

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

October 09, 2025

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

Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** introduced the agenda involving the special exception for a driveway. They built a detached garage to code and most of the cement work is done. They are requesting a curb cut, and the applicant submitted letters in support.

The second agenda item is Rock Haven, south of 200 East in an R-2 zoning district, a multi-family zone. A 10,000 square foot lot in this zone allows a duplex. In this case, three duplexes would be allowed. Instead, the owner is proposing six single-family lots in a Planned Unit Development (PUD) with a private road in the center with three 4,500 square foot lots on each side. **Gibson** said the PUD ordinance has a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres, and this one is 1 acre. The Commission may need to table this. There are two applicants, each with half the property. Together they applied, but **Bell** is more interested in keeping things rolling along. **Gibson** has taken one call from the landowner directly south of the site. She wanted to make sure the City is aware of the huge boulders in the ground that may influence construction.

Gibson expects a lot of public comment tonight on 187 proposed residential lots known as The Heritage. There have been several development attempts on this property in the past. It is 52 acres running along the West Davis Corridor (WDC) now known as the Buffalo Ranch Equestrian Center. Historically there have been rodeos, horse boarding, and horse training here. When it was put in years ago with The Ranches homes to the east, they designated this as open space in order to allow housing clustering. There was a conservation easement placed on the land before the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) decided to put a freeway through it. The courts said the conservation easement is not legally binding at this point. It is now zoned agricultural, one unit for every 5 acres. The equestrian commercial use is a nonconforming use that is allowed to continue. Anything else would need a rezone. Because of the impact of the freeway, the nature of the horse business has been impacted. There was an earlier proposal to have sports fields in the area, which was not well received. Cole West is the first formal application since. The Agriculture Planned (AP) District process was tried to preserve a commercial use, which isn't allowed under the Agriculture zone. The proposal today represents feedback from the Council and two open houses with the neighbors. This proposal takes all commercial equestrian uses out and will all be single-family detached residential units. While the City is not bound by the General Plan, it is a good guideline to follow. The General Plan shows a neighborhood residential designation for this property.

The application came under the AP District, which may not be appropriate for two reasons. One is that the district accounts for non-commercial and non-residential development, while this is residential. Minimum lots sizes is another. It may need to be re-noticed and come back under a different designation. **Gibson** welcomes Commissioner's feedback tonight. Planning Commission Chairman **Frank Adams** said the AP District was mostly allowed to help establish the Western Sports Park (WSP).

Gibson addressed the STACK agenda item. STACK has been through many hearings and the application is very complicated. They came in 6 months ago to address the Master Plat, which cleans up property lines, tax information, easements, and rights of way, but doesn't allow anything to be built. It identifies project areas. There is a townhome component that residents may not like the height of. The end units are two stories, but the rest are three stories. Like Evergreen, some want the townhomes to be two stories within 200 feet of the Denver and Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Rail Trail. It would transition to three stories and later four stories throughout the development. They have two options: two-story apartments against the Rail Trail, or for-sale townhomes that transition to three stories sooner. The top of the project fronts 950 North, where they are entitled to have a commercial element, which wasn't restricted in height. They are proposing three-story live/work townhome style units there. Residents are concerned with the height of developments along the trail.

Applicant **Chase Freebairn** said they looked at everything along the Rail Trail and have taken the position that they would model their entitlement after Evergreen's Arrowgate, which creates a larger buffer. Similar to Sego, the end units would have the rooftop patios. They are open to trimming the live/work units down to remove the work element and make them residential units only on 950 North. There is not a net loss of commercial with this most recent proposal. They would like to put trees between the easement and the trail with the help of their design team. The regional gas line was moved to the west, and Enbridge won't allow trees to be built on top of it. They plan to start construction next year. Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) has not yet put in a planned sub station there, which is affecting this development's capacity. Therefore, proposed residential for next year has been cut in half. This will be subject to figuring out power infrastructure. RMP's decisions are affecting many developers in this same area. Construction on the self storage, pads and drive throughs could start in 2026 because the power for that is now available.

Gibson said this is a mixed-use district zoned Office Mixed Use (OMU), which is urban to the street without visible parking. They are asking for drive-through provisions in these auto-centric areas right off the freeway. Form-based requirements are very strict here to hide as much parking as possible. The Commission has legislative discretion on these issues. The applicant needs specific architectural exceptions for its self-storage component. The Council had asked for architecture with more pitched roofs instead of flat roofs. Four-story buildings would be in the third phase and will not be on tonight's agenda. From a design standpoint, the applicant said it is modern agrarian themed, similar to what can be seen at Day Break.

Gibson said signage in mixed-use areas is very limited. STACK would like larger signs for their interested tenants. The multi-tenant pylon sign for the shopping center on the north may be coming first and is proposed to be 30 feet in height. Tenants want visibility for their big box establishments located behind smaller pads up front. The applicant wants to do as few signs as small as possible to get leases signed. Trees would be required in the park strip. A carwash and gas station may be proposed in future phases. The applicant has chased desirable mid-box tenants including a grocer.

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

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

SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPLICATION – public hearing

Item #1: Craig Mattinson – Applicant is requesting a consideration of a Special Exception application, for an approval regarding a driveway width extension to exceed the standard 30 feet, for the property located at 131 S. Bonanza Road, in the AE (Agricultural Estates) zone.

City Planner **Shannon Hansell** presented this item. This special exception is for a requested increased driveway width as measured at the front property line for an additional 12 feet to create a curb cut of 56 feet wide. Driveways are supposed to only be 30 feet wide.

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.

Applicant **Craig Mattinson** addressed the Commission. He needs a 12-foot curb cut to access his new detached garage. This will make it easier to back in a trailer and other items.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing at 7:05 PM.

Andrew Brock, vice president of Mattinson's Homeowner's Association (HOA), said he is in support of this item.

Chair **Frank Adams** closed the public hearing at 7:06 PM.

Two emails received were in favor of this project. Those are included at the end of these minutes.

MOTION:

Kristen Sherlock made a motion that the Planning Commission **approve** the special exception for an increased driveway width at the front property line of up to 56 feet for the Mattinson driveway, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances.

Findings 1-2:

1. The project is located on a parcel of sufficient size to accommodate the special exception.
2. The front portion of the yard which would be accessed is already covered by concrete.

Supplemental Information 1-2:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Site plan

Joey Hansen seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Brian Shepard	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Tony Kalakis	X Aye ____ Nay

REZONE AND SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – all 3 public hearings

Item #2: Charles Rawlins – Applicant is requesting consideration of a request for Schematic Subdivision and Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Rock Haven PUD consisting of six residential lots on 1 acre at 413 South 200 East.

Hansell presented this item. This proposed subdivision is located in the R-2-F zone. The R-2 is the least dense multi-family residential zone for mainly duplex-type development. The lot area in the zone is 10,000 square feet for each single-family or two-family dwelling, with a maximum of two dwelling units per lot. The two parcels combined are 1.04 acres, which is about 45,302 square feet. Under the zoning, this would mean that the property could yield up to three lots, which could each house a duplex (not including standard road access with a cul-de-sac or hammerhead turnaround). The applicant is proposing a six-lot planned unit development, where each lot would be a single-family dwelling. The PUD is being requested to create a private drive that does not meet the City's development standards and to create smaller lot sizes and setbacks for the sake of a single-family lot layout, as well as allowing access across more than one lot to another. There is no bonus density for this project. The yield plan showed three buildable lots under the conventional lot size of 10,000 square feet on which could be built duplexes, up to six dwelling units. In this scenario, the density remains the same—six dwelling units—but the lot sizes require flexibility. Staff recommends tabling this item.

Applicant **David Bell**, a part owner of this land, addressed the Commission. He and his wife, **Jolene**, are not in favor of tabling this item at this point. Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** said the two property owners are co-applicants on this item. The other property owner is **Kelly Rawlins**, who has asked City to table this item. **Gibson** said time may be needed to get both of the applicants united. **Jolene Bell** said **Charlie Rawlins** went behind their backs to ask for this item to be tabled. Without the Commission's favorable recommendation, the **Bells** can't get the money they need to do their part of the project.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing at 7:11 PM.

Kerry Hansen, who lives across the street from this proposed subdivision, addressed the Commission. He described the nature of the street being very pedestrian friendly, but difficult to pull out because of traffic. He is worried about the increased traffic and noise that the new development could bring.

Lonnie Fausett (397 S 200 E., Farmington, Utah) owns land north of the property being discussed. He wants to know if the boundary line will be fenced or not. In the past, the owners piled rocks along the property line and planted trees. The partial rock wall needs to be addressed. Otherwise he agrees with the project going forward.

Chair **Frank Adams** closed the public hearing at 7:15 PM.

The Commissioners all said the partners in the venture need to be on the same page before moving forward. **Adams** agreed and said a PUD is only applicable for a parcel that is at minimum 2.5 acres. This 1-acre parcel does not satisfy that requirement. However, Staff will help the applicants figure out another way to make it work. He said the Commission decides things not based on opinion, but on whether or not it satisfies City code.

MOTION:

Joey Hansen made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend **tabling** the schematic subdivision plan and preliminary PUD master plan for the Rock Haven PUD.

Scott Behunin seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Brian Shepard	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Tony Kalakis	X Aye ____Nay

Item #3: Cole West/Zeus Investments LLC – Applicant is requesting consideration of a rezone of approximately 52 acres of property at 37 North Buffalo Road from Agricultural Very Low Density (AA) to the Agricultural Estates (AE) zoning district to include the Agricultural Planned (AP) District overlay and Schematic Subdivision/General Development Plan for the Heritage residential development consisting of 187 residential lots for applicant Cole West.

Gibson presented this item, 52 acres on the far west side of town. The property owner operates the Buffalo Ranch equestrian center and grounds at the subject address which runs adjacent to the West Davis Corridor (WDC) from roughly Clark Lane to Flat Rock Drive. The property operates as a commercial use and was for many years under a conservation easement that was nullified by the new freeway project. While the conservation easement is no longer in effect to limit what can be done on the property, the City still maintains its land use authority and zoning powers. The existing center essentially operates as a non-conforming business in a zone which otherwise is very limited in the amount of development that would be allowed. The property owner has expressed an interest in changing the use of

the property as the freeway greatly impacted their ability to operate the business as they have in the past. In search of alternate uses, applicant Cole West has come to the table with a proposal for a residential subdivision.

Cole West has been under contract for several months on this property while exploring a number of potential options for development. They received direction from the City Council at a work session and even held neighborhood and small group meetings to get feedback on different concepts to inform the proposal that is under consideration at this time. This hearing is the first proposal formally in front of the Planning Commission for consideration since consideration of a sports complex type proposal a few years ago.

