

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

August 07, 2025

WORK SESSION Present: Chair Frank Adams; Vice Chair; Commissioners Kristen Sherlock, Joey Hansen, Spencer Klein, & Scott Behunin. Staff: Community Development Director Lyle Gibson, and City Planner Shannon Hansell. **Excused:** Planning Secretary Carly Rowe; Commissioners, George “Tony” Kalakis, and Tyler Turner, and Alternate Brian Shepherd.

Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** discussed driveway issues. Agenda Item #1 is a corner lot, but the ordinance normally has driveways extending into the side yard. Because of the slope, the property owner would rather have a pad. This parking would accommodate the Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in his home. The owner moved and intends to rent the upstairs portion out while his mother-in-law lives in the basement. Chair **Frank Adams** said the owner may need to qualify his IADU with the City. State statute recently allowed every home to have an IADU, but the City is allowed to control who is in it. Typically, the City wants the owner on site.

Regarding Item #2, there is an easement drafted across an adjacent lot, although it is not recorded yet. Since it meets separation and width requirements, Staff is recommending approval.

For Item #3 preliminary plat approval, the applicant is present. Staff has been working on the engineering, and now recommends approval. One condition worth highlighting is the property they would like to acquire on the northeast corner owned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The plat cannot be recorded or construction allowed until the acquisition is completed. Construction is contingent on getting that lot. Without it, they won't be able to build a road. This would be the Planning Commission's last time seeing this item. **Gibson** brought up the width of the road for public safety reasons while the road is lined with garbage cans. Commissioners questioned the length of driveways, snow removal, as well as number of visitor parking spots.

Commissioner **Kristen Sherlock** said people may move out of this development because of lack of parking. She noted that the road to the south doesn't allow on-street parking on both sides. She said the Commission's role is to make sure the parking functions in generations from now. The applicant said they meet the City's parking minimum. The applicant agreed to a cash payment option instead of providing some moderate-income housing. Floorplans include room for garbage cans. The applicant said there is a “handshake deal” with the church, but after preliminary plat approval, they intend to put more pressure on them in order to complete the deal.

Item #4 involves Boyer and City-owned property on North Main Street. It was entitled for a commercial shopping center years ago. When the developer was unable to finish, the City picked up the property in bank foreclosure proceedings. The City has held this property for years, but now could use the cash to build a fire station on the City's west side. The City put out a Request For Qualifications (RFQ), and had seven responses. Boyer was selected based on their capacity and experience. It is going to be a residential development in the future. Based on the current Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) zoning, zoning within the 36-acre district shall not exceed nine units per acre. That works out to be 324 residential units. However, there are about 68 existing homes there, meaning only 256 are left to be developed. Therefore, the contract is capped at 256. The City controls just under 18.5 acres of that district, from which they need 1 acre for a culinary well site currently under construction. The City also has rights to use the 2.5-acre UDOT detention property, or “sledding hill,” on the far north side. Considering this, the project area could be assumed to be 19 acres, making way for 174 units.

Gibson said the Planning Commission has a judgement call to make tonight regarding interpretation of the ordinance and how many units the City is going to allow. The NMU is contradictory in its set up and therefore assumes the need for a Development Agreement. The Planning Commission's role tonight is to determine best use for the property. It will be tabled tonight, as the Development Agreement is still being drafted. Public comment may help shape that. **Adams** said he would like to not close the public hearing tonight, in order for the hearing to continue once the public can read the Development Agreement.

Boyer's purchase price is based on a sliding scale related to the number of units they will be allowed to develop, ranging from 140 to 250. In a public open house in March, Boyer presented 190 units, which they have lowered now to 174 due to comments received. The development needs to have the right feel for the community. Parking and traffic are key elements to consider.

Gibson said Boyer is proposing two-story townhomes along Main Street and near the freeway. Single-family detached units are also in the mix on 0.1 to 0.12 acres. The City has always been able to do any development by Development Agreement, as long as a legislative process was used to enable public comment. In this project, the Development Agreement will likely be used. Density issues and traffic will be the big topics of concern brought up in tonight's public hearing.

REGULAR SESSION Present: Chair Frank Adams; Vice Chair; Commissioners Kristen Sherlock, Joey Hansen, Spencer Klein, & Scott Behunin. Staff: Community Development Director Lyle Gibson, and City Planner Shannon Hansell. **Excused:** Planning Secretary Carly Rowe; Commissioners, George “Tony” Kalakis, and Tyler Turner, and Alternate Brian Shepherd.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPLICATIONS – *public hearing (items 1 and 2)*

Item #1: Peter Cannon (25-02) – Applicant is requesting consideration of a special exception to allow a 20'X24' concrete pad for parking on the southwest corner of the lot, which would be 12 feet from the south property line – the requested exception would allow the pad to be poured without requiring an additional “properly designated

parking space” behind the 30 foot setback; at the property located at 1078 Oakridge Drive, in the LR (Large Residential) zone.

Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** presented this agenda item. The subject property is a corner lot with the front of the home facing west and the existing drive access leading to the north side of the home from 1100 North (Quail Flight Road). The applicant hopes to pour a new driveway or parking pad on the southern portion of the property as identified in the included site plan. As a corner lot, an additional driveway would normally be approved by Staff as a permitted use in the proposed location. However, to reduce the amount of concrete or impact to the property, the applicant is only proposing a driveway that is 20 feet deep from the sidewalk. Section 11-32-060 (A)(1) of city code requires that a residential driveway lead to a parking space that is outside of the front yard setback, unless the Planning Commission approves otherwise through the special exception process.

The proposed driveway consists of a 20'X24' concrete pad for parking on the southwest corner of the lot, which would be 12 feet from the south property. In addition to considering whether or not the pad itself can be considered as a “different location of a properly designated parking space” than defined by code. The Planning Commission should consider if a 24-foot wide driveway is also acceptable as it is only two parking spaces. While a 20-foot wide driveway can accommodate two cars, they are often wider for ease of use. Typically, a home with a driveway leading to two spaces has room to flare out; this request would have 4 extra feet where measured at the property line.

Gibson said there is plenty of room and frontage to accommodate this request. The applicant desires to have the least impact on the property as possible. Staff recommends approval. Four or five lots share a native scrub oak and choke cherry forest, which is not real common. They would like to keep as much of it as possible. He will need to cut a 20 foot by 6-foot curb approach from the street. The only thing at the proposed pad site right now is level grass.

Applicant **Peter Cannon** addressed the Commission. He shared several rationales for the special exception. Code would normally require the parking pad to be set 30 feet back from the street. This would require destruction of over 20 trees in the forest. It would also require a 30-foot driveway to reach the parking pad. The code allows a request for a special exception. A family with multiple cars needs this additional parking space to comply with winter on-street parking restrictions. The parking pad is over 100 feet from the corner of 1100 North. He said he doesn't currently live in this home himself, as he lives in another Farmington residence by the golf course. He has had renters there for nine years, and as their children have grown older, they have needed additional parking. The home has a mother-in-law apartment, so two family units could reside there, necessitating more parking. All utilities are together and there is only one garage, so it is not practical to have two unrelated families living there together. Applicant has stated that the property will not be rented to more than one family at a time.

Applicable Code:

11-32-060: ACCESS TO OFF STREET PARKING AND LOADING SPACES:

A. Ingress And Egress: Adequate ingress and egress to all uses shall be provided as follows:

1. Residential driveways shall be not more than twenty feet (20') in width when serving as access to two (2) properly designated spaces, or thirty feet (30') in width when serving as access to three (3) properly designated parking spaces as measured at the front or side corner property line. "Properly designated parking spaces" shall include spaces in a garage, carport or on a parking pad located to the side of a dwelling and not located within the front yard or required side corner yard. Tandem parking on a residential driveway leading to a properly designated parking space contributes to the number of parking spaces required for a single- or two-family dwelling. Additional driveway width for access to a rear yard, for more than three (3) properly designated parking spaces, or for multiple-family residential developments, or for a different location of a properly designated parking space than set forth herein, may be reviewed by the planning commission as a special exception. Residential driveways shall be designed at a width which is the minimum necessary to provide adequate access to designated parking spaces.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened and closed the public hearing, as no comments were offered in person or online.

MOTION:

Kristen Sherlock made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the special exception for the 20' x 24' pad as shown on the included site plan with this application.

Findings 1-3:

1. The requested driveway is less impactful to the property than a longer driveway with a typical properly designated parking space.
2. Even if more parking spaces are poured or required, vehicles could still park on any portion of the driveway.
3. Assuming 24 feet in width and lack of a typical properly designated parking space is acceptable, the driveway meets all other applicable requirements.

Supplemental Information 1-3:

1. Site Photos
2. Vicinity Map

3. Site Plan

Joey Hansen seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Kristin Sherlock	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Spencer Klein	X Aye ____ Nay

Item #2: Alberto Parra (25-03) – Applicant is requesting consideration of a special exception to allow driveway access over 708 W. Moon Circle, across the adjacent lot at 1371 N. Main Street; both located in the R (Residential) zone.

