

FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

September 16, 2025

WORK SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,*

*City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Community Development Director Lyle
Gibson,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell,
Assistant Finance Director Levi Ball, and
City Parks and Recreation Director Colby
Thackeray.*

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the work session to order at 6:05 p.m.

TRAILS APP PRESENTATION

Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** introduced GIS Specialist **Scott Kichman**, who is developing an app for the City. He came from Hawaii, where he worked for the Park Service in mobile development. He also worked for the Bureau of Land Management. He is impressed with Farmington's trails guidebook, which he has used while developing this new app. The new app shows easy, moderate, and strenuous trails marked by different colors. It will also indicate available amenities such as restrooms, parking, and pavilions. He hopes to add in future 3D modeling, historic sites, and photos of points of interest. He is also considering adding in a reservation system for City facilities such as playing fields.

While he has been doing this for the last 1.5 months, **Kichman** feels there is still a lot of room for development. He noted that e-bikes on trails is a controversial topic. He suggested posting QR codes along the trails pointing to this new app. Mention of it will also be made on the City's facebook, website, and newsletter. This is a great time of year to roll this out, as many residents are enjoying cooler weather on the City's trails.

The Mayor and Councilmembers expressed their excitement for this new app. Councilmember **Amy Shumway** noted that the West Davis Corridor was not included in the trails guidebook.

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** said he and the City Parks and Recreation Director have been considering bringing back the Trails Committee to organize volunteers who want to be involved in trail clean up.

Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** said he thought there would be subcommittees under the Parks, Recreation, Arts and Trails (PRAT) Advisory Board, and one of those would be for trails. PRAT was active while working on the General Plan, but they need a continued purpose.

Mellor said PRAT dwindled on the vine since the City hasn't kept them engaged. He suspects that two or three PRAT members would be interested in the Trails Subcommittee. This is an opportunity to rework the PRAT, to reform it and give members additional assignments. New

members need to be recruited to help organize volunteer labor. The new park will have an awesome stage, so it may be a chance to bring more artists and performers to the City. The Old Mill site is another future venue to consider. Farmington recently hired an employee whose main job is to help with trails throughout the City.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** suggested having high school and college students help with marketing. **Issacson** said his daughter, **Melissa Mills**, who has a PhD in Music, is working on proposals to support the arts in the City.

Shumway, who served on the Trails Committee for 3.5 years, said the PRAT needs guidelines and could benefit from a Staff member attending each of their meetings. Various trail chiefs were assigned to walk certain trails at least twice each year while noting maintenance and service project possibilities. **Issacson** said the Youth City Council works because a Staff member is assigned to guide them.

DISCUSSION OF REGULAR SESSION ITEMS UPON REQUEST

Councilman **Alex Leeman** asked if Farmington had plans to put a stop light in on Mountain Road in the north of the City. **Mellor** said it is a City decision, and it was already part of the plan, although he doesn't want to impede traffic at that intersection.

Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** said since it is so close to the next traffic signal, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) would be leery of a new light. However, it is up to Farmington to decide. The question is if the traffic volume justifies it. **Mellor** said the City Council doesn't decide on traffic measures; residents can instead comment on traffic at the Development Review Committee (DRC) level.

REGULAR SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Community Development Director Lyle
Gibson,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell, and
Assistant Finance Director Levi Ball.*

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Councilmember **Melissa Layton** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember **Scott Isaacson**.

Farmington High School Chamber Choir sang the National Anthem.

PRESENTATION:

Appointment of Levi Ball as Finance Director and administration of the oath of office

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** presented this agenda item. He said he and Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** started considering candidates over a year ago when **Greg Davis** told them of his planned retirement. They were impressed with **Ball** when they first met him. **Ball** grew up in Farmington and still has family who live there, including his parents and in-laws. He is a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and graduated from the University of Utah with a Master of Accountancy. His wife and four children were in attendance.