The applicant is requesting the AE zone as it is the dominant district west of I-15 and certainly west of the Denver and Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Rail Trail. This zoning essentially allows for development at 2 units per acre. Of more importance perhaps is the request for the AP Overlay, which allows for consideration of unique rules and restrictions through consideration of a Development Agreement, including establishing an allowed number of lots. The use of the AP district has been anticipated as a likely means for considering any development of this site in large part because it was thought to have been necessary to account for the commercial use in relation to potential residential development. While any commercial component has gone away, the AP overlay can still be used to allow consideration of the requested number of lots, lot sizes, and proposed setbacks. Entitling a project with an agreement can also help ensure elements—like trails with public access or the sound wall—are implemented as proposed.

The existing zone would allow for development of 1 unit for every 5 acres of property. The proposed project, Heritage, is approximately 3.7 units per acre. The development as proposed includes single-family home lots accessed from a public road network with access at the existing entrance to Buffalo Ranch and a second point of access at the bend of Buffalo Ranch Road and Buffalo Circle. Farmington City actually controls a narrow strip of property at this south entrance. Previous conversations have indicated that with acceptable development, the City would be willing to coordinate for access in this area so long as development accounts for the storm water detention currently managed on this ground.

The Development Review Committee (DRC) has reviewed the provided plan. From a technical standpoint, their finding to date is that the plan can be serviced. At this stage in the consideration of development, there are known items to be accounted for. Should initial approvals be granted, the developer would be required to do additional engineering and design work where more work and permitting may be needed to address items such as wetlands, floodplains, storm water, and other soils or hydraulic considerations. A traffic study has been provided, together with the subdivision design that indicates that the projected increase in traffic from the proposed 187-unit development would maintain acceptable levels of service throughout the area. Apart from gathering more detailed information for items previously mentioned at future phases of development, the DRC has commented on the number of cul-de-sacs because they are generally harder to maintain and come with more costs to the City over time.

The rezone and Development Agreement process signify a legislative process granting the City broad discretion in whether or not to approve the request. The Planning Commission is tasked with making a recommendation to the Planning Commission based on its findings of compatibility and/or appropriateness of the request. The General Plan, which was recently updated, offers a vision upon which a motion may be supported. Regarding housing, the plan indicates some themes and priorities for consideration including Preservation of Neighborhood Character, Compatibility and Integrity; Housing Diversity; Cohesive and Sustainable Growth; Compatible and Planned Development Patterns; and Celebrate and Highlight Distinguishing Features.

Gibson said the AA zone is essentially one home for every 5 acres, or a holding zone until more development comes into place. A rezone is a discretionary, legislative action. The Commission would have broad discretion on whether this fits into the area or not. Staff has been receiving many emails about this agenda item.

Sherlock asked if the Army Corps of Engineers has weighed in on the wetlands and bird refuge in the area. **Gibson** said the DRC made up of engineers and utility providers has looked at this morphing application over the years. Deeper engineering and resource gathering will take place at the preliminary plat level. Engineering staff has had some concerns with the hydrology of the area, especially going under the freeway. While the Residential (R) zone allows for five units per acre, this proposal is for about four units per acre, which is worth consideration given the recent General Plan update.

Applicant **Chase Freebairn**, representing Cole West, addressed the Commission. He indicated that their office has talked to the neighbors at two gatherings. They have had to balance a housing shortage along with private property rights of not only the landowner, but the surrounding neighbors as well. While they may not agree, he is glad the neighbors have agreed to speak with him.

The project includes 51.24 acres and 187 single-family detached lots and 10.88 acres (or 20%) of open space. This is 3.65 units per acre, so this is not a dense project in general. There are no apartments, townhomes, or condos. They cannot build under power lines and over easements. Open pastures will be located under the power lines. They will have high standards for architecture, amenities, and open space programmed for families. The homes will start in the \$700,000 range, and he noted by no means is this “affordable housing,” which means something different everywhere you go. Relative to Farmington and surrounding homes, many of which are worth \$1 million to \$1.5 million, this is more attainable.

Playgrounds and community gathering areas will be spread throughout the elongated project area. Heritage will add multiple public access points to trails. The developer is working with landowners to develop a trail along Shepard Creek that connects Buffalo Ranch Road to this project, subject to HOA approval.

There are three lot types: cottage type 1 (82 of these – smallest) with no basements and up to 2,600 finished square feet; cottage type 2 (81 of these – medium size) up to 2,900 finished square feet; and estate lot (24 of these – large lots) up to 2,900 square feet finished. The estate lots will abut existing homes. The smallest lot size is 0.08 acres, largest is 0.76, and the average is 0.16. He indicated that some people cannot afford acres of land, and children should be able to have homes in areas we want. He feels the AP District is the best way to move forward with this application. There should be room for everyone at the table in Farmington. **Freebairn** feels that his application represents the highest and best use for the land. Lastly, he mentioned the developer will pay for and install a 12-foot tall sound wall along the length of the entire WDC, which comes at a huge expense to the developer.

Commissioner **Brian Shepard** asked about lot sizes and the effect on area traffic. He would like to see larger lot sizes and not as many homes in order to make yards bigger for kids to play in. Commissioner **Kristen Sherlock** asked what the yield plan would be if the land remained zoned AA and therefore each lot would be 5 acres. **Freebairn** said while it could be done, it would not be financially and economically viable.

Joey Hansen asked about property values. He asked the audience if the WDC has decreased property values and in turn, could the proposed subdivision lower the value also? **Freebairn** acknowledged that the WDC coming through here upended a lot of people’s worlds, but it can’t be undone. However, buyers are willing to live under power lines near a freeway. The sound wall will mitigate a lot of those concerns and will protect home values. Roads have impacts on values, but there are positives as well.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing at 7:50 PM.

Eric Frauendorfer lives in the Ranches with his wife and bought the property there in 2007 with no knowledge of the WDC. Nothing then was mentioned of future high density development nearby, which would be inconsistent with the homes that exist there now. He was offended by the presentation being characterized as “good for the community,” when it is not since surrounding property will decrease in value. He has already seen an increase in traffic and crime due to recent high density development in the area.

John Poulos (16 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) has lived here since 2016 and has been in the real estate business since 1978. He bought into the area before it changed. He is not sure how a pasture can be under power lines. The WDC was a big change, but the proposed density will make traffic worse.

Denise Poulos, John’s wife, addressed the Commission. Her concerns center on her animals and how they will be received by new neighbors who don’t like them and the snakes and bugs that come with them. Her land floods when it rains, and the property can’t be built up anymore. She is concerned about taxes, traffic, and noise pollution.

Greg Daly (1951 Buffalo Circle, Farmington, Utah) asked the Commission to give a denial as it failed on every priority named in the recently adopted General Plan. This will change the character of the existing neighborhood. There is ample moderate-income housing zoned and planned for in areas other than this. The proposed project is not cohesive and sustainable. You can make a traffic study say anything you want it to say, but the recent death on 1525 speaks to a safety issue in the area that may get worse.

Jim Daly, Greg’s father, has lived in the Ranches since 2007. The proposed lots are so small. They want growth, but not to this extreme.

Keith Gould lives on the corner of Country Bend and Clark Lane. He said this raises serious concerns as he witnesses high traffic volume as well as speeding very often while on walks. The proposed density runs counter to previous precedents set by the City. Clark Lane is the only ingress and egress for the proposed development. He has heard that landowner **Spencer Plummer**’s asking price is \$40 million, and now he is on his fourth developer.

Arianne Hellewell has lived in Farmington Ranches on Comanche for 11 years and has been in real estate for nine years. She does not want the rezoned approved because it does not match the General Plan put out by the City. There is a demand for horse property. Those who bought into The Ranches paid a premium to not be around land that was going to be developed like Cole West’s proposal. They want like-minded neighbors who also want animals. This land was intended to be a conservation easement. While the easement

has been dissolved, the next best option is to leave it zoned as-is. A lot of her neighbors wanted to be here tonight, but can't due to a choir concert in the community. There is not community support for this proposal.

Hayley Rosenbaugh (Flatrock Drive, Farmington, Utah) said this request is not good planning and does not have a community benefit, but rather it is about profit. **Plummer** has raised his asking price, and Cole West can't make it profitable without the rezone. **Plummer** has already been well compensated for the land he sold to the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), reported at \$6.6 million for 232 acres of land that was unbuildable because of the conservation easement. This was a voluntary sale and was not taken by eminent domain. Yet **Plummer** is playing the victim when he shouldn't be. UDOT paid Farmington City \$5 million and an additional \$700,000 for beautification. The people who purchased land at a premium because it was next to a conservation easement have not been compensated. Farmington and the residents didn't want the new freeway. While both **Plummer** and Farmington City have received compensation, rezoning this would compound the impact it has had on the residents, who are bearing the brunt for the WDC. There are 199 acres for sale in Syracuse for \$5.2 million, or \$26,000 per acre. **Plummer** received \$28,500 per acre a decade ago.

Chelsea Hagman lives on Country Bend Road in The Ranches. She is against the rezone. As a librarian at Eagle Bay Elementary in the neighborhood, she sees all the kids walking to school and wants to keep the area rural. She moved to Farmington for a rural area with open space.

Brandon Layton (Flatrock, Farmington, Utah) said he was here 9 months ago and was hopeful Cole West understood neighbors' expectations. This is now a slap in the face. On the south side, WDC has plans for an interchange on 1525, so all those cars will flow through Flatrock. He understands this land will be built on, but they need to be mindful of the existing homes. They expected a sound wall to be built regardless of who ends up owning the property, so it shouldn't be marketed as a bonus.

Marci Porter (Flatrock, Farmington, Utah) said she chose to build a \$1 million home next to the highway because she liked the open area. All the homes in Flatrock are bigger than 1/3 acre, which is the biggest proposed in the new development. Neighbors were not included in the focus group mentioned by the applicant. There are places for others to live in North Farmington Station. Having a place for everyone to live in Farmington is not a good goal. There was a recent lawsuit in Meridian, Idaho, concerned with noise complaints from pickle ball courts.

Sean Martin (2054 W. Buffalo Circle, Farmington, Utah) is against this plan. He is not excited about 300 cars dumping out onto his driveway multiple times a day. It would make it impossible for him and his family to exit and enter his house without a lot of trouble. He also doesn't looking forward to construction vehicles blocking his access for years. He has lived in Farmington for 40 years, and this construction would make him think about moving. He suggested the City purchase this property for an indoor lap pool.