City Planner **Shannon Hansell** presented this agenda item. The applicant is requesting a special exception to place a driveway for a building lot over one adjacent building lot. The applicant has applied for a plat amendment to the Moon Park Subdivision to consolidate property. The purpose of this consolidation is to build an accessory building in the rear yard without building over a property line, which is not permitted by the Building or Zoning Code. The applicant would like to avoid removing a mature tree in their park strip to access the rear accessory building. The plat amendment includes an easement across the southwest corner of 1371 N. Main Street to access the proposed rear yard accessory building. This easement not only prevents possible tree removal, but also creates the minimum 40-foot distance between driveways (11-32-060 B1). Crossing 1371 N. Main Street with the easement necessitates a special exception for access across one building lot to another. The applicant is working on a plat amendment to remove easements. Staff is recommending approval of this. Both the applicant and his neighbor were not present at the meeting.

In considering the Special Exception, FCC 11-3-045 E identifies the standards of review:

11-3-045 E. Approval Standards: The following standards shall apply to the approval of a special exception:

1. Conditions may be imposed as necessary to prevent or minimize adverse effects upon other property or improvements in the vicinity of the special exception, upon the City as a whole, or upon public facilities and services. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, conditions concerning use, construction, character, location, landscaping, screening, parking and other matters relating to the purposes and objectives of this title. Such conditions shall be expressly set forth in the motion authorizing the special exception.
2. The Planning Commission shall not authorize a special exception unless the evidence presented establishes the proposed special exception:
 - a. Will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity;
 - b. Will not create unreasonable traffic hazards;
 - c. Is located on a lot or parcel of sufficient size to accommodate the special exception.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing and closed due to no comments received.

MOTION:

Spencer Klein made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the special exception for a driveway to cross one adjacent building lot to provide access to another, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

Findings 1 a-d:

1. If the above conditions are followed, then:
 - a. Because of its position further than 30 feet from the nearest intersection, it is reasonable to assume that the widened driveway will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in vicinity.
 - b. The property is of sufficient size to accommodate the special exception.
 - c. The proposed access will not cause unreasonable traffic hazards.
 - d. There is value in preserving the mature tree on site.

Supplemental Information 1-3:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Plat amendment boundary survey
3. Site plan

Scott Behunin seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Kristin Sherlock	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Spencer Klein	X Aye ____ Nay

SUBDIVISION AND PROJECT MASTER PLAN (PMP) APPLICATIONS – public hearing (item 4 only)

Item #3: Cole West / Garff Properties – Michigan LLC (Matt Garff) (S-7-22) – Applicant is requesting consideration of a Preliminary Plat and Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for the proposed “The Ana” project, consisting of 75 townhomes on 9.5 acres located at approximately 1000 North and 650 West.

Hansell presented this agenda item. The Ana PUD is located at approximately 1000 N. Shepard Park Road on Parcel 08-051-0235. The 6.65-acre [residential] parcel was rezoned to Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) in 2022. The entire parcel is part of the East Park Lane Small Area Master Plan, which was approved by the City Council on April 17, 2018. Prior to the approval of the Master Plan, the General Plan was amended to its current designation on July 7, 2004. In the same year, on December 1, 2004, the City Council approved the CMU zone. As specified in that text, all development must be considered as a PUD or planned center development.

The Ana PUD was originally introduced as The Ivy PUD in 2022, and received schematic approval from the Council on August 16, 2022. The layout is the same, including 75 attached single-family townhome units, active and passive open space, with pickleball courts and a connection to the Hess Farms development to the south, which benefits internal circulation between the projects. The project is the final section to connect Shepard Park Road (700 West) from Shepard Lane to Lagoon Drive, as well as 1015 North. The sidewalk on the north side of 1015 North borders the rear yards of the Hidden Farms development.

The Ana received approval from the City Council on February 4, 2025. The approval included the schematic subdivision plan, preliminary PUD master plan and development agreement, which includes provisions for fencing and landscaping installation and maintenance along the north side of 1015 North. The City Council did not require that the Moderate-Income Housing calculation be updated from that of the 2022 agreement, so the fee in lieu remains based on 2022 figures.

Applicant **Abraham Lopez** with Cole West addressed the Commission. This is 75 townhomes. **Adams** said he had hoped to see snow removal and trash collection addressed by now. Approval is contingent on acquiring land in the northeast corner. **Lopez** said they have engaged the church, which wanted to use the land in question as a turn around. He said they are willing to sell them the land. **Sherlock** said visitor parking as planned is inadequate, and she is concerned with snow removal and tight streets.

