked in front of homes for up to 72 hours. Councilmember Smith thanked staff for their support.

E. ACTION ITEMS

MOTION: Councilmember Hulet– To approve changes to the agenda if needed and at the direction of Mayor pro tem Smith. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. All in favor, the motion passed.

1. Public hearing to receive input from the public with respect to (i) the issuance of the Series 2026 Bonds and ii) any potential economic impact that the project to be financed with the proceeds of the Series 2026 Bonds may have on the private sector. (6:25 p.m.)

MOTION: Councilmember Moss – To open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes - Brian Hulet
Yes - Anne Moss

Yes - Bob Provstgaard
Yes - Ryan Rowley
Yes - Lacee Smith

The public hearing opened at 6:25 p.m.

Cathy Jensen explained that the bond was for $6.3 million to fund the new fire station. Councilmember Hulet stated that $5 million had already been allocated toward the building and the bond would cover the remaining building costs. No action was required by the City Council for the bond item.

Public Comment: No members of the public wished to address the City Council in the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes - Brian Hulet
Yes - Anne Moss
Yes - Bob Provstgaard
Yes - Ryan Rowley
Yes - Lacee Smith

The public hearing closed at 6:30 p.m.

2. Public Hearing – Update to the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) Related to Public Safety (6:28 p.m.)

Robert Mills explained that impact fees are directly related to new growth and development within the city, emphasizing that new growth should pay for the impact it creates. New developments have increased demands on city services, and impact fees were assessed to developers and collected with building permits. These fees can only be used to fund new infrastructure and could not be used for repairs or upgrades to existing facilities. Robert noted that the city had significant needs for both fire and police stations, as the existing facilities were insufficient to accommodate the city's growth. Councilmember Hulet stated that a table would be included in the fee schedule and that the fees need to be reviewed on a regular basis. Councilmember Rowley expressed approval of the proposed fees.

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hulet. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes - Brian Hulet
Yes - Anne Moss
Yes - Bob Provstgaard
Yes - Ryan Rowley
Yes - Lacee Smith

The public hearing opened at 6:35 p.m.

Public Comment: No members of the public wished to address the City Council in the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Rowley – To close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

The Public Hearing closed at 6:35 p.m.

Councilmember Provstgaard stated that new construction needed to pay its fair share of the impacts associated with development. He asked whether impact fees were assessed for each residential unit when developments were approved. Staff clarified that each residential unit paid the applicable fees, while commercial impact fees were based on square footage. Councilmember Smith stated that the City had no current bonds other than the bond being considered for approval, which had been addressed earlier in the meeting.

3. Ordinance - Adopting the Payson City Public Safety Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Public Safety Impact Fees

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To approve Ordinance 10-07-2026-A - Adopting the Payson City Public Safety Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Public Safety Impact Fees for a 10-year period with interim review. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

4. Public Hearing – Update to the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) Related to Parks & Recreation

Karl Teemant introduced Drew Geiger from Horrocks Engineering, who presented the Parks and Recreation impact fee updates. The previous update had been completed approximately four years earlier. The analysis projected an increase of 27,975 residents by 2045 and explained that the city's existing parks established the level of service expected as the community continues to grow.

Drew stated that maintaining that same standard of parks was estimated to cost $2,733 per resident per year. Approximately $43.8 million in park and trails projects were planned over the next six years. Based on an average of 3.3 residents per household, as reported in the 2020 Census, the proposed impact fee was $9,021.14 per home.

Councilmember Smith asked whether the city could charge impact fees for commercial buildings. It was clarified that Park and Recreation impact fees applied only to residential developments. Councilmember Hulet asked whether the city could evaluate individual developments to determine whether developers could contribute park space. He encouraged the city to review impact fees annually. It was explained that developer contributions, including land donations and open-space requirements for higher-density developments, could be considered on a case-by-case basis through the development agreement process. Staff negotiate development agreements, which are then presented to the City Council for approval. Councilmember Rowley asked whether trails were included in the impact fee calculation. Drew confirmed that they were. Councilmember Provstgaard asked how the proposed fees compared with those of neighboring cities, including Salem. It was explained that, following the proposed update, Payson's fees would be higher than Salem's. Robert Mills noted that Salem negotiated directly with the development community regarding parks. He explained that Payson's proposed fees were based on the costs of park improvements specifically identified for Payson and emphasized that park development continues to be expensive.

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

The public hearing opened at 6:47 p.m.

Public Comment: No members of the public wished to address the City Council in the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Moss – To close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Provstgaard. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

The public hearing closed at 6:48 P.M.