City Recorder **DeAnn Carlile** administered the oath of office.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Consideration of a Development Agreement for the Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Schematic Subdivision for the Brickmoor residential project

Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** presented this agenda item. This is a unique property, as the City is the current owner. Farmington decided it was time to sell this asset for different uses in the community. A Request for Qualification (RFQ) process was used to select a developer for the City to work with as a partner. Boyer was selected as the developer of choice. The City owns 18 acres, and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) owns 2 acres on the far north. Some land will not be sold, as it is used for a culinary water well. The property was originally zoned for retail and nonresidential use, but over the years there has not been any interest in developing retail shops.

Two public hearings for this project were held at the Planning Commission level. When the purchase contract was considered, email addresses of interested individuals were collected. The

typical online and physical publication guidelines were followed, and the email distribution was an additional layer of notification the City doesn't typically do.

This project has a total of 168 units, with 31 of those single-family detached units. Townhome front doors will face Main Street, with units featuring two and three stories closer to Highway 89. In response to public input, the number of units was reduced, additional guest parking was added, and the bakery was preserved. In addition, the stream running through the property will be daylighted so it can continue to be an asset to the community. A trail will be added to connect to a much bigger trail network on the east side. Since this is at schematic level, there are still things to be solved such as traffic impact on Main Street and intersections, stream alteration permits, and wetland mitigation.

Gibson said Staff's opinion is that using the PUD process allows bonus density as a standard process. This is a high-level schematic proposal, and is not the final approval. The Council must consider if they are O.K. with the big picture elements, general configuration, and number of units. After that, the developer can move forward with engineering and design, which is a significant cost to pursue. Under normal circumstances, this would not come back to the Council, but would only go back to the Planning Commission two more times. If the project proposal changes significantly, it will come back to the Council. Concept approval will come after the project has cleared engineering hurdles and other technical elements.

Mellor said he anticipates some changes to the Development Agreement to address elements such as phasing and financing for the park. He said public feedback was to put money to the fire station instead of to a park no one wants.

Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** said he was concerned with Section 19D on page 16 of the Development Agreement where Boyer would be allowed to transfer the project to a subsequent owner without City approval as long as the new owner followed the agreement.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** said changing it could take away the new landowner's right to sell. She didn't see reference to a "Welcome to Farmington" sign in the Development Agreement.

City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said it is typical for a Limited Liability Company (LLC) to take over after development. He said the Council could restrict it and decide if a subsidiary would be allowed to own the land in the future.

Applicant **Spencer Moffat**, representing the Boyer Company, addressed the Council. The original density was 192, but it was reduced after his company spent time at open houses with the surrounding residents. They initially presented a 174-unit plan to the Planning Commission. It is now at 168 units. He said the contract language is standard in that the land would be assignable only after Boyer owns the property, although it is not their intent to assign or give it away. However, they will review any changes the City Council wants to make. **Mayor Anderson** said the City would like a voice at the table should there be discussions about assigning the contract to another party. **Moffat** said that is not something he has done in a Development Agreement before. The Development Agreement will be recorded with the property and run with the land, so any future owner would be bound by the agreement.

While **Isaacson** said in his career representing owners and developers of major projects, he would never allow the contractor to freely assign the contract to someone else. However, he said

it makes a big difference if the City owns the land or not. He just always envisioned being closely involved in this whole project because it started out as City land. He wanted to know if the City's "say" ends when Boyer buys the land. He had assumed they would continue to work together.

Councilmember **Alex Leeman** said the City would be involved in every aspect of the Development Agreement, but that agreement may be with another partner in the future.

Shumway asked if the plans could get rid of four units that are near an important trailhead and access to a potential future park. That would leave more open space with opportunities to develop.