Bryan Bryner (309 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) indicated this proposal is not compliant with the AP zone. He has lived here for 14 years, and times have changed since. The traffic study only accounts for the time delayed intersections due to increased traffic. The study detailed 1,700 daily vehicle trips. He is more concerned with kids walking to school, church, and friends' houses. He has witnessed cars traveling at 60 miles per hour on Buffalo Ranch Road. There isn't even a cross walk crossing Clark lane on the west side to help kids walk to school.

Monica Bell (1712 W. Flatrock, Farmington, Utah) would prefer to keep it AA and believes that North Station Park can handle future housing demands. She does not feel this proposal fulfills the purpose of the zoning ordinance. This is not a matter of community or beautifying the City, but of a profit to the developer.

Joe Belgren has six kids, has lived here since 2006, and sees nothing but greed in this proposal. There is no consideration for the existing neighbors. This is not "Farmington," but an obvious money grab.

Bill Kimble lives a few houses west of the access point. As a lawyer, he understands developers want to make money, which isn't a bad thing. The density is too high for the area and does not fit in with the surrounding 3-acre lots. His lot is just under 1 acre. He won't complain about the pickle ball courts or sound wall, as UDOT stopped the berm on the corner. The Commission should table or deny this proposal. Maybe **Plummer's** ask is too high and needs to be more reasonable.

Nate Tanner (242 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) moved here for the easement and the space. This isn't incremental infill, but a dramatic change in the character of the area. It represents a 40 time reduction in the size of acres compared to the existing parcels. Setbacks are 5 feet on the sides, so people could reach out and touch their neighbor. He appreciates the larger lots on the east abutting his property, but the south end is very dense. He would like more of a buffer between the large and small lots. He is concerned about the ponding of water and wants to make sure there are studies done on this. Plans call for homes to be raised above the floodplain, which could make ponding worse for the existing homes.

Christine Mikklesen (17 N. Buffalo Road, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission via Zoom. She is the other entrance to the neighborhood. She is concerned about an increase in the number of cars that will go past her home and cause congestion on Buffalo Road. This is an emotional issue for the people living there, as they fought WDC for years. This was devastating for them and their way of life, and she asked the Commission not to make decisions that would further hurt residents. She and her neighbors are not opposed to development here; they just want bigger lots. She is worried about newcomers' interactions with the animals on existing abutting lots, which could create liability issues. She asked for substantial fencing separating the new homes from existing animals and pastures.

Michael Criddle (Comanche Road near Country Bend Lane, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission via Zoom. He asked the Commission to deny the proposal for several reasons including density and lot size. He has studied the zoning maps of West Farmington. There is only one small section of the whole AE zone where lot sizes are remotely comparable to what is being proposed.

There are less than 20 along the edge of the AE zoning next to Clark Lane and the Farmington Station area. This is substantially more small lot sizes than anywhere else in the AE zone area including those smaller lots mentioned. This does not fit the character of the community and would have a significant adverse effect on residents. He is not opposed to development, but the lot sizes are significantly too small.

Lauri Nelson (Flatrock Drive, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission via Zoom and agrees with the density concerns voiced earlier. She wanted to emphasize the larger infrastructure concerns in the area. When she goes to work via 1525 each morning, traffic is difficult with the students driving to high school at the same time. She watched a man and his dog almost get hit a week ago. There is nowhere to walk along there.

Adam Hellewell (142 Commanche Road, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission via Zoom. This is not the first or last time this property has come up for development. It is not the City's responsibility to save **Plummer** from a business deal gone bad. This plan goes against established planning guidelines. Clark Lane has needed to be widened to handle traffic increases from other developments. Having been involved in real estate for the past 10 years, he knows property values will be negatively impacted in Flatrock and The Ranches. Larger homes and lot sizes would increase surrounding property values.

Angelle Salway (468 Commanche Road, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission via Zoom. She has property near the denser part on the south side. She is frustrated with this plan and how many homes would be put in such a small area. It doesn't leave enough space for children and families and is incongruent with what is already there. Driving WDC from Farmington to where it ends, there is nothing like this development along the corridor. This could wipe out 80% of the existing equestrian area in Farmington City. Glovers Lane is a major road that is already unsafe with no sidewalks or room for more than two cars. Adding more traffic on that road would be unsafe. The traffic study was conducted when public school was not in session.

Rebecca Child (156 Commanche Road, Farmington, Utah) has an 8-year-old son who goes to and from school and she is concerned for his safety. She doesn't think the horses will be able to share the road with future traffic. Her house backs up to Buffalo Ranch Road, and this would be a big difference in that area. She would like the City to keep the current zoning.

John David Mortensen (1769 W. Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) is pro-property owners and pro-profit. He said the challenge is density. This proposal is consistent with the General Plan in that it is a residential neighborhood. It is not in two other areas including density and consistency with the surrounding area and property use. Commissioners can interpret that it is not compatible. A way to get around this is the AP District, which shouldn't be used. Tabling is only advisable if the applicant would be willing to cut the proposed density in half, which they probably won't. He is in favor of rezoning this area to AE but not with an AP designation. Otherwise, it should be denied.

Andrew Brough (1933 Old Fort Road, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission. He is a commercial developer and broker who is pro-development. However, he would like to see half-acre lots. He bought his home across from the elementary school in 2005 before The Ranches was developed. When Clark Lane became too busy, he moved across the park. The road is already busy and it wouldn't be feasible to add more.

Matthew Rodgers (1919 Old Fort Road, Farmington, Utah) is The Ranches Homeowner's Association (HOA) president over 600 homes. No one he has talked to in his HOA is happy with this proposal. They had to preserve 55 acres for their neighborhood. The proposal's open space is wetlands that otherwise can't be developed. That is not meaningful conservation. They want to see something congruent that matches the General Plan. It is clear that it should be denied as it doesn't match either the AE or AP District. Lot sizes of 0.79 acres is the standard in the area.

Chair **Frank Adams** closed the public hearing at 8:59 PM.

Numerous emails were received regarding this project. Those are included at the end of these minutes.

Commissioner **Scott Behunin** asked the applicant if there was any wiggle room on density. **Freebairn** said they are willing to make some changes, but he is not sure what those changes would be without talking to his team. He wants the chance to go back to the drawing board.

Hansen wondered what happened to the other two developers that had been engaged by **Plummer** in the past. **Freebairn** said he knew there was talk of a soccer facility and fields in the past. **Hansen** said many neighbors were unaware of past meetings with the developer. **Freebairn** said he noticed those meetings twice by mail with landowners within the standard 200 foot range of the property.

Freebairn said he appreciates and respects the comments that were shared tonight. It is clear they care about the community and what is at stake. This is the best possible long-term use of the property, and better than the prior commercial equestrian use. This area has irreversibly changed with the coming of the WDC. He feels residents' pain, but he can't change the past. They tried to buffer the larger lots the best they could, but it is not feasible. This represents reasonable progress in Farmington. Anyone trying to monetize property would not put the biggest, nicest homes along a freeway. Nowhere else would they build a \$1.5 million to \$2 million home against a freeway. At some point, this property will be developed. They have faced strong sentiment from neighbors, whom they disagree with. They are a for-profit developer, and there is nothing wrong with that. Without developers like them, we all would likely not have a home to live in. There is no crime for trying to make a profit in America. They build homes and communities

they are proud of along the Wasatch Front as well as in Southern Utah. They are a Centerville-based builder and developer with employees who live in the cities they develop in. The landowner has the right to develop his property. He would prefer a motion to table rather than an outright denial.

Chair **Adams** said there is a three-way negotiation going on among the City, landowner, and developer. Plummer needs to know the feelings of the City and the residents who showed up tonight. Commissioner **Bran Shepard** is leaning towards denial because the density does not fit the Buffalo Ranch area.

Commissioner **Sherlock** said Cole West makes a good product. She mentioned a recent listing she had with 0.58 acres that sold better than smaller lots despite being close to a freeway. Acreage in this part of the City makes a difference. The Commission received more than 52 emails expressing discontent with this proposal. If residents are to trust the City with the rest of the General Plan, they need to stick true to the plan in all areas of the City. This density doesn't make sense here. If they can discuss larger lots, it's a table; if not, then it is a denial. It has to be a minimum of 0.5 acres.

Commissioner **Tony Kalakis** echoes that it does not fit the surrounding area and is too high of density on the south end. He feels there are better uses for the land and would support a flat-out denial unless they want to consider 0.5-acre lots.

Commissioner **Joey Hansen** asked about the previous zone for The Ranches. **Gibson** said it was likely an AA holding area, and was at one point unincorporated. **Hansen** said it does not match the surrounding area in reference to lot sizes, so it doesn't meet the criteria of the General Plan. He asked what it takes for the City to buy property like Old Farm and the Old Mill. **Gibson** said the City Council controls the purse strings and would have to reallocate the budget to purchase this property if they found it to be a priority. New funding could come from taxes, grants, or donations. He said there is currently not enough money to rehabilitate buildings at the Old Mill. Also, the City is not taking property rights if they choose to leave the zoning as is. He does not believe there is risk in a denial. **Hansen** said he would vote to deny the request, and the findings in the Staff Report articulate the justifications for the denial.

Commissioner **Behunin** said he wished it was a golf course. He does not like the proposed density and would like to see a compromise of 0.5-acre lots. He said we adapt and adjust here in Farmington, but he would like to see this denied.

Chair **Adams** indicated that some of the questions asked of the applicant weren't answered tonight because he is not the landowner, Mr. **Plummer**. The third person is not at the table tonight, while the fourth person (the residents) was. He said that the property will get developed, but this density is astronomically too high. The Commission only recommends to the City Council but does not make the final decision. There is a density and design that would make more sense. The inconsistency with the General Plan is crucial. It does not meet the neighborhood by any stretch of the imagination. He feels the application needs to be denied tonight. This is an active and cohesive group, and he wants them to have the opportunity to participate in a future public hearing.

MOTION:

Kristen Sherlock made a motion to **recommend denial** of the requested rezone to the AE zoning district and AP Overlay with the accompanying agreement and schematic plan for the Heritage.

Findings 1-4:

1. The proposed development is inconsistent with the Farmington City General Plan and vision for the area.
2. The subdivision as designed creates a neighborhood that is incompatible with surrounding neighborhoods.
3. The proposed development does not comply with the stated purpose of the requested zoning district and the AP overlay.
4. Items vocalized by each Farmington City Planning Commissioner tonight.

Kalakis seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Brian Shepard	X Aye ____Nay
Commissioner Tony Kalakis	X Aye ____Nay

Break taken until 9:35 PM.

Item #4: STACK Farmington Land LLC – Applicant is requesting consideration of a request for various Stack Real Estate projects in the North Station area on approximately 117 acres of property between I-15 and the D&RGW Rail Trail south of Shepard Lane and north of Burke Lane.