Councilmember Provstgaard asked whether impact fees discouraged new construction. Councilmember Smith and Councilmember Rowley discussed how fees were passed on to homebuyers but could also reflect the value of the development and amenities available in the area. Councilmember Provstgaard commented that he was impressed with the parks developers had constructed in Salem and noted that Salem's current parks impact fee was approximately $4,500 per residential unit. Councilmember Rowley emphasized that the City Council's decisions affected the entire community and were not taken lightly. Councilmember Hulet added that the City's parks and amenities helped make Payson attractive to newcomers. Councilmember Rowley cautioned staff against increasing impact fees without sufficient justification and emphasized that fees needed to be supported by data and analysis. It was noted that the Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) met state standards and that the Home Builders Association had been provided with information regarding all impact fees considered during the meeting.

5. Ordinance – Adopting the Payson City Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Parks & Recreation Impact Fees

MOTION: Councilmember Rowley – To approve Ordinance 10-07-2026-B- Adopting the Payson City Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Parks & Recreation Impact Fees, review as often as needed. Motion seconded by Councilmember Provstgaard. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
No	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

Councilmember Moss stated that she appreciated the work put into the analysis but disagreed with doubling the fee.

6. Public Hearing – Update to the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) Related to Transportation

Travis Jockumsen discussed Transportation impact fees and explained that residential road costs placed a burden on the City's General Fund and Class B and C road funds. He introduced Chris Thompson, who presented the updated Transportation Impact Fee Analysis. The proposed transportation impact fee for a single-family home and other uses was based on the average number of trips generated along with other state mandated calculations. Chris agreed that impact fees should be reviewed annually to account for changes over time. He explained that when fees did not reflect the actual costs of transportation projects, the city had to make up the difference if developers did not pay the full cost of the impacts their developments created. Transportation impact fees were calculated according to land-use categories, including single-family homes, multifamily housing, retail, restaurants, industrial, office, and flex space. Chris discussed credits for retail and restaurant businesses based on pass-by trip percentages. These percentages accounted for trips made by customers who were already traveling on nearby roads and stopped

at a business along their route. Councilmember Hulet asked whether pass-by percentages were calculated by the city. Chris explained that businesses provided the city with information regarding their pass-by percentages, which the city then used to calculate the appropriate impact fees. This approach helped establish more equitable fees among different types of businesses. Councilmember Hulet also asked how hotels were categorized. Chris explained that hotels were included in the retail category. Councilmember Rowley asked about the distinction between industrial and office uses. Chris explained that industrial uses generally generated fewer trips but could involve larger vehicles, such as trucks, while office uses typically generated different traffic patterns. Chris also discussed flex spaces, which could include recreation facilities, studios, and small retail businesses. He emphasized that the goal was to keep Payson's transportation impact fees generally consistent with those of surrounding cities and to allow future increases to reflect inflation.

MOTION: Councilmember Hulet – To open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

The public hearing opened at 7:08 p.m.

Public Comment: No members of the public wished to address the City Council in the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Rowley – To close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

The public hearing closed at 7:09 p.m.

Councilmember Rowley noted that the City's current transportation impact fee was $0 and stated that residents continued to express concerns about road conditions. He asked whether transportation impact fees could be used to help fund utilities located beneath roads. Staff explained that transportation impact fees could only be used to fund new regional road infrastructure and could not be used for utilities or maintenance. Collecting transportation impact fees could help preserve Class B and C road funds for maintaining existing roads. Eligible road improvements included asphalt, road base, striping, and curb and gutter. Water impact fees were used to fund water infrastructure beneath roads.

Councilmember Rowley noted that residents wanted more restaurants in Payson and asked whether impact fees could discourage restaurants and offices from locating in the city. He also asked whether the city could provide incentives for builders constructing single-family homes. He suggested lowering fees for certain uses to attract more businesses. Councilmember Moss agreed. Staff explained that businesses could face greater upfront costs if they were required to fund the full cost of regional road improvements themselves rather than paying impact fees. Staff also noted that, under state law and guidance from the state ombudsman, the city could be required to cover the difference if it chose not to charge developers the full allowable impact fees.

Councilmember Smith asked whether the city could provide information showing available credits to people reviewing Payson's impact fees. Chris explained that major restaurants and big-box retailers were generally familiar with impact fees and that the fees were often substantially less expensive than paying the full upfront cost of infrastructure improvements. Travis Jockumsen noted that Chris Thompson was very familiar with the retail area in Spanish Fork. Councilmember Hulet asked whether the analysis also included comparisons with Salem, Springville, and Santaquin. Chris confirmed that it did. He explained that the amounts listed in the fee schedule represented maximum fees and that credits could be offered. The proposed fees were intended to be comparable to those of neighboring cities.

Councilmember Smith asked how impact fees would apply when an existing business expanded. Staff explained that impact fees could apply to expansions involving retail or industrial uses when a building permit was issued. Credits could be offered when the use changed or the site became smaller.