Mayor Anderson said the City received emails that will be included as part of the record. He opened the Public Hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Steve Anderson, who has an interest in Buttered Bakeshop and Rose Cottage, addressed the Council. In the past, travelers would stop here along the major road running through the area for lunch and to trade out horses. Brigham Young would stop here to house cattle and livestock. For three years, this area wintered livestock before they were moved to Antelope Island. He is concerned about the historic nature of Main Street in this area. He is also concerned about the area where four lanes collapse into two lanes, as well as the amount of density. He would like a traffic study. He wants the fire marshall to determine if engines can move around appropriately. Streams on his property run at 16 gallons per minute. He is willing to put a plaque on his land, as it is the most visible on his corner. He does not want the emergency access opened up. This area used to be an agricultural extension planted with every tree in Utah, and a giant sequoia still remains.

Andrew Gemperline addressed the Council. As a civil engineer for 38 years, safety is his first priority, specifically ingress, egress, and pedestrian movements on Mountain Road. Youth in the area will be interested in walking to nearby Cherry Hill. Since traffic lights are mitigation for poor planning, he would rather see a right-in and right-out. The south access has terrible sight distance. Good engineering can take care of the problems there for a small price. He offered his services to review any future engineering there.

Leeman said the City's decisions need to be made by engineers, otherwise they could be sued. Therefore, the Council will rely on traffic studies and the Development Review Committee (DRC).

Patricia Anderson (671 Somerset Street, Farmington, Utah), Steve's wife, addressed the Council. She said if the crash gate is opened up, people will use it. She is worried about the ingress and egress. She knows the Development Agreement can't address whether or not the units can be rentals, but parking is not addressed in the agreement. She said the daylighted stream is not clear. There has been a lot of tweaking and stretching to allow bonus density. She anticipates five housemates living together in order to afford rent, which will cause on-street parking. The agreement is very vague and otherwise open to change and interpretation, and she understood that the exhibits are not included.

Leeman said that is not correct, as the Development Agreement requires the project to be developed consistent to what is in the exhibits. If it is in the Project Master Plan (PMP), it is in

the Development Agreement. **Isaacson** agreed, saying paragraph 9 says the PMP is part of the agreement and is therefore binding. While conceptual in nature at this point, it can be modified.

Gina Kearns said it is very discouraging to come to City meetings. After a lot of talk in the neighborhood about what development would be best here, the townhomes are exactly what everyone did not want. The residents there were just beat down so the City could do whatever they wanted to do anyway. There will always be contention in this area.

Sharon Tru (Northridge Road, Somerset, Farmington, Utah) said the Development Agreement compromises the Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) ordinance, which is supposed to protect residents from overwhelming development. The smaller the units are, the more rentals there will be, and the more adults will be living in each. She does not like the deviations from City Code listed in Exhibit D such as the three stories adjacent to Highway 89. Noting the recent death of a 13-year-old Farmington resident while riding an e-bike, she said the NMU requires bike pathways throughout the development. Getting bikes off the road will help. She asked the Council not to approve the Development Agreement, as too many adjustments need to be made. It pushes the limits. She would like more time so better solutions and compromises for traffic and safety can be made between the City and the developer.

Jake McIntire said the PMP is part of the Development Agreement, but it clearly has ways to be amended for economic and developmental reasons. Since this is a schematic phase, this will not come back to the Council again unless the Planning Commission feels they can't approve a change. Therefore, the Council won't have another say on this. In nine years from now, architectural style changes can be made because the original is no longer marketable. He works with communities on master plans, which are conceptual and up to change. There is very little in the actual Development Agreement that holds the City accountable for what they care about. The community members to the south came and asked that community benefits and amenities be made a part of the Development Agreement. A lot of empty promises didn't come true because they were not made part of the Development Agreement. He strongly encouraged the Council to add qualifiers to item 19D regarding selling off to other development companies. The City could have right of first refusal, or the developer could come back to the Council for reapproval of the Development Agreement.

Patricia Anderson said she generally walks 5 miles each day, and motorists have turned left into her while she was in the middle of a crosswalk by the funeral home.