Master Plat: Clarifying property and project boundary areas, and correcting street dedications over 117 acres of property.

Residential Development

R1 (phase 1) – Schematic Subdivision Plan and Project Master Plan (PMP) for residential development consisting of 37 townhomes and 1 apartment building (52 units) on approximately 5 acres of property south of 950 North Street between Innovator Drive and the D&RGW Rail Trail.

Commercial Development

C1 – Concept Site Plan, Schematic Subdivision, and Project Master Plan (PMP) for a self-storage facility on approximately 3 acres near Shepard Lane on Innovator Drive.

C4 – Concept Site Plan, Schematic Subdivision, and PMP for a commercial retail center including consideration of allowed signage for approximately 8 acres north of 950 N. Street.

C6 – Concept Site Plan, Schematic Subdivision, and PMP for a commercial retail site on approximately 1 acre south of 950 North Street on Innovator Drive.

There are multiple items under consideration with this report. Each item may be addressed individually with a motion if desired. In hopes of simplifying things, each item will be introduced and discussed separately in this report and similarly discuss with the Planning Commission during the 10/9 meeting will follow this piece by piece breakdown of elements being considered.

General Background Information: North Farmington Station: Planning of this area has been ongoing for many years and many hearings have previously taken place including a hearing for R1 and some of the commercial under consideration in this report.

In 2020, STACK Real Estate entered into a Development Agreement with the City, planning approximately 143 acres in the North Farmington Station Project Master Plan (PMP-2-20). This original agreement was included with the Staff Report for reference. The agreement set some high-level expectations as to how the property would develop, granting certain assurances for both the developer and Farmington City. Among other items, the agreement specifically grants the property owner the right to develop residential uses with the Office Mixed Use (OMU) zoning district. To ensure residential doesn't overtake other desired elements of the vision for the area, specific areas were set aside where residential may be included and the agreement outlines that residential development may only proceed at a ratio of 3 acres for every 1 acre of office. However, the yellow area on the attached PMP Land Use Map is entitled to start residential development at any time (this is the R1 project area).

MASTER PLAN/PLAT clarifying property and project boundary areas and correcting street dedications over 117 acres of property: The North Station Master Plat and accompanying land uses total 117 acres. The breakdown of parcels found in the Master Plat is as follows:

1. There are 11 commercial parcels ranging from 1.2 acres to 8.4 acres in size.
2. There are 5 office parcels ranging from 0.57 acre to 16.53 acres
3. There are 4 residential/mixed use parcels ranging from 1.32 acres to 16.7 acres in size.
4. Additional parcels include A and R identifiers that are primarily intended for future boundary adjustment purposes.

The Master Plat merely established parcels, not buildable lots. When each parcel is ready for development in the future, it will require a new plat and specific project review. The Master Plat creates the R1 parcel, the R1 Subdivision plat deals with the project specific easements, as determined by the R1 site plan proposal. The same process applies to the commercial parcels: The Master Plat creates the parcel; the subdivision plat amendment creates the lot; and the site plan determines what easements are needed in the plat amendment and any exceptions to be included in a supplemental Development Agreement.

The idea of recording a Master Plat for the large area is very beneficial moving forward to ensure survey work in the area is consistent. This will enable the clean-up of right of way and make future development less susceptible to error with property boundaries. While properties are labeled to reflect likely residential, mixed, or office development, approval of this plat does not grant further entitlement for land use. The original 2020 land use development agreement still determines land uses and would require an amendment to change those uses.

The DRC has reviewed the plat to ensure that known easements are accounted for and that no parcel is landlocked preventing its future development. Staff is recommending that this Master Plat be forwarded to the City Council with a positive recommendation for approval.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT / PROJECT MASTER PLAN: With the high-level entitlement in place, more detailed plans require review and consideration by the City. Detailed development proposals are considered through site-specific PMPs. For example, the Commission and Council have previously reviewed and approved Canopy Square by Wasatch Development along the south end of the original entitled area under a PMP with its own Development Agreement.

While the R-1 and Commercial items are generally consistent with the existing entitlements and agreements in place with the City, there are clarifying details related to how those areas may be developed which are addressed in the included Development Agreement and PMP. Like a new agreement, amendments to an agreement are a legislative function and grant the City discretion as to whether or not to approve any changes. Both parties need to be okay with any changes before the amended agreement would take effect. Following is a list of key topics the applicant is seeking to be addressed with the new Development Agreement and PMP.

1. Clarifies the height limit for the R1 area granting an option Maintaining 200 feet of two-story buildings to the west before transitioning to higher structures if rental units are pursued, with an option of increasing in height faster if for-sale townhome units are built instead.
2. Allowance of Drive Through use – With additional detail as to how the retail/commercial lots may develop, specific lots or pads have been identified where the ability to include a drive through window are being requested. Actual design of these sites would come at a future time.
3. Deviation from architectural standards including a reduction in required ground level fenestration.
4. Reduction in lot frontage coverage requirements following the proposed design.
5. Approved plan for signage including pylon signs.
6. Parking requirement for self-storage.

If not addressed by the proposed amendments to the Development Agreement listed in the previous section – more could be added to said agreement or a separate / supplemental DA could be considered by the City Council to include certain deviations to Title 11, Chapter 18 Mixed Use Zones.

Gibson said STACK is the primary property owner of the area between I-15 and the Rail Trail, controlling roughly 120 acres on the north end near the Shepard Lane interchange. STACK has been working with the City for many years to determine how this would develop. Multiple prior agreements have been approved that entitle STACK to certain development, which was originally envisioned as an office park and has now shifted to a mixed-use area for long-term sustainability. The Shepard Lane interchange will be functional by spring of 2026. There is a lot of interest in the commercial area, so they want to develop that area as soon as possible.

Chair **Frank Adams** asked for any public comments regarding the M1 Master Plat (essentially designating the Rights of Way) at 9:40 PM; none were given.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT R1 (Phase 1) Schematic Subdivision Plan and PMP for residential development consisting of 37 townhomes and one apartment building (52 units) on approximately 5 acres of property south of 950 North Street between Innovator Drive and the D&RGW Rail Trail: When brought before the Planning Commission in May of 2024, the site plan for parcel R1 showed 135 apartment units and 33 townhome units. In this concept, a pair of two-story apartment buildings were closest to the trail. The current agreement simply states that development in the yellow area must have a two-story element near the trail. The original R1 proposal mimics what was approved regarding building height for 'The Trail', the project to the south which has a 200 ft. buffer distance where height is restricted.

Based on interest from the Planning Commission in seeing more for sale housing, the developer proposed an alternative option which included 197 townhomes units and one 50-unit apartment building in October 2024. This included a single row of 2 story townhomes near the Rail Trail and 3 story structures in the form of 3 story townhomes. The Planning Commission voiced concerns about the architectural design of the buildings, noting a "modern warehouse" feel. Today's proposal contemplates the northern portion of R1 (Phase 1), and includes 37 townhomes and a 52-unit apartment building with updated architecture. The townhomes will be built to be platted individually should for sale housing become an option.

The live/work units along North Station Lane (950 North) remain as originally proposed. The live/work units are part of the red area from the original 2020 agreement so are not currently limited to the 2-story height like the yellow area. The Commission should indicate whether or not it feels the live work satisfies the commercial desire of the original agreement or recommend the changes proposed in the amended development agreement which accommodate this use.

Gibson addressed the R1 piece. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this about 6 months ago, including Phase 1 and most of Phase 2. The City Council already entitled this as a residential component transitioning from two stories to three stories. In Phase 3 and against Innovator, it is planned to be four stories. There are more architectural details offered tonight. The height component is the key issue tonight. Other two-story residential has been developed in the area along the Rail Trail including Arrowgate Townhomes to the north. The Evergreen Project called The Trail is currently being built. STACK is proposing two stories within 200 feet of the Rail Trail before it transitions to three, with additional height extending east toward the interstate. They originally proposed apartments, but have now changed to a townhome style.

The commercial uses toward 950 North didn't come with the same height requirements that the residential did. Instead of straight commercial, STACK is now proposing a live/work product with a three-story component on the end cap. The Commission gets to determine if this is an appropriate switch.

Applicant **Ryan Thomas**, representing STACK Real Estate, addressed the Commission. The buildings marked in blue on the Staff Report are two stories within 200 feet of the Rail Trail.

Chair **Frank Adams** asked for any public comments regarding the R1 element at 9:46 PM.

Kyle Stowell (1764 W. Burke Lane, Farmington, Utah) lives south of the proposed project. Over a dozen years ago, this property was rezoned to OMU and the room was full of people with comments and concerns. That discussion led to talk about buffer zones, which he would like to see. He mentioned previously proposed buffers were a lot more than what is being presented now. For the project to the north, he met with the developer to hear their proposals. The two-story element was the compromise for that area, but he somehow missed that meeting. After they hauled in 8 to 9 feet of fill, it is now much higher than the original ground level. The four-story building on the north part marked in purple would be looking down on the current one-story home to the west.

Amme Ruedas (1864 W. 875 North, Farmington, Utah) lives near the site. She wants to recognize STACK as they have been so good to work with the communication. She referenced a note from a friend regarding the pipeline. They were under the impression nothing could be placed on the pipeline easement, so they are wondering about the plan to put a roadway there. She asked about light pollution coming from the street lights and if they will be shined towards the homes or only towards the business. They live right behind this. She is concerned about emergency response and crime rates. **Ruedas** has concerns about the purple building and has a friend that lives right behind it. **Ruedas** likes the live-work idea and would like to see more. She appreciates the change to townhomes.

Collin Christiansen (852 McKittrick, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Council via Zoom. He lives across from the blue buildings on the south side. He mirrors the previous public comments and said it appears that the buildings creep a little more west each time. He said he mentioned at previous meetings that the renderings look a little like a warehouse district with the lack of trees. He supports the buffer and wants to ensure privacy, not living in a fish bowl. He does not like the four-story purple building as it is intrusive looking down onto a single-story home.

It was asked if there could be an open house with the city, STACK, and surrounding residents.

Chair **Adams** asked how much parking would be lost if the whole block were moved a bit east.

Applicant **Trevor Evans** (4101 Thanksgiving Way, Lehi, Utah) said the 52 units in the apartment building would need that row of parking, as it is right on par with what the market would demand even though it is beyond City minimums. It would impair parking plans dramatically for the developer. It may encroach on a planned lot. They are open to the two-story concept fronting 950 North by removing the live-work element if desired. The landscape plan with trees is coming before final approval, but Enbridge will not allow trees to be planted. Trees on the west side would be within the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) and trail easement. The live/work units would be businesses like tax preparation that don't rely on traffic.