Gibson said the Commission is the approval body, and the City Council will not be seeing it next. Staff can follow up on issues as assigned by the Commission. For this item, the Commission is the final stop. **Adams** asked Staff to ensure that their trash collection plan is feasible. **Gibson** said Robinson Waste typically does traffic collection in the area, and can determine the feasibility.

MOTION:

Joey Hansen made a motion to move that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat and Final PUD for The Ana, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following condition:

1. Prior to final plat approval and recordation, the northeast section of property owned currently by another entity needs to be acquired and included with the subdivision plat.

Findings 1-5:

1. The project follows the East Park Lane Small Area Master Plan.
2. The project complies with the City's General Plan and zoning ordinances for the CMU zone.
3. 1015 North will be constructed concurrent with The Ana. 1015 North provides a connection from Main Street to Shepard Park Road (700 West) and eliminates dead-ends longer than 1000 feet.
4. The project completes the connection of Shepard Park Road from Shepard Lane to Lagoon Drive.
5. The project was previously approved by the City Council in 2022 with the same proposal.

Supplemental Information 1-2:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Preliminary plat and improvement drawings

Sherlock seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Kristin Sherlock	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Spencer Klein	X Aye ____Nay

Item #4: Boyer Company (25-10) – Applicant is requesting recommendation of a Project Master Plan (PMP) and Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed residential subdivision consisting of 174 units on approximately 19 acres of property at approximately 1700 North Main Street (between Main Street and Highway

89) for applicant Boyer Company.

Gibson presented this agenda item. Farmington City currently owns several acres of property between Main Street and Highway 89 just south of the interchange. The property, which is zoned NMU, had previously received entitlement for development as a commercial shopping center. Only the bank at the intersection ever developed, and the commercial demand has since shifted towards Station Park. The City acquired the property when the commercial development failed. The City has sat on the property until recently, when the City Council decided that the best use of the property for the City was to find a developer to whom the property could be sold to produce a desirable development while providing revenue to the City that could be used to help fund City needs, specifically a new fire station.

The Boyer Company was selected from amongst multiple responses to a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), and they have been working to develop a concept for several months. Based on the total amount of land in the NMU zoning district and the number of existing units within that area along Main Street, the City entered into an agreement with Boyer that considers no more than 265 total residential units. Boyer has engaged with residents in the area on multiple occasions since going under contract on the property. Based on the initial feedback they have received, they have put together the PMP and Schematic Subdivision included with this report.

The current phase in the approval process is conceptual. While far more than just a napkin sketch, much of the detailed engineering has yet to be done. The City's approval processes are established in this manner to better facilitate consideration of a project. Adjusting at the concept level reduces risk to developers who are seeking assurance, while providing input opportunities for the City at every stage. Items such as stream alteration permits and wetland mitigation are potentially needed, and resolution to such would be determined through the preliminary plat process where additional engineering is required (see FMC 12-5-110 for preliminary plat requirements).

The NMU district requires that development be considered through the PUD process. The purpose of a PUD is to provide public benefits that would not otherwise be required, while also achieving better site design through flexibility. As stated, the NMU district requires all development to go through this process. Alternative allowances and flexibility permitted through the PUD process are typically memorialized through a Development Agreement. While the zoning district indicates in its purpose that it would provide for a mix of single-family and multi-family residential units together with commercial development, the demand for commercial development at this location has proven to be very limited. Multiple discussions with commercial real estate professionals have confirmed that the use of the property will be residential.

Brickmoor includes 33 proposed lots for single family detached units, and 141 single-family attached units (townhomes) with varied architecture, common areas with a clubhouse, trails, and other amenities. Townhomes include two-story units that are either front or rear loaded with three-story rear loaded units near the highway. Lots for detached single family homes are located closest to existing residential on the west side of Main Street. Private streets serve the development with two access points onto Main Street.

Among the number of issues to consider with the project is the number of proposed units. The NMU zoning states that maximum residential density in the NMU zone is nine (9) units per acre. This could be interpreted in different ways. As previously noted, a cap was placed on the initial agreement with Boyer that there would be no more than 265 units based on the read of this language assuming a density over the zoning district at large. Of note, per FMC 11-27-030, "a Planned Unit Development is a residential development in which the regulations of the underlying zone are waived to allow flexibility and innovation in site and building design if approved by the Planning Commission and City Council." Consistent with this intent, State Law allows for the establishment of unique regulations including establishing density through the use of development agreements. The NMU zone includes language indicating this may be expected.