Sheri Evarts (1735 N. Hampton Court, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Council via Zoom. She agrees with **Steve Anderson** and **Gemperline**, and would also like to eliminate the four homes by the trailhead. She agrees with **Patricia Anderson** about ingress and egress. She agrees with Kearns and Tru that the NMU should protect the surrounding neighborhood. This proposal exceeds 9 units per acre. She would like this approval delayed in order to reassess. She does not want to bury another child like they did on Saturday.

Jody Vanskiver addressed the Council via Zoom. She lives south of the proposed project and is worried about traffic. The Mayor is familiar with their concerns. She was told that the access road would be for emergencies only. That road can't handle additional traffic through the neighborhood.

Mayor Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 8:35 p.m.

Leeman said he is not sure where the notion that the Development Agreement and PMP is not enforceable came from. Minor changes can be approved by the Planning Commission, but major changes must be approved by the Council. Every agreement can be changed if the two parties agree to it. **Isaacson** said the agreement is very clear that it can only be modified by mutual agreement. It is not possible for the developer to unilaterally change things.

Leeman said this project has to be moved forward in order to get greater details such as soil, water, and drainage studies. The DRC has to pass off those issues, and permits must be obtained in order to alter streams. If the developer doesn't get those third-party approvals, the project stops. There is no guaranteed development. Part of the process is that each step adds a layer of detail, which costs a lot of money. The Council respects that the City needs to get more details, and the process ensures that.

Regarding the allowed density, **Gibson** noted that they started out with 250 units. **Leeman** said that with 15.76 acres at 9 units per acre, and with a bonus, they qualified for 177. They are now under that. They are still under the most conservative calculation in the Staff Report.

Gibson said it could be looked at many different ways, including if the streets, open space, and detention are included, or if it includes the entire district or just what the City owns. This is a legislative action in the Council's discretion, as they must decide if it is appropriate or not.

Shumway said 20 years ago, none of the current Councilmembers sat on this Council. Many decisions were made long ago.

Layton directed the public to consider page 26 and what Farmington got in return, saying that the Council listened to resident feedback. Nine townhomes are deed restricted for moderate-income housing. A public trail going behind the development, as well as open space, is a big deal. The area around the Rose Cottage is a gem and asset to this little community. It was a really big deal to open up space and put gardens, parking, and utility access next to a historic space.

Councilmember **Roger Child** said he appreciates the preservation of frontage, and that the taller units are deeper inside the project next to the highway. From Main Street, there are only two stories. The developer is being sensitive to the preservation of Main Street, and keeping a very residential overtone. Most of the safety issues that have consistently come up can be resolved further along in the process. This is still a schematic plan and engineering has not all been completed yet. The traffic study was originally based on 275 units, and now the unit count is 1/3 less. He doesn't want a traffic light and would rather have a right-in and right-out. He hears from residents that they don't want their taxes raised, but they would have been if the City didn't consider selling this property to fund a new fire station.

Shumway said she would like pedestrian access through the crash gate, which would connect neighborhoods with pedestrian access. However, she does not want that area open for cars.

Isaacson said the City could have done other things that could have made much more money off this property, and the Council is trying to find a balance. As stewards of the City, they could not let this land sit there any longer. Technical issues will be addressed as the City proceeds to meet legal standards. He knows by experience that change is hard, as he moved to 1100 West 22 years ago. He doesn't live in the country anymore.

Mayor Anderson said the City needs to find a happy medium. He recalled Gov. **Spencer Cox** inviting mayors throughout Utah to his mansion on May 29 to discuss the state's housing crisis. By the time the Olympics come to Utah in 2034, **Cox** said the state needs 400,000 more living units, which could be solved with inventory. He told the cities that if they are unwilling to solve this, the state would instead, which would take planning away from cities. Montana and Texas have already done this. He researched what other cities recently bonded for new fire stations including Syracuse for \$12 million, and Sandy for \$21 million. They are literally burning money.

Leeman said he appreciates the modifications that the developer has made. The quality of Boyer's development speaks for itself, especially along the Main Street frontage.