Commissioner **Behunin** said he was leaning toward tabling this item. Others were leaning toward approval. **Sherlock** said she wants to ensure visitor parking. **Adams** said he is ambivalent about the live/work space on each end, as he feels it is an odd location and there is not a need for it. Otherwise, he would vote to approve it.

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT C1: This commercial parcel includes a site plan for a self-storage building. The parcel borders Haight Creek, the Arrowgate townhome subdivision and Shepard Lane. The property owner has been previously entitled to include multi-story self-storage in the North Farmington Station Project Master Plan (pg 7). **Gibson** said they would be indoor and climate controlled. It is an allowed use and best meets the form code, but the architecture doesn't meet expectations including windows on the ground floor. There may be a few thousand residential units in primarily stacked apartments in the area, so there is a demand for this product. Due to the proposed use, the storage building will require exceptions to fenestration requirements as described in 11-18-070 b.5 (D)(F) and c.1 (C) and c.4 (A), all of which describe openings and minimum fenestration percentages. Parking reductions will also

require approval as part of amendments to the Development Agreement. It is recommended as part of the North Station Area Master Plan, that an easement is added and shown on the site plan for a pedestrian footpath along Haight Creek. The applicant said there is a demand for self-storage as evidenced by their saturation analysis of current and future residents. This area is already significantly underserved. The sizes range from 5x5 feet to 10x30 feet accessible only during 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. (not 24 hours). Paying customers will have their own code to ensure security. STACK will own it and hire a management company to run the self-storage.

Chair **Frank Adams** asked for any public comments regarding the C1 Self Storage at 10:19 PM.

Amme Ruedas (1864 W. 875 North, Farmington, Utah) said self-storage in this area is very needed. She would like the outside to look like a warehouse since it is so close to residential.

The applicant said they originally submitted a plan with less relief and different materials. After feedback similar to **Ruedas's**, they changed their plans. There will be a mix of materials.

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT C4 and C6: This is the northern area of Stack's property nearest the new interchange at Shepard Lane and I-15. While Exhibit "E" shows a fair amount of detail, it has been created to help understand how stores would likely situate on each property. The applicant is in talks with a number of interested parties, but specifics would come at a future date with site plan reviews as to how each will actually develop. A summary of the applicant's vision for this area is to include more auto-oriented and suburban type uses north of 950 North with the more urban and pedestrian-oriented uses south of 950 North street.

For now, because of the large demand for drive-through windows on stores, particularly for food users, the applicant is showing where they would like to have permission to propose a drive-through. This is identified within the proposed language for the Amendment to the Development Agreement. Consideration of the subdivision may require some flexibility to the Regulating Plan for the area with deals with block size and road patterns.

In addition to a concept layout and site plan, the applicant has included details of the signage that they hope to build for this commercial area. The OMU district allows for wall signs and smaller monument signs. The site plan for C6 shows a potentially multi-tenant building with access through Parcel C5 onto Innovator Drive. C6 and C5 border R1. Exceptions to be included in a DA would be building siting, specifically lot frontage percentages and percent of building within 20 feet of the right-of-way. When C6 was originally reviewed in October 2024, it was a potential site for an urgent care, with a drive-thru use, the current proposal for C6 does not include a driveway. C6 is under 5 acres and the building is less than 30,000 sf, so final site plan review for this item will be handled by Staff. Considerations for the Planning Commission are exceptions in the Development Agreement and approval of the schematic subdivision.

Gibson said Staff's biggest issue is that the OMU district doesn't allow for drive-throughs, so the Commission will have to accept them on a case-by-case basis. Closer to the freeway is more auto-centric, which will change as you go south and east, where things are more pedestrian-friendly. Post-COVID the demand for drive-throughs have continually increased. **Gibson** asked if the Commission wanted to provide input on architecture, and presented images of pitched roofs and flat roofs.

Sherlock said she would prefer a variety of façade styles so they don't look dated in the future. **Evans** said they call their design "modern agrarian" melted with a modern retail look, and they also don't want it to look dated. He would rather have a timeless design.

Gibson said he would like the Commission to consider signage, particularly a pylon sign of the proposed scale on the corner of 950 North. **Adams** said he would like to see a better design, although he understands the need for big box establishments in the back to get exposure. **Sherlock** said 950 North doesn't have high speeds, so a large sign is not needed. She asked how tall the Maverik sign is on Park Lane, because she feels it is a bit high in that area for the scale of the building. Bigger is not always better.

Evans said they were going after the Farmington stone look and other Station Park signage. They want to lead with the signage so future tenants can't come forward with their own proposals. It will help make negotiations easier. They want a seamless signage experience throughout the development. This proposed design is modeled after The Meadows on State Street in American Fork.

Behunin said it would depend on height. **Hansen** proposed having Staff make the decision on sign heights. **Kalakis** said he is indifferent about signs. **Sherlock** said she would like to see smaller signs. She would like to control the decision rather than let the tenant make the decision for the City. She mentioned the Costco sign at 400 West in Bountiful as it is not too big for the five-lane road. **Shepard** would like a shorter sign. **Adams** said he is ambivalent, but he doesn't like the proposed design and would rather see other options. He would like the sign a bit shorter.

Evans said they could work with Staff to identify height and design feedback. It makes sense to scale signs down as you move further to the west. **Gibson** said the Commission is not the final approval. They could recommend approval with comments on signage height. They can still take public comment on the issue.

Chair **Frank Adams** opened the public hearing regarding C4 and C6 at 10:43 PM.

Amme Ruedas (1864 W. 875 North, Farmington, Utah) said the proposed design is clean and nice, but too tall for the homes and trail around the area. She liked the lower sign designs shown tonight. The applicant has put together a nice, cohesive design.

Michael Criddle addressed the Commission via Zoom. He thinks the sign is gaudy, tall, and unappealing. He would like to see other options that better appeal to residents.

Adams closed the public comments.

Gibson said the motion could read as presented by the Staff Report, replacing the storage unit facade with that shown during the meeting, with a shorter sign. Minor changes could be made between the Planning Commission and the City Council, with the Council seeing the final version.

MOTION:

A. Master Plat **Joey Hansen** motioned that the Planning Commission **recommend approval** of the Stack Master Plat subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met.

Findings 1-3:

1. The stated Master Plat aligns with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan and original Stack Development Agreement from 2020.
2. The proposed plat does not create buildable lots, but parcels, which will require further review prior to development.
3. Recording the proposed plat will clean up property boundaries and rights-of-way while providing for easier identification of future development.

B. Schematic Subdivisions **Joey Hansen** motioned that the Planning Commission **recommend approval** of the schematic subdivision plans for R1, C1, C4, and C6, subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met.

Finding 1:

1. The stated schematic subdivision plans align with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan and original Stack Development Agreement from 2020.

C. Development Agreements **Joey Hansen** made a motion that the Planning Commission **recommend approval** for Development Agreements for R1, C1, C4, and C6, subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met for final site plan review.

Finding 1:

1. The stated concept site plans align with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan and original Stack Development Agreement from 2020.

D. Concept site plans **Joey Hansen** made a motion that the Planning Commission **approve** the concept site plans for R1, C1, C4, and C6, subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met. Final site plan approval for C6 will be by City Staff.

Findings 1-2:

1. The stated concept site plans align with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan and original Stack Development Agreement from 2020 and the proposed Development Agreement and Project Master Plan (PMP).

2. Refer final approval to the City Council in reference to the height of the sign and add new item for the façade as seen tonight into the agreement.

Supplemental Information 1-8:

1. Vicinity Map and Context Map
2. Existing Agreements
3. Master Plat
4. Development Agreement
5. R1 Residential – Concept Site Plan and Schematic Plat
6. C1 Commercial - Concept Site Plan and Schematic Plat
7. C4 Commercial - Concept Site Plan and Schematic Plat
8. C6 Commercial – Concept Site Plan and Schematic Plat

Kristen Sherlock seconded the motion, which was unanimous.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Brian Shepard	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Tony Kalakis	X Aye ____ Nay

OTHER BUSINESS

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

- a. Planning Commission Minutes Approval for September 18, 2025: all in favor with a few typos and grammar changes.
- b. City Council Report for October 7, 2025: **Gibson** said the City Council approved the Sorrel Springs project, which is a 10-lot subdivision off Compton, after a lengthy discussion and some objections.
- c. At the next meeting, **Gibson** said a water component will be presented as an amendment to the General Plan. An applicant will be proposing new construction through a trade secret clause, which means it cannot be presented during a regular public meeting. He invited Commissioners to come by and look at the plans, but Commissioners will need to keep details from the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Frank Adams motioned to adjourn at 10:51 PM.

Chair Frank Adams	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Scott Behunin	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Brian Shepard	X Aye ____ Nay
Commissioner Tony Kalakis	X Aye ____ Nay

Frank Adams, Chair

Tyler Turner Vice Chair

Planning commission meeting Oct 9 Cole West development

From galant2424 <galant2424@yahoo.com>

Date Mon 9/29/2025 11:24 PM

To Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

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 want to express my continued concerns on behalf of myself and all of my neighbors.

1. The Density is Still Too High

The core issue remains: 100% of the proposed lots are dramatically smaller than the existing zoning in our area, which is a minimum .50 acres per lot. This area was originally planned with intentional very low-density zoning to serve as a buffer between residential areas and sensitive wetlands. That buffer is critical not just to protect the environment, but to preserve the semi-rural character and safety of our neighborhood.

2. The Highway Does Not Justify Ignoring City Planning

While the West Davis Corridor has changed the landscape, it should not be used to rationalize abandoning long-standing planning principles. If anything, this makes it more essential to uphold low-density zoning in the remaining transition zones. These green spaces still serve a purpose, even with the highway nearby.

3. The Traffic Impact Will Be Significant

This proposal adds 187 homes, funneling hundreds of additional vehicles through residential roads and directly past Eagle Bay Elementary School, with a blind corner for eastbound traffic, which already experiences heavy traffic during school hours. The proposed density will create congestion and increase safety risks for children and families—something city officials should take very seriously. This type of high density development should only be allowed near the transit hub areas near 1-15 and Station Park. Mayor Anderson stated this to me personally.

4. This Will Alter the Social and Demographic Fabric

High-density housing attracts a different buyer profile than estate-style homes. This creates a mismatch in neighborhood expectations, values, and use of space. It risks disrupting the sense of community we've worked hard to maintain and introduces tension between incompatible living styles.