It is the opinion of City Staff that the Planning Commission may recommend whatever density or unit count they feel is appropriate for the site. For reference, the project area includes over 19 acres of land. Included in this area is 2.6 acres of UDOT property, which is integrated into the project for open space and storm water design. The 174 proposed units is 9 units per acre over the whole project area. If considering only the approximately 16 acres of land that are to be sold to Boyer by the City, the density is 10.8 units per acre. In addition to unit count, the Planning Commission may wish to weigh in on the layout/project configuration, unit mix, architecture, building height, setbacks, amenities, transportation network, and landscaping.

Of note, a trip generation statement has been provided indicating that the proposed development will create minimal impact or delay on the existing road network as designed.

Ultimately this development will be considered through the use of a Development Agreement as is typical with a PUD to spell out the specific allowances or restrictions applicable to the project. A draft agreement is in process between

Boyer Company and City Staff. It is the anticipation of both City Staff and Boyer that this initial hearing will help provide input regarding the use of the property and proposed design to potentially inform changes to the design and also better inform the Development Agreement. An additional public hearing with the Planning Commission will follow where a Development Agreement will be available for the review of the public and Planning Commission before the project advances to the City Council for additional consideration.

Gibson said the General Plan is a guide, and the Planning Commission should decide what best fits the location. While the site was zoned NMU and allows for commercial uses, the needs have shifted so commercial is no longer being considered here. Buttered Bakeshop and Zions Bank are the only existing commercial in the area along Main Street.

Applicant **Spencer Moffat** with the Boyer Company addressed the Commission. They entered into the contract with the City in December. They presented the neighbors with their initial plan of 192 units in March. They have since addressed neighbor's concerns including lowering density to 174 units (removing eight single-family units and 10 townhomes), giving the project more breathing room, removing large six-plex units for more breathability, and removing a third access point that could have gone through the neighborhood to the south (which will remain as an emergency-only access). Nobody wanted to drive down Main Street and see the backsides of homes. Therefore, the front of the buildings were oriented to Main Street with a traditional park strip. Guest parking is tough, as people will park anywhere and everywhere. Therefore, the developer is proposing no parking along Main Street, giving the volume of traffic on that road. They propose striping the curbs there red, and asked for the City's help in enforcing that. This is a historic area that should match the surrounding community, so brick is the heavy element in the Brickmoor development. There will be a sound wall along the freeway. There is a plan for a full movement intersection to be installed on the north side of the property with a second full movement intersection at Zions Bank. Existing road capacities can handle future traffic volumes.

Sherlock asked about guest parking. **Moffat** said many times garages can become storage sheds, so the more parking the better. There is not guest parking in the single-family part of the development. Guest parking may be included in the detention basin area. **Adams** asked about snow removal.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing.

Drew Neal said this really impacts him. He was around when the first phase was proposed with offices and stores. Old Shepard Road is narrow with businesses in front. Many going to those business decide to park in nearby residential areas in order to park in the shade. This makes it so only one car at a time can drive down the street. **Adams** said this will be only a gated emergency access. **Neal** said there is a preschool on this street that could be impacted. People walk their dogs down his street, and it has made a mess of his yard. He is worried it is too much residential for such a small area.

Patricia Anderson (671 Somerset Street, Farmington, Utah) owns four acres across the street from this, and has a financial interest in the **Ally Rose** home, which will become a bakery. She attended the February and May community meetings, where they were told good planning is more important than revenue. She understood that it would be nine units per purchased acreage. She disputes the number of proposed units, as well as the notification using the new NMU language. Consulting land use attorneys and other planning experts, she discovered proper notification was not given to the surrounding landowners. She is worried about water, including the protected historic perennial stream. She would like the stream to be visible like it is at City Creek.

Sharon True (931 W. Northridge Road, Farmington, Utah) asked how many acres Boyer is purchasing. **Gibson** said 16 acres, although it is still in negotiations. She said NMU only allows two stories. She is concerned with future traffic problems. Multiple traffic studies have been done on this area, including in 2002 when it was assumed a frontage road would run along Highway 89. Things haven't turned out that way, and now there is an on-ramp to Highway 89. The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) said there would be no allowances for a road going on to that onramp. This limits traffic getting in and out. There should be a traffic light at Mountain Road. A four-lane Main Street turns into a two-lane Main Street by Mountain Road. More and more Fruit Heights residents are coming this way as well.