Mayor Anderson proposed doing away with the 10 units surrounding the park, in order to open it up. **Layton** said she approved of that idea. **Mellor** asked what purpose the open space would serve. Each unit that is given up results in \$20,000 less for the new fire station. It is space that would be neglected, such as open space around the detention basin that no one seems to care about.

Shumway said this could be a developed park in the future, and four units seem to block access to a trailhead. She appreciated the historic items **Steve Anderson** brought up. She asked where the developers got the idea for the name Brickmoor.

Moffat said the intent was historic, and the primary building material will be brick. Older neighborhoods tend to have more brick, which is easily identifiable.

Isaacson said he is still troubled by the assignability part of the agreement, but he can live with it. However, if it is not a subsidiary of Boyer, he would like the City to have a look at it.

Motion:

Leeman moved that the City Council approve the Schematic Subdivision Plan, Preliminary Planned Unit Development, and Development Agreement for the Brickmoor as set forth in the Staff Report, including the attached Project Master Plan subject to Findings in Staff Report with the following additional Conditions 1-3:

1. The developer return to City Council in a study session with their final signage renderings.
2. Pedestrian access through the emergency access road southwest of the development be preserved.
3. Paragraph 19 of the Development Agreement referring to assignability indicate that the developer is free to assign to wholly owned subsidiaries. Assignment to other parties is subject to approval of the City, which should not be unreasonably withheld.

Findings 1-5:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the Farmington City General Plan and vision for the area.
2. The subdivision as designed creates a desirable neighborhood that is consistent with the NMU zone and Planned Unit Development purpose and standards.
3. As designed, the development can be serviced by required utility providers and establishes a street network capable of handling the number of units proposed.

4. The project creates a variety of housing while providing reasonable buffering and transitioning from abutting properties while creating a desirable streetscape along Main Street at the entry to the City.
5. The property supports and enhances the historic home/bakery which it is adjacent to while providing meaningful community benefits such as open space access and trails in addition to amenities created for the residents of Brickmoor. In addition to the proposed rent reduction on nine townhome units, these improvements qualify as “other benefits” to help the project meet its moderate-income housing requirement.

Shumway seconded the motion.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	Aye	X	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	_____	Nay

The motion passed, as it was 4-1 in favor.

Layton said she voted “nay” because she would still like to see a lower density. She feels concerned when people don’t feel heard by the Council. Councilmembers really do read and respond to residents’ emails. In this case, they held extra meetings that weren’t required. She even held meetings with residents on her own.

Isaacson said listening doesn’t always mean agreeing. Opinions can be respected even when they are not agreed with. **Leeman** said he didn’t feel the Council could do their fiduciary duty sitting on this land while borrowing money and paying interest to build a new fire station.

SUMMARY ACTION:

Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List

The Council considered the Summary Action List including:

- Item 1: Monthly Financial Report
- Item 2: Zone Change Enabling Ordinance – B and C-R to CRT (Lagoon Administration Building)
- Item 3: Approval of minutes for September 2, 2025

Motion:

Child moved to approve the Summary Action list Items 1-3 as noted in the Staff Report.

Layton seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	_____	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	_____	Nay

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

Mayor Anderson and City Council Reports

Isaacson mentioned that his daughter recently got a \$800 water bill, which was the result of a running toilet after grandchildren had stayed for a long weekend. **Mellor** said he regularly gets calls about such situations, and he would like to work this out personally.

Leeman is concerned with safety at the four-way stop on Innovator, as there have already been accidents there. The intersection is so big that it is difficult to see the stop signs. **Mellor** said he would follow up on putting more stop signs on Innovator. He and **Boshell** have been putting pressure on getting lighting in that area as well. There is no power transformer to put a light up at Burke and Innovator, so solar panels may be necessary. He said there will be stop sign at Maker and Burke, as well as the T at Maker and Innovator.