5. It Sets a Dangerous Precedent

Perhaps most concerning of all: approving this zoning change opens the door for more high-density rezoning next to very low-density neighborhoods throughout the city. If this change is allowed here, it will undermine trust in Farmington's long-term planning, inviting piecemeal exceptions and increased pressure from profit-driven developers.

6. The Profit Incentive is CLEAR! —But the Community Cost is Greater

We understand that this new proposal, even without townhomes, would generate significantly more profit than a very low-density alternative. However, city planning should never be driven by developer profit. Residents live with the consequences—traffic, crowding, lost open space, school strain, and irreversible changes to the land.

In Summary: This updated proposal does not reflect what is best for the community, the environment, or the long-term health of our city. We ask you to deny the Cole West development as proposed. Or recommend they are limited to the same zoning as the adjoining Ranches phase 8, 0.50-acre minimum lots—or seeking development opportunities in areas already zoned for higher density.

We cannot attend in person. Please consider our feedback for record.

Kevin and Patricia Tanis
397 s buffalo ranch rd
Farmington
801-726-4820

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S25 Ultra, an AT&T 5G smartphone

Recall: Buffalo Ranch Development THUMBS DOWN...

From Chris Burns <chrisburns@tech-steel.com>

Date Tue 9/30/2025 11:09 AM

To chase@colewest.com <chase@colewest.com>; Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>;
shansell@farmintong.utah.gov <shansell@farmintong.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Cc Marlene Burns (marleneburns2006@gmail.com) <marleneburns2006@gmail.com>

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.

Chris Burns would like to recall the message, "Buffalo Ranch Development THUMBS DOWN...".

RE: Buffalo Ranch Development THUMBS DOWN...

From Chris Burns <chrisburns@tech-steel.com>

Date Tue 9/30/2025 11:11 AM

To chase@colewest.com <chase@colewest.com>; Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>; Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>

Cc Marlene Burns (marleneburns2006@gmail.com) <marleneburns2006@gmail.com>

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.

Farmington City Planning Commission,

We have very strong feelings about the changes that are being proposed to the west and south of our home by this "development".

When we purchased in 2012, the HOA, Farmington City, Great Salt Lake Conservation areas and trails (and UDOT other than WDC) all indicated that there would be NO further development west and south of this area. This is the entire reason we chose this area to move to. To be on the edge of the Great Salt Lake Conservation area, Eccles Education, Farmington Bay and Wetlands.

No to homes.

No to high density living.

No to added streets and traffic.

No to soccer fields and night lighting.

No to blocked views.

Thank you



Chris Burns
JD Sales Manager
chrisburns@tech-steel.com
O: 801-328-2543 D: 801-820-5548
C: 801-647-4731



Fwd: Plummer could stay rather than this many new Homes

From Megan Parkin <meganparkin32@gmail.com>

Date Tue 9/30/2025 12:45 PM

To Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>; Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>

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,

I live in Flatrock Ranch on a half acre lot.

CW is building 28 homes behind my home next to the West Davis Corridor.

My concerns are with their new proposed plan where Buffalo Ranch currently is.

Each household owns at least 2 vehicles. This causes drivers to fly past my home to get to 1525 West (where there was a recent fatality).

These changes will affect me.

There are zero apartments along Legacy Highway.

I want to see Zero Apartments in my area near Flatrock and the Davis Corridor.

I would rather have Plummer stay than this many new homes.

-Megan Parkin

FW: Please consider our neighborhood

From Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>

Date Tue 9/30/2025 2:22 PM

To Lyle Gibson <lgibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

From: Kami Stewart <kamifay@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:12 PM

To: Shannon Hansell <shansell@farmington.utah.gov>

Subject: Please consider our neighborhood

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,

My name is Kami Stewart and I live at 413 Comanche Road in West Farmington. I am writing to ask you to please advocate for us in the situation regarding the Buffalo Ranch property.

I think that squeezing nearly 200 homes into that space is a bad idea for many reasons. The main roads to access the neighborhood are Clark Lane (which passes Eagle Bay elementary school right on a bend in the road--already a dangerous situation!) and Glovers Lane which is dangerously narrow and highly trafficked by High School drivers. Adding hundreds of additional cars onto those roads each day could be disastrous.

Those of us who moved to the West edge of The Ranches were willing to live with the aggressive mosquitos and the floodplain risks in order to have property surrounded by less homes and people. We took a BIG hit when UDOT decided to build the Highway right next to our previously quiet yards and nature trails. :(We hope that you will do what you can to help us keep the impact of this project from further destroying the country feel of our neighborhood!

Thank you for taking time to consider this request.

-Kami Stewart and family

Opposition to the proposed Rezoning and High-Density at Buffalo Ranch

From Sarah Martin <sjmartin1982@gmail.com>

Date Thu 10/2/2025 9:36 AM

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

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 Carly Rowe -

My name is Sarah Martin, my family and I have lived at the south end of Buffalo Ranch Road for 11 years, owning our property for nearly 20. We love this community and are deeply invested in its future.

I want to emphasize that we are not opposed to high-density housing in principle. My family has lived in and worked with high-density communities. I worked for Garbett Homes before having children, and I understand the important role townhomes and high-density developments can play in providing affordable housing in a community. But what is being proposed here is neither affordable nor appropriate for this location. CW has stated that these homes will *start* at \$800,000. At that price, they are already out of reach for the families high-density developments are meant to serve. So why does this project need to be high density? Who benefits from this, other than the developer's bottom line?

Farmington already has a well-planned high-density area—North Station—which was designed for this purpose. It has wide roads, infrastructure, and walkability built in to support high numbers of residents. Buffalo Ranch Road and Flat Rock Drive are very different: they are narrow residential roads, barely fitting three cars across. Adding more than 400 cars a day would overwhelm them. The proposal also lacks visitor parking, which will force overflow parking onto our streets, making these already-narrow roads even more dangerous.

Many have made the argument that with the closeness of this land to the Davis Corridor the only thing that will sell is high density. To that I argue back, look at the communities we already have, or are currently building, or were just approved, that are lining Legacy Freeway and the Davis Corridor here in Farmington. They are not high density communities. So what makes this land any different?

On a very personal note, I probably should have started with this point, because it is the most important to me, one of the proposed neighborhoods has 111 homes. For this section of the development, its main entrance is directly across from my driveway. Even if each home had only one car (which is unrealistic), that's 111 cars funneling straight into my driveway every day. Realistically, it will be closer to 200–300 cars. This is not safe, fair, or responsible planning.

I also want to point out the drainage parcel next to the proposed entrance across from my house. It fills every spring. What will happen to this drainage area? Has this problem been addressed?

This rezoning request is not about building affordable homes or strengthening Farmington's housing options. It is about maximizing profit from poorly situated land, at the expense of current residents who will bear the cost in traffic, safety, and quality of life.

As a neighborhood who has dealt with the sneaky and unlawful ways that Spencer Plummer tries to make a buck, this is where we must draw the line. My family, and the whole Ranches neighborhood should not be asked to pay the price he is demanding. We would rather deal with his parties and noise than let this rezoning go through. The current zoning fits this neighborhood and part of Farmington better, that is why it is zoned that way.

I respectfully ask you, as a member of the Planning Commission, to DENY this rezoning request. Please preserve the integrity of our community and keep high-density development where it belongs—in the areas Farmington it has already been planned and prepared for.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Sarah Martin

Buffalo Ranch Concerns

From Mollee Steele <molleesteele8@gmail.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 1:01 PM

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

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

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.

Good afternoon,

My name is Mollee Steele and my husband and I have lived in Farmington for 19 years. We have lived in our current home on Comanche Road for 12 1/2 years. We love it here and want to stay forever. We have concerns over the possible change in zoning for Buffalo Ranch. Buffalo Ranch is zoned for agricultural use and using that as a commercial venue is a zoning violation that the city needs to enforce. We also don't want a zoning change to be approved because that would allow a lot of homes to be built really close together. We want to maintain the zoning integrity of our lovely neighborhood and maintain the landscape as it was intended. This is not a trivial thing.

Our concerns if you were to approve a zoning change are set forth below:

1. Environmental: Expanding housing into undeveloped areas can destroy ecosystems, displace wildlife, and reduce biodiversity. Construction activities and the resulting increase in population density can contribute to greater energy consumption and emissions. Building more housing without thoughtful planning can lead to inefficient land use and dependence on cars, worsening pollution and traffic congestion. More homes increase demand for water, electricity, and waste disposal, which can strain local resources and infrastructure.
2. Safety / Infrastructure: Rapid housing development can outpace the expansion of schools, hospitals, roads, public transport, and emergency services. Increased population density often leads to more vehicles on the roads, causing congestion and longer commute times. The increase would also jeopardize the safety of the people in our neighborhoods as there would be more cars on the roads. We do not want to see a large increase in traffic on our roads with cars exiting and entering the neighborhood. There are only a few ways to get in and out and we don't want those roads overcrowded.

Another concern is the narrow roads in this area. A large part of Glovers lane is, as I understand it, considered a country road and thereby isn't under the same rules for width of roads. There are no "country roads" now in Farmington. Drive that road at 715 any school morning with kids heading to

Farmington High and you will see your life flash before your eyes. It is barely wide enough for two regular cars. It is definitely not wide enough for a car and a truck or a bike or a runner etc. This country road isn't equipped for the increased traffic that a new group of homes or apartments would create.

3. Community and Cultural Concerns: New developments, especially high-density housing, can change the aesthetic and cultural feel of neighborhoods which we strongly resist. Construction can cause long-term disruption, noise, and dust, affecting the quality of life for all of us who are nearby.

FARMington must remain a FARMing town, not a metropolis made up of too many homes and apartments where they were never meant to be! We want to preserve some open areas that create the farm feel of our city.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mollee & Jeffrey Steele

19 year+ residents of Farmington

Public Hearing Comment - Oct 9, 2025

From Al Ogles <alvin@riverbendmedia.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 1:31 PM

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

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 Members of the Farmington City Council,

My name is Alvin Ogles and I am a resident of Country Bend Road in Farmington. I have reviewed the developer presentation by Cole West regarding the proposed rezoning and subdivision, and I am strongly opposed to this project.

My primary concerns include the high density of small lots, which would significantly increase road traffic in our neighborhood. We were fortunate to avoid the construction of an on/off ramp for the West Davis Corridor on Clark Lane, and I urge the city to similarly protect our community by denying this rezoning and subdivision request.

I would support a development that aligns more closely with the rural character of the area, such as equestrian homes on lots of 2 acres or larger. Please carefully consider the long-term impacts of this proposal on the existing community, including traffic congestion, quality of life, and preservation of our neighborhood's charm.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I appreciate your commitment to thoughtful decision-making that benefits all residents.