Adams said he is anxious to hear everything the public has to say. They will consider all the things said.

Heather Romano (739 S. Hansen Court, Farmington, Utah) said **Moffat** has been responsive to her concerns. Traffic is a huge issue to her, considering each townhome will have about two vehicles. That will be 348 cars around four traffic lights in a short area. She is glad to see the recent reduction in units, and asks if there could be even more.

Melanie Whipple has been teaching at Knowlton Elementary since 2014, and is advocating for lower class sizes. She is glad to see the number of proposed units has come down. Her school is overcrowded, with four portables on campus.

Lou Brown (819 White Hall Court, Farmington, Utah) asked if the units will be owner-occupied. **Gibson** said it has been in discussion. **Brown** has been in the development business for 40 years before retiring. Developments being approved in Tooele and Salt Lake Counties have up to 20 units per acre, which causes him to shake his head. Many developers like to rent out townhomes in order to make a bigger profit. He is wondering if making them owner-occupied would be included in the Development Agreement. He wants

to know if the roads will be public or private. He was happy that it was only nine units per acre. He met with people to find out that increased traffic from the development would have a negligible effect on existing roads.

Moffat said the project will have private streets. The traffic signal is a City issue. The market drives if they will sell the property or rent it out. High liquefaction was revealed in a recent soil test, which means there is a high potential for differential settlement for townhomes. Helical piers will be required, which adds risks to the project that may be best mitigated if Boyer retains ownership. They are doing risk analysis about that issue now. In addition, many people will actually buy townhomes with the pure intent to rent them out themselves. The single-family products will be for sale at market rates. He only likes to use deed restrictions for affordable housing units.

Gibson said often the City will require separate parcels for every unit so they could be owner-occupied, but they can't require that they are not rented out. The Mountain Road intersection is close in proximity to other signalized intersections. He is confident of getting a signal there. **Moffat** said they do plan to individually plat the townhomes so they have the flexibility to do either for-sale or for-rent options.

Laura Wilson (957 Lands End Road, Farmington, Utah) said she recently collected signatures and met with the mayor. Her main concern is the density. The community would like to see open space for community gardens, perhaps maintained by a land trust. Across the street from there is animals. They would like a sign welcoming people to North Farmington. She would like to see more single-family homes and fewer town homes, and she realizes this may affect Boyer's profit margins. The community would like to bond more and charge Boyer less to keep open space.

Michelle Packer (Hollyhock Circle, Farmington, Utah) lives south of Zions Bank. She said townhomes are prone to renters. She lives in a townhome Homeowners Association (HOA) project. Private streets are usually narrower and can't handle the parking needs of the development. She would like to have the density calculated by the actual project area, not the UDOT area. She does not want the PUD to be used, since it allows increased density. Stick to the density allowed by the underlying zone. She would like to see the stream left open instead of piped, as proposed. She is not sure she wants the screening wall.

Linda Hoffman addressed the Commission online. She asked about guest parking, and is worried they may park at Zions Bank. Her main concern is general that Farmington has almost no transitional housing for those getting older. There needs to be something between a two-story townhome and assisted living. She would like patio homes between 1,200 and 2,000 square feet in order to stay in their community. The proposed 3,000 to 5,000 square-foot homes are large considering they would be bounded by townhomes and a bank. She said those large homes could be switched to patio homes instead. Keeping the stream above ground could help migratory birds.

Mark Adamson lives on the west side of the freeway. In the past 10 years, he has had a lot of townhomes put in his area, and he feels the pain.

Chair **Frank Adams** closed the public hearing.

Adams said he appreciates the heart-felt comments shared tonight. He took notes tonight. **Moffat** wanted to find out if they are in the ballpark or not. Staff should be able to help them out with this in coming weeks.

Commissioner **Joey Hansen** said he appreciates the concern of the citizens. He has taken copious notes, and wants to make sure they are all addressed. He feels his neighbors' pain. He hadn't considered patio homes for the aging population as part of the Development Agreement. Commissioner **Behunin** said he found the areas of liquefaction interesting.

Sherlock said she is impressed with Boyer's willingness to listen to neighboring landowners. She would like to incorporate the open stream idea. She believes traffic lights help slow traffic. The amount and speed of traffic are two different things. She would like pedestrian issues addressed including lighting and accessibility. HOAs can address rental vs. owner-occupied. Farmington has addressed short-term rentals, but not mid- and long-term rentals. She would love to also address this in the Development Agreement. Liquefaction scares her. She would like to see "Welcome to Farmington" signage in this area. She always has a big issue with parking. As a private resident, she feels the pain. She started getting involved in City meetings when 352 apartments were proposed behind her home. However, this land is owned by the City, who can balance things better for residents than a private property owner. She wants people to know they were heard.