CLOSED SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell,
Matt Church,
Trent Ferrin, and
Libby Lowther.*

Motion:

At 9:39 p.m., Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** made the motion to go into a closed meeting for the purpose of strategy session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman
Councilmember Roger Child
Councilmember Scott Isaacson
Councilmember Melissa Layton
Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay

Sworn Statement: I, **Brett Anderson**, Mayor of Farmington City, do hereby affirm that the items discussed in the closed meeting were as stated in the motion to go into closed session, and that no other business was conducted while the Council was so convened in a closed meeting.

/s/ Brett Anderson

Brett Anderson, Mayor

Motion:

At 10:06 p.m., Councilmember **Alex Leeman** made the motion to adjourn the closed meeting.

Shumway seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman
Councilmember Roger Child
Councilmember Scott Isaacson
Councilmember Melissa Layton
Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay



DeAnn Carlile, Recorder

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Leeman made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman
Councilmember Roger Child
Councilmember Scott Isaacson
Councilmember Melissa Layton
Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay
X Aye ____ Nay



DeAnn Carlile, Recorder

Fw: Old Farm Proposed Development

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Libby Hansen <libby@libbyhansen.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:52:14 PM

To: Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Old Farm Proposed Development

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.

I am opposed to the current proposed development plan for the Old Farm Development. I do not believe this proposal is the highest and best use of the land!

There is a rush to approve this I I sincerely ask that you step back, listen to the citizens of Farmington and consider further investigation.

Please do not approve this development as proposed at this time.

Sincerely

Libby Hansen

The Adams Company

801 201-6570 libby@libbyhansen.com Sent from Gmail Mobile

Fw: Brickmoor Residential Project

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

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

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:30:47 PM

To: Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Brickmoor Residential 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 Councilmembers,

Thank you for the opportunity to share ideas and concerns regarding the Brickmoor Residential Project. Please consider the following:

- 1) Increased focus on the safety issues raised by Mr. Andrew Gemperline concerning the North entrance of the development. His points are based on expertise, experience, and legal perspectives.
- 2) Again, I would like to ask you to consider including some housing for the fastest growing population in the USA: seniors desiring to size down. Many of us are very active and not yet ready for the many assisted care centers in the city. Single-story patio homes or duplexes could fit nicely into this plan, increasing the opportunity for older adults to continue living near friends, children, and grandchildren.

Thank you for your consideration,

Linda C. Hoffman

1766 Campden CT

Farmington, UT 84025

Fw: Our Requests of the Brookmoor (Old Farm) Project

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Derek Snow <derek-snow@leavitt.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 5:30:00 PM

To: Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>

Cc: Jaci Snow <jaci.cummings5@gmail.com>

Subject: Our Requests of the Brookmoor (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 Mayor and City Council,

We remain very concerned about this project and the lack of several components being nailed down IN the agreement as we read it. We ask that you:

1. **Include specific details in the agreement such that nothing of consequence is left to further negotiations or discussions between the developer and City—and even that the developer can unilaterally decide what best suits them,** including: altering parking spaces/capacity, ingress/egress requirements, community spaces, dealing with the water/stream, eliminating and/or modifying the mitigation requirements for dealing with the water that could cause flooding of homes/basements in the area, etc. There is so much that should be included in detail. The developer should appreciate this so they are clear as to expectations and protection of their reputation (this project will assuredly impact their reputation with everyone in our area). This protects the City Council from accusations it isn't operating in good faith. And lastly, it would ensure the developer can be held accountable.
2. It's obvious this project will have a negative effect on those of us living in this area. **Please require a traffic impact study that clearly includes all relevant safety issues.** Adding another traffic light within that tiny distance would be a nightmare for all of us who have to travel through this multiple times each day. The obvious probability of greatly decreased safety when pedestrians are present and drivers are aggravated clearly demands such a study—as does any proposed solution. While traffic lights are solutions to some traffic problems, adding a fourth signal within such a small distance is no solution: it's a cop out. You've received an offer from an experienced traffic engineer to work pro bono to conduct this exact study; please engage him and see that this is done. There is no excuse for pushing forward without doing so given the potential legal liability we would be incurring as a city.