Councilmember Hulet asked whether transportation impact fees could be used to fund road widening. Chris confirmed that they could and explained that lane miles were calculated for each road, with the applicable percentage used to determine the eligible costs.
Councilmember Provstgaard asked for clarification on the definition of a regional road. Staff explained that a regional road was generally a road serving broader transportation needs rather than a local residential street.

Councilmember Rowley suggested lowering the proposed impact fees for restaurants and single-family homes. Staff explained that state law required different land uses to be treated differently in accordance with standards established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and not assessed without the proper calculations. Councilmember Hulet asked whether the City could selectively lower fees for certain land uses or whether it would need to reduce the projected trip rates overall. Councilmember Smith expressed concern that lowering fees could leave the City without sufficient revenue to cover the remaining infrastructure costs.

Councilmember Provstgaard stated that the amount of data presented was substantial and requested additional time to review the information before making a decision. He also emphasized the importance of reviewing impact fees regularly. Robert Mills recommended that the City Council table the item rather than make adjustments immediately, allowing additional time to evaluate the proposed fees and ensure the city would not be legally responsible for covering unfunded infrastructure costs.

Ordinance – Adopting the Payson City Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Transportation Impact Fees

MOTION: Councilmember Hulet – To approve Ordinance 10-07-2026 - Adopting the Payson City Public Safety Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Transportation Impact Fees. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. A roll call vote was taken as follows. The motion did not carry.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
No	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
No	-	Ryan Rowley
No	-	Lacee Smith

MOTION: Councilmember Rowley – To remand the Payson City Public Safety Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA); and Enacting Transportation Impact Fees back to staff for further information. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows. The motion did not carry.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

7. Resolution – Flyway Annexation Petition for Consideration of Further Review Located at Approximately 900 S Goosenest Drive, Payson, UT consisting of approximately 8 acres. (Parcel No. 30:055:0053)

Michael Bryant presented the proposed annexation, which was adjacent to the Haskell Annexation petition already under consideration. Staff had provided preliminary approval of the concept, and a proposed layout was presented. The layout was subject to change and included proposed lots ranging from 15,000 to 23,000 square feet. Staff indicated that the proposal was suitable for further review and consideration. Councilmember Provstgaard and Councilmember Rowley thanked the applicant for working with the city on the plans and accommodating larger lot sizes. Councilmember Smith suggested reconsidering the City's 10-acre minimum requirement for annexations, noting that many applicants did not meet the requirement. Michael explained that larger annexations were evaluated in part based on the utility infrastructure needed to serve the proposed development. The discussion also included impact fees. It was clarified that the annexation review criteria served as guidelines rather than strict requirements.

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To approve Resolution 10-07-2026-A - Flyway Annexation Petition for Consideration of Further Review Located at Approximately 900 S Goosenest Drive, Payson, UT consisting of approximately 8 acres. (Parcel No. 30:055:0053) Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

8. Ordinance – Payson City Zoning Map amendment on behalf of D-S Meat Processing, changing approximately 4 acres of land from R-1-A Residential Agricultural Zone to R-1-7.5 Residential Zone including the RMO-1 Two-Family Overlay for the purposes of a Planned Residential Community of single-family homes (Parcel No. 30:072:0134 and 30:072:0029)

Michael Bryant explained the respective roles of the Planning Commission, City Council, and City staff in reviewing zone change requests. Councilmember Rowley asked whether townhomes or twin homes could be built under the proposed zoning. Michael clarified that they would not be permitted in the R-1-7.5 zone. Councilmember Rowley also asked whether the development agreement would remain enforceable if the applicant sold the property to another party. Michael confirmed that it would.

Michael presented a map of the proposed zone change and explained the property boundaries along the canal. The Bureau of Reclamation owned property along the canal corridor and was enforcing the applicable property boundaries which led the meat processing plant to shut down their business. Staff also presented an alternate recommendation to unify the surrounding zoning areas. A conceptual development layout was presented, with the understanding that it could change.

Michael addressed public comments received during the previous Planning Commission meeting and public hearing. Councilmember Provstgaard asked what purpose the overlay zoning served. Michael explained that the planned residential development designation required planned open space and established an overall density designation. Councilmember Provstgaard asked whether the City Council could participate in determining how the required open space would be used, such as designating an area for a dog park. Michael reviewed the Planning Commission's favorable recommendation, which included detached single-family homes. He also presented the lot sizes of surrounding properties and explained that a previous planned residential development had allowed smaller lots in the area.