Sincerely,

Alvin Ogles
187 Country Bend Rd Farmington, UT 84025 801.230.1225

Public comment on Rezoning at 37 Buffalo Rd, Farmington

From Chelsea Hagman <c.hagman33@gmail.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 5:13 PM

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

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,

I am a resident of Farmington Ranches and I am opposed to the rezoning proposed by Cole West/Zeus Investments LLC – Applicant is requesting consideration of a Rezone of approximately 52 acres of property at 37 North Buffalo Rd from AA to the AE zoning district to include the AP.

I am opposed to this plan because our neighborhood does not have the infrastructure to handle all that traffic. Additionally, it would change the feel of our neighborhood by putting all those houses so close together. We love the open land and want to keep the serene small town feel of Farmington.

Please do not allow this rezoning the happen.

Thanks!

Chelsea Hagman

1722 Country Bend Rd, Farmington, UT 84025

Concern About Proposed Buffalo Ranches Zoning

From Jane Johnson <janey.johnson@gmail.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 9:38 PM

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

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 Members of the Farmington Zoning Commission,

I wanted to reach out to ask that you do not approve the proposed zoning for the Buffalo Ranches small housing units. I understand that Farmington is growing and that development near the freeway can make sense, but this specific project feels out of step with the area and will create some serious challenges for the community.

Traffic in this area is already overwhelming during peak hours—especially at the four-way stop at 1525 and Clark Lane. It's often backed up and confusing, and adding even more cars from a high-density development will make it chaotic.

I'm also really worried about safety. Our area still has a small-town feel where a lot of kids walk, bike, and play outside. Adding more homes and cars in this finite space makes that much more dangerous.

Beyond that, this type of development just doesn't match the surrounding area. We already have higher-density housing closer to the freeway, which makes sense there, but pushing it past the rural homes will lower property values and chip away at the unique farming-town character that makes this part of Farmington special.

There are also broader concerns—our roads, utilities, and schools are already stretched. Adding this level of density will strain resources that weren't designed for it. And as the land out here transitions from open space to pavement, we lose the green buffers, natural runoff, and wildlife that have always defined this side of town.

I'm not against growth—just hoping it's done in a way that fits the area and preserves what's left of Farmington's rural heart.

Thank you for considering the perspective of those of us who live here and care deeply about this community. I'm not able to come to the meeting but want to make my voice heard.

Warmly,

Jane Johnson

284 Wrangler rd

Farmington UT 84025

208-757-9088

Public Comment on Heritage Development (37 N Buffalo Ranch Road) - Planning Commission Meeting 10/09/2025

From Seth Johnson <sethjohnson@gmail.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 10:01 PM

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

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,

I am writing to submit my public comments regarding the proposed Heritage development at 37 N Buffalo Ranch Road, scheduled for your meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2025. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the meeting in person due to my daughter's choir concert at the junior high, but I wanted to ensure my perspective is made known and officially part of the record.

First, I want to express my appreciation for the growth our city is experiencing. I've loved the new people moving into our area. The townhouses around Innovator have brought new welcomed neighbors. I fully support the idea that increased housing supply helps bring housing costs down, allowing others to enjoy the wonderful community we have here. I am likewise not against housing at 37 N Buffalo Ranch Road generally.

However, the current plan proposing 187 residential lots (approximately 3.65 units per acre) is, in my view, greedy, out of place, and not safe for our community.

My request is simple and reasonable: let's keep the housing density fairly consistent with what's around it. The current plan, which includes predominantly 0.11-acre lots, is a substantial deviation from the surrounding lot sizes. If the current plan goes into effect, even a complete stranger would be able to visit our community and immediately notice the blatant misfit of this development.

Furthermore, the significant increase in traffic poses a major safety concern. As we know, we've recently seen tragic loss of life along what would now be the major artery for this development. Adding hundreds of new vehicle trips a day without adequate infrastructure improvements is irresponsible.

We expect a lot from our town leaders. Reasonable and responsible development is what we are asking for, and the current proposal for the Heritage development is not it. Please consider the profound impact this over-densified project will have on neighborhood character and public safety before making your recommendation.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration of these vital community concerns.

Sincerely,

Seth Johnson

284 Wrangler Rd.

Farmington, UT 84025

Public comment on Rezoning at 37 Buffalo Rd, Farmington

From Chase Hagman <chasehagman@gmail.com>

Date Tue 10/7/2025 7:04 AM

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

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,

I am a resident of Farmington Ranches and I am opposed to the rezoning proposed by Cole West/Zeus Investments LLC – Applicant is requesting consideration of a Rezone of approximately 52 acres of property at 37 North Buffalo Rd from AA to the AE zoning district to include the AP.

I am opposed to this plan because our neighborhood does not have the infrastructure to handle all that traffic. Additionally, it would change the feel of our neighborhood by putting all those houses so close together. We love the open land and want to keep the serene small town feel of Farmington.

Please do not allow this rezoning to happen.

Thank you for your time.

--

Chase Hagman

Buffalo Ranch rezoning

From staceydavis349@gmail.com <staceydavis349@gmail.com>

Date Mon 10/6/2025 6:14 PM

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 whom it may concern:

I am writing to inform the planning commission of my opinions regarding the rezoning of Buffalo Ranch. I am concerned that the current plan proposed by CW is too dense. While some homes in that area could bolster Eagle Bay's enrollment problem, decrease the mosquito population, and provide much needed housing, exercising some moderation by preserving the current zoning would be best for the safety and feel of the city.

My main concern is that the lack of road access will cause all of the traffic to spill into surrounding neighborhoods that were never meant to handle that level of traffic, causing increased pedestrian and car accidents, parking problems, and difficult access in emergencies.

Another concern is that West Farmington was intended to be more open, so it does not make sense to go from large open areas to tiny lots. Keeping this area zoned as AA will allow Farmington to keep its farm-town feel and will enhance the beauty of the city. It is my understanding that the city plan is to decrease in density as it expands west, so a super dense at the edge of more open lots will look and feel like a circus. We have plenty of high-density housing going in north of Station Park that will fill that need for our city, so I don't think we need more of it out west.

As difficult as it can be to deal with Plummer, I'd prefer Buffalo Ranch to stay in his hands and retain its AA zoning than to change the zoning to allow an unsafe and unsightly level of development.

Thank you for your consideration,
Stacey Davis

Nicole Knowles
42 South Buffalo Ranch Road
Farmington, Utah 84025
Nickknowles84@gmail.com

October 5, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission
Farmington, Utah 84025

Re: Opposition to Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of the Buffalo Ranch property. I strongly oppose this change, as it represents irresponsible city planning that does not prioritize the best interests of current residents, landowners, or the long-term character of our community.

Rezoning Buffalo Ranch away from AA zoning would erode the rural lifestyle that Farmington has always valued. Larger lot sizes attract like-minded residents who appreciate open space, animals, horses, and the rural way of life. Reducing lot sizes to 2–3 acres butting directly against 0.10-acre lots creates a jarring and incompatible development pattern. Such an approach undermines the integrity of our existing subdivisions and fails to protect property values or quality of life.

Infrastructure is already strained. Our secondary schools are overcrowded, yet new developments continue without consideration for long-term capacity. Growth west of I-15 should be paused until the second fire station is completed. With the county jail, the amusement park, the new sports complex, and Station Park already demanding significant police and fire resources, it is clear that public safety cannot keep pace with unchecked development.

The builder has argued that high-density housing belongs next to freeways. This is simply not the case in our city. Established neighborhoods such as Flat Rock, Chestnut Farms, and Miller Farms — located directly along Legacy Highway — are comprised of large lots and mini-estates, not high-density housing. The precedent in Farmington has been rural estates along the freeway corridor, not high-density subdivisions.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to development or even to a new subdivision at Buffalo Ranch, so long as zoning is respected and continuity with the surrounding area is preserved. What I strongly oppose is a zoning change that introduces high-density housing next to farmland and agricultural properties. Such development inevitably creates conflict: new residents unfamiliar with rural life will complain about flies, manure smells, and the presence of large animals, while long-time rural residents are forced to defend practices and values that have always defined our community.

Finally, I ask the Commission to consider a broader question: must every inch of Farmington be developed? Our city has experienced years of relentless growth, often prioritizing quantity over quality. It is time to pause, refocus on the quality of life for existing residents, and ensure safety, infrastructure, and rural heritage are protected before more high-density projects are approved.

For these reasons, I urge you to reject the proposed rezoning of Buffalo Ranch. Please protect the integrity, safety, and rural character of Farmington by keeping AA zoning in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Nicole Knowles

Jordan and Laurie Call

1674 Clark Ln.

Farmington, UT 84025

October 7, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission

160 S. Main Street

Farmington, UT 84025

Subject: Opposition to the Proposed Rezone and Schematic Plan for “The Heritage” Subdivision (51-Acre Parcel, 187 Units, Rezone from AA to AE/AP)

Dear Members of the Farmington City Planning Commission,

As long-term residents living near the proposed “The Heritage” subdivision, we respectfully oppose the rezone from Agricultural (AA) to AE/AP and the schematic plan for 187 residential units on a 51-acre parcel. While we support sustainable growth in Farmington, this proposal raises serious concerns about traffic congestion, infrastructure limitations, emergency evacuation routes, and the preservation of our neighborhood’s character. Below, we provide a detailed analysis, supported by facts, data, and personal experiences, to highlight the potential impacts of this development.

1. Infrastructure and Traffic Limitations

The proposed development fronts Clark Lane, a minor collector road with one lane in each direction, curb, and gutter, which already operates at capacity during peak hours. Without direct access to the new state highway, all traffic from the 187 proposed units—estimated to generate approximately 400–500 additional daily vehicle trips—will funnel through Buffalo Ranch Road and Clark Lane, which serve as collectors for multiple existing subdivisions. Freeway access is restricted to Park Lane, creating a significant bottleneck that exacerbates congestion.

Lived Experience and Safety Risks: Over the past ten years, Clark Lane has seen a marked increase in traffic volume and speeding. Drivers frequently exceed the posted speed limit, posing risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and children. A tragic bike accident on 1525 West, which claimed the life of a young cyclist, underscores the urgent need for enhanced traffic safety measures. A personal incident further illustrates this danger: last year, our four-year-old son’s upright scooter rolled into Clark Lane and was crushed by a speeding truck, whose driver continued at full speed. Our child was mere feet from a potentially fatal accident. Despite our prior requests for traffic calming measures, the City’s response—a small “reduce speed” sign—has been inadequate.

The absence of direct highway access amplifies the traffic burden on local roads, significantly impacting residential livability. The developer’s traffic study may suggest capacity, but it does not reflect the real-world congestion and safety challenges we experience daily. Adding 400–500 vehicles to this strained corridor would exacerbate these issues, directly conflicting with General Plan Policy 5.5.4, which mandates “adequate street design standards appropriate for the context.”