Thank you again for your willingness to serve us and the entire Farmington community. We are truly grateful for your service and sacrifice.

Sincerely,

Derek and Jaci Snow
1890 Kensington St.
Farmington, UT 84025

Fw: Concerned Old Farm Resident - Still tracking Brickmoor

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: karl farbman <aaronofthepigeons@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 4:49:29 PM

To: Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Concerned Old Farm Resident - Still tracking Brickmoor

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.

Hello all,

I just want to express my continued interest and concern for this project. I have not forgotten and continue to have serious doubts and concerns.

Will be attending tonight's council meeting.

Aaron Silver

Fw: Brickmoor Concerns

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Jake McIntire <jakealexmcintire@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 4:40:44 PM

To: Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Brickmoor Concerns

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.

As a resident of an adjacent neighborhood I have the following concerns about the Brikmoor Development being considered.

- Ideally, I believe this land should be preserved as open space in protection of the wetlands and agricultural character of the property. Sale of this land from the City to a land trust to protect the land and character is a very feasible option.
- A resident asked at a recent meeting for budget justification of the fire station being built on the west side of the City that is being used as the reason for selling this land. I have been following this process and have not seen justification for the exceptionally high construction cost compared to similar projects in the region. It appears there are ample opportunities to streamline this budget and simplify the proposed design to reduce the pressure to sell the Old Farm property.
- If the City decides development of this land is absolutely necessary and in keeping with the community's vision, there are many options for development that would be in better keeping with the agricultural and multi-generational spirit of Farmington. I have previously shared concepts in public meetings and via email for the development of a multi-generational "agrihood" that prioritizes the historical, environmental, and local context of this site. There are many creative options to develop this land that are more appropriate for and reflective of our community. The proposed development is generic and continues to degrade our community character. I am happy to share more about these possibilities.
- A primary component of the proposed development in conversations with community stakeholders was the inclusion of a public park/open space on the UDOT land. This is one of Farmington's only sledding hills and is a highly used public asset. This concept has been removed from the proposed

development without clear communication to the community. Protection and improvement of this land should absolutely be required as a condition of the development

- In a previous council meeting City Council members communicated that affordability is a major concern and that this development helps with that priority. Allowing “supporting and enhancing the historic home/bakery” to count as qualification to meet additional moderate income housing requirements should not be allowed. These are two separate priorities – both important but they should not be blended. The developer should not be allowed to avoid moderate income housing requirements beyond the 9 being offered – if they cannot do this, there are other developers in our state who can.
- I do not believe public safety in terms of traffic and active transportation (bike, pedestrian, etc) has been appropriately considered or addressed.
- I do not see appropriate reflection of the community benefits or conditions made by the City/developer to the community are reflected in the Development Agreement. These items seem to be expected in good faith but are not included in the Agreement which gives me little faith in them being realized. The removal of the park is a perfect example of how this development has already been watered down from what was sold to local stakeholders. I have confidence that the developer will continue to dilute the concept and further pad their profits. I worry specifically about the following: community amenities, open spaces, the historic stream, connection to the historic home/bakery, and density. These things would all be easily adjusted or removed as the phases progress and economic realities set in.
- I do not believe this development is being built in the best long-term interest of our community. Long term vision and investment in authenticity are what make communities special. This development does not do that. I worry this development will be in conditions of blight in 20 years. As community members and stakeholders it is not only our responsibility to think about what is best for today but to think about what is best for future generations. I fear we are creating long-term unintended (but foreseeable) consequences to solve an immediate need when there are alternative solutions to solve that need that do not require long term costs of the same scale.

Fw: Main St Development

From Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Wed 9/17/2025 4:04 PM

To DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: sheri sheri <s.sherisheri@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 3:52:29 PM

To: Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Main St Development

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.

To Farmington Mayor Anderson & Farmington Council:

Regarding : Main St Development

As a resident of Somerset Farms for 35 years I have watched the development of Old Farm & Zions Bank. And I've attended the Council meetings regarding the Boyer acquisition of the Main Street Property.