Adams said the Commission would like to have a fully fleshed-out Development Agreement before it votes on this agenda item. He would like the public to be able to read it before it is on the agenda next.

MOTION:

Sherlock made a motion to **table** this agenda item.

Behunin seconded the motion, which was unanimous.
Chair Frank Adams

X Aye ____Nay

Commissioner Kristin Sherlock
 Commissioner Joey Hansen
 Commissioner Scott Behunin
 Commissioner Spencer Klein

X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #5: City Council Reports, Approval of Minutes, Upcoming Items & Trainings

- a. City Council Report: August 5, 2025
 - **Gibson** said the Council discussed the General Plan as recommended by the Planning Commission. They had a couple of additional items they wanted to see amended before adopting it. Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** asked for areas that are outside of Farmington to be removed from the General Plan maps. They may be annexed in the future, but should not be included as part of the City. Foothill development is a concern.
- b. Wright Development – Park Lane Commons.
 - **Gibson** said he would like to introduce this application on Station Parkway across from the Legacy Assisted Living Center and west of Sticky Bird. It is a vacant property on the corner. While Wright Development owns the land, it is part of a larger Development Agreement for Farmington Commons. Typically in mixed use developments, drive thrus are not allowed. They tend to be more auto-oriented, and nearby McDonalds and Sticky Bird have them. Tenants interested would like to have a drive thru element.
 - **Mr. Logan Johnson** said full civil and building plans were made up assuming it would fill up very easily. The market did not produce any interest, even after \$40,000 was spent on plans. However, some tenants have said that a drive thru would entice them to locate there. They also recently purchased the Sticky Bird building, and they are trying to get a new tenant there as well. He is looking for feedback of the possibility of amending the Development Agreement to allow a drive thru and awning. They have been marketing to traditional retail uses, specifically food. Keke's Breakfast Cafe out of Florida backed out. Banks won't lend on buildings without at least one tenant. A nail salon and beauty supply have inquired. The three- to four-tenant, 8,000 square-foot building would have one food tenant in about 3,000 to 4,000 square feet. He purchased the building from **Rich Haws** about four months ago. Commissioners said parking, traffic flow, and the in and the out related to drive thrus must be addressed in a future Development Agreement.
- c. Planning Commission Minutes Approval: 07.17.2025
 - **Joey Hansen** made a motion to approve the minutes; **Scott Behunin** seconded the motion. All in favor.
- d. **Sherlock** said she is tired of Farmington not having patio homes. They are only in Kaysville and West Layton, and there is nothing for the aging population in Farmington. This Boyer development is the chance for the City to propose certain needed uses to a developer.

ADJOURNMENT

Kristen Sherlock motioned to adjourn.

Chair Frank Adams
 Commissioner Kristin Sherlock
 Commissioner Joey Hansen
 Commissioner Scott Behunin
 Commissioner Spencer Klein

X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay
 X Aye _____ Nay



Frank Adams, Chair

FW: Brickmoor Development Community Feedback

From Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Tue 8/12/2025 8:29 AM

To Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Cc smoffat <smoffat@boyercompany.com>

A comment received by the PC chair for the record.

From: Frank Adams <fadams@farmington.utah.gov>

Sent: Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:27 AM

To: Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Fw: Brickmoor Development Community Feedback

Did not see this until this morning.

From: Linda Hoffman <lindacall.hoffman@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 8:41 PM

To: tturner@farmington.utah.gov <tturner@farmington.utah.gov>; Frank Adams <fadams@farmington.utah.gov>; Joey Hansen <joey.hansen@farmington.utah.gov>; Kristen Sherlock <ksherlock@farmington.utah.gov>; George Kalakis <gkalakis@farmington.utah.gov>; Brian Shepherd <bshepherd@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Behunin <sbehunin@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Brickmoor Development Community Feedback

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission Members,

Thank you for receiving community input on the proposed development next to Zion's Bank. The following comments and suggestions are organized according to the parameters you will be considering and include both suggestions and compliments on the presentation. I am grateful for your thoughtful consideration of how to help Farmington grow in the best way possible.