Councilmember Smith, who lived near the proposed development, expressed sadness that the meat processing plant was leaving the area. She raised concerns about her daily commute on Canyon Road and noted that drivers frequently exceeded the speed limit. She also hoped the developer would make efforts to preserve existing trees. Regarding traffic, she expressed concern about the available routes through 600 South and 800 South, particularly the difficulty of making left turns. She noted that additional vehicles from each home could increase congestion and emphasized the importance of providing adequate driveways and parking spaces.

Councilmember Rowley thanked residents for attending the meeting and sharing their concerns. He also thanked D-S Meats for its longstanding presence in the area and discussed the operational constraints associated with the facility and the Bureau of Reclamation's right-of-way.

He noted that residents had previously expressed concerns about the meat processing operation. The applicant had initially expressed interest in townhomes, but staff indicated that townhomes would not be considered under the proposal. The developer subsequently reconsidered the plan and proposed detached single-family homes. Councilmember Rowley also noted the importance of park space and the development's proximity to Payson Canyon.

Byron Haslam, of 571 East Canyon Road, expressed concerns about the proposed lot sizes and questioned why the development should be allowed to have a different zoning designation than surrounding properties. He felt the developer was not providing sufficient open space and questioned what benefits the proposed R-1-7.5 zoning would provide to the surrounding area. He suggested considering R-1-9 or R-1-10 zoning instead.

Matthew Smith, one of the owners of Gary's Meat, spoke about the business and its longstanding relationship with the community. He explained that he and his brother owned the meat processing plant and expressed appreciation for the surrounding residents. He stated that requirements imposed by the Bureau of Reclamation had forced them to reconsider their business operations. He asked the City Council to approve the zone change so they could meet their financial obligations. He believed the proposed development would beautify the area and add value to surrounding properties.

Devin Weaver, of 1183 South 550 East, asked for clarification regarding the acreage and whether a traffic study would be required before the City Council voted on the zoning change. Councilmember Rowley explained that the need for a traffic study depended on the anticipated impact. Devin expressed interest in a study addressing traffic flow and parking.
Devin also asked how much weight the conceptual development plan carried in the approval process. Michael Bryant explained that the concept plan provided guidance and feedback regarding what could be developed on the property. The development agreement would establish the number of lots in the subdivision but would not include the conceptual layout itself.

Councilmember Provstgaard expressed concerns about allowing multiple housing types under R-1-9 zoning and stated that he would not support that designation because it would allow for multi-family units and clarified that R-1-7.5 zoning only allowed for single-family home options. He also noted that developing the property with half-acre lots would not be financially feasible for the developer. The Council discussed the differences between R-1-9 zoning and overlay zoning, including the types of development each could allow.

Councilmember Rowley explained that development agreements provided direction for the developer while establishing expectations for the project. He asked whether requirements for garages, driveways, and parking could be included in the development agreement. Staff confirmed that they could. Councilmember Rowley suggested that staff include these elements in the agreement.

Brandon Dalley explained that design standards would be incorporated into the development agreement, which had not yet been submitted to the City. Councilmember Smith thanked the Planning Department for its consideration of the City Council's direction.

MOTION: Councilmember Provstgaard – To approve Ordinance 10-07-2026-C– Payson City Zoning Map amendment on behalf of D-S Meat Processing, changing approximately 4 acres of land from R-1-A Residential Agricultural Zone to R-1-7.5 Residential Zone including the RMO-1 Two-Family Overlay for the purposes of a Planned Residential Community of single-family homes (Parcel No. 30:072:0134 and 30:072:0029) contingent on the review and approval of the development agreement – including driveways, garages, design elements, and the map as recommended by the applicant, to be considered by the council at a later date. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rowley. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
No	-	Lacee Smith

9. Resolution – Authorizing the Mayor to sign a Development Agreement with D-S Meat Processing Inc. for the property located at 515 E Canyon Road

MOTION: Councilmember Hulet – To table Resolution 10-07-2026- Authorizing the Mayor to sign a Development Agreement with D-S Meat Processing Inc. for the property located at 515 E Canyon Road. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

10. Resolution – Authorizing the Payson City Council to create an easement on the Trikes Building property located at 40 S. Main Street

MOTION: Councilmember Hulet – To approve Resolution 10-07-2026-B– Authorizing the Payson City Council to create an easement on the Trikes Building property located at 40 S. Main Street. Motion seconded by Councilmember Moss. A roll call vote was taken as follows and the motion carried.

Yes	-	Brian Hulet
Yes	-	Anne Moss
Yes	-	Bob Provstgaard
Yes	-	Ryan Rowley
Yes	-	Lacee Smith

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Councilmember Moss– To adjourn. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hulet. Those voting yes: Brian Hulet, Anne Moss, Bob Provstgaard, Ryan Rowley, and Lacee Smith. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

/s/ Amalie R. Ottley
Amalie R. Ottley, City Recorder