Our neighbors have repeatedly stood before you as representatives for all of us, and have respectfully pleaded with the Council to listen to our concerns. We have consistently raised our hands in support of the verbal shared comments at each meeting (as Council requested, instead of clapping).

Please, please make sure our concerns are specifically defined in the Development Agreement so that Boyer cannot alter or delete or modify all the items that we have been repeatedly pleading for:

- keeping community spaces,
- keeping the historic stream,
- don't let Boyer discard mitigations for water (allowing for flooded foundations),
- Don't let Boyer install choked parking,

- Don't allow them to put in an unconscionably tiny two lane north entrance
- Don't let Boyer claim financial need to alter unit number or unit size/style.

Traffic Concerns:

We've submitted to The City Council the extensive traffic impact studies & warnings of EXTREME Congestion & Traffic overload that this new development will add to the narrow Main St lanes in North Farmington.

We are begging for **"a right in and right out of that intersection and that in particular would take care of a good 90% of the safety problem"** without a need for a signal so close to an intersection.

We don't want any children or lives taken.

Water Concerns:

This area has always been a water catch basin. Long term residents have memories of kids playing in this area with their water 'toys' after rain downpours. This area has always been a year round catch basin.

We don't want the current financial stability of Our Farmington City to become bankrupt by future lawsuits regarding flooding.

Again, we plead with you to add these specific items to the Development Agreement (before it's signed) so that Boyer cannot alter, change, delete, modify the items that we have consistently brought to you as our utmost concerns.

Respectfully,
Sheri Evarts
1735 N Hampton CT
Farmington
801-898-7613
Sent from my iPhone

From: Patricia Andersen <patricia.a.andersen@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 12:12:05 PM

To: Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>; Roger Child <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>; Scott Isaacson <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>; Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>; Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>; Amy Shumway <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: On record regarding insufficiencies in the development agreement -- Brickmoor development

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.

Patricia Andersen

671 Somerset St, Farmington UT 84025

patricia.a.andersen@gmail.com

September 15, 2025

To: Mayor Anderson and Members of the Farmington City Council

Re: Attention to Insufficiencies in the Development Agreement – Brickmoor Development

Dear Mayor Anderson and City Council Members,

I am writing to formally object to the broadness of the proposed Brickmoor development agreement. It lacks sufficient requirements for the daylight stream, the north entrance/exit, the south emergency exit, high water, and density. Promises have been made by this council to the community, which also cares for the safety and livability of this area.

Given that the developer is providing vague ideas which can all be adjusted in time, I respectfully request the following be formalized in the **development agreement** specifically as well as on the Project Master Plan.

1. Density. "Bonus density" has been claimed per PUD allowances. The PMP doesn't show sufficient percentages to approve 26 more units than are allowed at 9 units per **purchased** acre. The NMU is understood to restrict over-building and has been altered.
2. High water. Clearer, more specific requirements are needed, rather than allowing for draining before permissions are acquired. Kicking Army Corps studies down the road for water that can be so high that people have reported seeing bales of hay floating after harvest. Breaching water has been documented in the south wetland.
3. South Emergency Entrance. Require it to be written into the development agreement for the safety and well being of the neighborhood.

4. North Entrance/Exit. Require a safer entrance than is now planned, regardless of possible future UDOT plans. The original traffic study, commissioned in March, indicates this need. One of its engineers told the commission that he didn't want to scrape a member of the new neighborhood off the road in order to obtain a traffic light warrant study. He offered his expertise, free of charge, to enhance safety.
5. Daylight Stream. Require the daylighting and preservation of the historic perennial stream to be written into the development agreement. This looks great on the PMP, but is not formalized and its alteration must be permitted through the DNR.

Thank you for your work on this. I understand that the developer wants to get started. However, I also know developers will use an insufficient development agreement to their own advantage.

Sincerely,
Patricia Andersen