Linda Hoffman
1766 Campden CT
Farmington, UT

- **Layout/project configuration**

- The ANA PUD (also mentioned in the Aug 7 packet) follows the ordinance of 9 units/acre, as does a recent build-out in West Farmington. Why is the Brickmoor development 10 units/acre?
- Will all units have basements, and is the proposed mitigation for the high water table suitable to keep the basements free from the type of flooding we have seen in West Farmington?
- Are all of the condo driveways 12 ft or just some of them? There is concern about condo owners and guests not being able to park within the driveway space (as in the Farmington Crossing development

and Old Farm).

- Where will visitors/guests park who are visiting the condos facing Main Street, since no parking will be allowed along that corridor?

- **Unit mix**

- Farmington has almost no "transitional" homes for the fast-growing demographic of an aging population. Please encourage developers to include housing that can bridge the gap between multi-storied condos and assisted living. Patio homes between 1200 and 2000 square feet would be a great fit in a multi-generational setting such as Brickmoor. These could be configured as duplexes or triplexes of varying sizes.
- It was announced that the 33 "single-family" homes would be 3,000-5,000 sq. ft. It could be financially beneficial to redesign some of them into patio homes, thereby increasing density, sales, and the multigenerational benefits of Brickmoor.

- **Architecture**

- The renderings shown are attractive and should be easy to maintain. They will blend in with the surrounding area. Thank you.

- **Building height**

- The two-story condos in Old Farm visually blend with the surrounding housing. Three stories would be out of place in this area, even if next to Hwy. 89. (Consider putting the patio homes for Seniors in that area since many of us don't hear very well anyway. 😊)

- **Setbacks**

- This seems very tight--like Farmington Crossing Development. Parking is a huge problem there.

- **Amenities**

- See landscaping below: keep the creek above ground as an amenity.
- The proposed trail will be a well-used amenity and enhancement to the community. Thank you.

- **Transportation network**

- There is great concern over traffic safety with the addition of over 1000 new trips a day in this area. The sudden reduction of south-bound lanes at the curve by Mountain Road entrance is already death-defying. It needs more signage (warning lights?) and perhaps clearer road markings to warn of the upcoming lane reduction.
- The proposed "Welcome to Farmington" sign would be a beautiful addition. Thank you.

- **Landscaping**

- The proposed 5' wide sidewalks and tree plantings will help to create a more beautiful entry into the area. Thank you.
- Keeping at least a portion of the creek above ground would provide support for migrating birds, connections to nature, and create a peaceful "pocket park" along which the residents could

decompress.

FW: Brickmoor (Old Farm) Project

From Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Thu 8/7/2025 2:30 PM

To Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Public comment sent to PC.

From: Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>

Sent: Monday, August 4, 2025 9:04 AM

To: Frank Adams <fadams@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Re: Brickmoor (Old Farm) Project

The public can see what is in the packet. So yes they would probably know what the proposal is.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Frank Adams <fadams@farmington.utah.gov>

Sent: Monday, August 4, 2025 8:56:18 AM

To: Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Fw: Brickmoor (Old Farm) Project

FYI. What is interesting to me is the complaint about "high density". Is the proposed density public knowledge at this point?

From: Cindy Cook <cindycook19@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 3, 2025 3:36 PM

To: Tyler Turner <tturner@farmington.utah.gov>; Frank Adams <fadams@farmington.utah.gov>; Joey Hansen <joey.hansen@farmington.utah.gov>; Kristen Sherlock <ksherlock@farmington.utah.gov>; George Kalakis <gkalakis@farmington.utah.gov>; Spencer Klein <sklein@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Behunin <sbehunin@farmington.utah.gov>; Brian Shepherd <bshepherd@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Brickmoor (Old Farm) Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am very concerned about the high density development Boyer Company is proposing which is inconsistent with the nature of the existing neighborhoods. The purpose of development is to improve the area and not create problems that the surrounding neighborhoods will have to deal with for years to come.

If the high density project is allowed, there will be dramatically increased traffic on Main Street which already has heavy traffic. As it is now, those coming from Fruit Heights and east neighborhoods have a hard time turning left

onto Main Street from Mountain Road. A traffic light at Mountain Road and Main will be too close to the existing traffic lights to the south and north.

Farmington has a charm of its own that is worth preserving. People choose Farmington because it is a nice place to live and raise a family. High density housing brings with it instability and turnover--which does not provide the same type of environment that currently exists in this part of Farmington.

Your decision should represent the voice of the community and what will enhance the surrounding neighborhoods. High density housing is not an improvement. Please carefully consider how this proposed high density project will negatively impact the overall quality of life in the northern part of Farmington.

Best regards,

Cindy Cook