2. Limited Emergency Evacuation Routes

The Ranches community faces critical vulnerabilities due to limited evacuation routes, a concern highlighted during the 2021 “Legacy Fire.” Clark Lane and Park Lane are the primary access routes, with only a single dirt road to Centerville as a secondary option. This creates a dangerous bottleneck during emergencies, endangering residents’ safety. The addition of 187 households would further strain these routes, potentially overwhelming evacuation capacity. General Plan Policy 5.5.10 requires development proposals to be assessed for infrastructure adequacy, including emergency access. Approving this rezone without addressing these limitations would jeopardize community safety.

3. Incompatibility with Neighborhood Character and Density

The Heritage proposal, with 187 units on lots averaging 0.11–0.12 acres, deviates significantly from the low-density, conservation-oriented character of surrounding neighborhoods. Nearby developments reflect a deliberate pattern of larger lots:

- **Ranch Road (Northeast boundary):** 27 lots averaging 0.37 acres
- **Buffalo Ranch Road (East boundary):** 35 lots averaging 1.41 acres
- **Flatrock Ranch (Southeast boundary):** 40 lots averaging 0.54 acres
- **Farmstead Subdivision (Approved 2025):** 30 lots averaging 0.27 acres, approved only after purchasing 17 Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) to exceed the zoning limit of 13 lots on a 15-acre parcel

The 102 homes adjacent to the proposed site average 0.79 acres per lot, with some as large as 2.94 acres. The Heritage’s proposed density—over three times that of surrounding areas—would disrupt this cohesive, rural-residential character, undermining the City’s planning efforts.

General Plan Alignment: The General Plan designates this area as Neighborhood Residential (NR), intended for medium-to-large lots or clustered developments with meaningful open space to protect sensitive areas (Section 5.3). The Heritage proposal, with 86% of lots sized at 0.11–0.12 acres, fails to meet this standard. Goals 5.4.1–5.4.3 and Policies 5.5.5, 5.5.9, and 5.5.10 emphasize preserving neighborhood character, supporting conservation-oriented development, and ensuring compatibility with existing patterns. This proposal introduces suburban-scale density that conflicts with Farmington’s rural-residential identity and infrastructure design.

4. Recommendations and Conclusion

We urge the Planning Commission to deny the proposed rezone from AA to AE/AP and the schematic plan for The Heritage subdivision. To address our concerns, we respectfully request:

1. **Independent Traffic Study:** Commission a comprehensive analysis of Clark Lane’s capacity, focusing on peak-hour congestion, speeding, and pedestrian safety, with actionable traffic calming measures.
2. **Enhanced Emergency Access:** Develop additional evacuation routes for the Ranches community to mitigate risks before approving high-density developments.

3. **Adherence to General Plan:** Ensure any development aligns with the Neighborhood Residential designation, prioritizing medium-to-large lots and open space to preserve the area's character.

We sincerely appreciate the Planning Commission's commitment to Farmington's residents. As you review this proposal, we ask that you prioritize the safety, quality of life, and neighborhood integrity of current residents, in alignment with the General Plan's vision for sustainable, context-appropriate growth.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely, Jordan and Laurie Call

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:29 AM
To: Bryan Bryner
Cc: Greg Daly; Spencer Moffat; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Comments regarding proposed Heritage Development

Thank you for your email, we will send this to the planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Bryan Bryner <bryan.bryner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Cc: Greg Daly <skidaly@gmail.com>; Spencer Moffat <spencermoffat@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments regarding proposed Heritage 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.

Hi Carly,

I live on Buffalo Ranch Road. I want to share some concerns about the proposed Heritage Development in advance of the Planning Commission meeting on October 9, 2025. My concerns are of a technical nature.

1. Fire/Emergency Access

Looking at the proposed development, it really should be considered 2 different projects: one at the north end and one at the south end. The South end appears to be a PUD with 58 lots of about 0.11 acres each. This South end has 2 access points - one at the curve of Buffalo Ranch Rd, and the other going to the proposed road through the north end project. These 2 access points for the South end PUD are separated by approximately only 300 feet. This poses a major risk in case of a fire or other emergency, and does not appear to comply with the minimum separation requirements of the IFC for multiple access points for a subdivision with this many lots.

2. Non-Compliance with Density Requirements for AE and Overlay Zones

And this problem is evidence that the proposed development, and especially the South end, is just too dense. The AP overlay should be rejected. In particular, the AP District Overlay standards and requirements of Farmington City Code 11-27B-020.C states that, for the AP District Overlay, "[a]pplicable zoning regulations shall apply except as otherwise set forth in an AP District shall be as established by the General Development Plan and Development Agreement

and may include: ... 2. **Minimum development area or lot size, which may not be less than allowed in the underlying zone;** ..." (emphasis added)

In other words, Farmington City code prohibits the minimum lot size in an AP District from being less than what is allowed in the underlying zone. If the Heritage development land is rezoned to AE (which would be the underlying zoning), the conventional standards for AE minimum lot area are 1 acre (11-10-040.A) or, with moderate income housing concessions, 1/2 acre (11-10-040.B).

Perhaps the applicant intended to amend the property to AE with the PUD overlay? But even if that's the case, Farmington City Code 11-27-120.H states: "H. Increase In Residential Density: Residential density may be increased **up to a maximum of twenty percent (20%) above that allowed in the underlying single-family zone**, at the discretion of the City." (Emphasis added). Again, if the underlying zone is changed to AE with minimum 1 acre or 1/2 acre lots, 0.11 acre lots do not meet the density requirements of a PUD under 11-27-120.H.

Thanks,
Bryan
801-450-9310

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:30 AM
To: Travis Johnson
Cc: Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: 9 Oct 25 Planning Commission - Resident Comments Cole West

Thank you for your email, we will send this to the planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Travis Johnson <trj1470@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 2:56 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: 9 Oct 25 Planning Commission - Resident Comments Cole West

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.

Good afternoon,

My wife and I are residents at 1661 W Clark Ln, Farmington, UT 84025. We attended Cole West's resident meeting on their proposed development at 37 North Buffalo Rd. Their development plan is inadequate and their rezone request should not be approved at this time.

Cole West was unable to answer any questions on the traffic plan for this new development. It was apparent they felt that traffic was not their problem. Their proposed development plan will significantly increase traffic in the area, with the most direct route being Clark Lane. Clark Lane is a 25 mph zone with many residential driveways (ours included) and an elementary school. It is not the proper route for hundreds more daily drivers.

We have a young child that plays in the area, and we hope will be able to walk to elementary school when he gets to that age.

Cole West's development should not be approved unless its impact to traffic is significantly reduced, either with less units or with an alternative route to the site.

If a Glover Lane exit for the West Davis Corridor is added, then this development would be reasonable.

Thanks,
Travis and Sam Johnson

Matthew Rodgers
1919 Old Fort Rd.
Farmington, UT 84025
October 7, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission
160 S. Main Street
Farmington, UT 84025

**Re: Opposition to Rezone and Schematic Plan for “The Heritage” Subdivision – 51-Acre Parcel
(Request for 187 Units, Rezone from AA to AE/AP)**

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a homeowner in the adjacent conservation subdivision to respectfully oppose the proposed rezone and schematic plan for *The Heritage* development—187 units on approximately 51 acres currently zoned AA. While I support balanced, thoughtful growth within Farmington, this proposal does not align with the City’s General Plan, surrounding development patterns, infrastructure capacity, or conservation objectives.

1. Inconsistency with the General Plan

Farmington’s newly adopted General Plan designates this area as *Neighborhood Residential (NR)*, described as providing *medium-to-large residential lots or clustered developments with meaningful shared open space that protect sensitive areas*. The proposed 187 units—more than 86% of which are on 0.11–0.12 acre lots—do not meet this definition.

The General Plan’s Key Themes (Section 5.3) emphasize *Preservation of Neighborhood Character, Compatibility, and Integrity; Cohesive and Sustainable Growth; and Quality of Life*. Similarly, Policies 5.5.5, 5.5.9, and 5.5.10 direct the City to:

- Support the *character-defining elements* of existing neighborhoods,
- Preserve agricultural lands and open space through *conservation-oriented development patterns*, and
- Assess development proposals for *compatibility with existing development patterns and infrastructure adequacy*.

This proposal conflicts with each of these directives. Rather than reinforcing Farmington’s rural-residential identity, it would introduce a suburban-scale density that is incompatible with the area’s intended character and infrastructure design.

2. Neighborhood Character and Density Mismatch

Surrounding development demonstrates a consistent pattern of low-density, conservation-minded growth:

- **Ranch Road (Northeast boundary):** 27 lots averaging **0.37 acres**
- **Buffalo Ranch Road (East boundary):** 35 lots averaging **1.41 acres**

- **Flatrock Ranch (Southeast boundary):** 40 lots averaging **0.54 acres**
- **Farmstead Subdivision (Approved 2025):** 30 lots averaging **0.27 acres**, only achieved after the developer purchased **17 Transferable Development Rights (TDRs)** to exceed the underlying zoning limit of 13 lots on the 15 acre parcel.

The surrounding 102 homes on the streets directly adjacent to this parcel average **0.79 acres**—some as large as 2.94 acres. This uniformity of scale reflects deliberate planning by the City to protect neighborhood integrity. The proposed Heritage subdivision, at **over three times the surrounding density**, would represent an abrupt and incompatible transition in land use.

The General Plan (Goals 5.4.1–5.4.3) explicitly calls for maintaining diverse residential opportunities while *preserving the integrity, quality, and character* of existing neighborhoods. The Heritage proposal undermines that goal.

3. Traffic and Roadway Constraints

The proposed development fronts a minor collector—one lane in each direction with curb and gutter—without direct access to the new state highway. All traffic would funnel through Buffalo Ranch Road/Clark Lane, which already serves as a collector for multiple subdivisions. The developer’s traffic study may claim capacity, but lived experience by current residents indicates congestion during peak hours.

Adding nearly 400–500 additional daily vehicle trips would exacerbate existing safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and children. This directly conflicts with General Plan Policy 5.5.4, which calls for “adequate street design standards appropriate for the context.”

4. Infrastructure and Water Supply

City staff have noted that the project would require new utility extensions to service the site. This places financial and operational strain on existing city systems and contradicts Goal 5.4.2—that new development should be *self-sustaining and progress logically, utilizing existing infrastructure and minimizing scattered developments*.

Moreover, Sections 10.3 and 10.4 of the Conservation & Stewardship chapter emphasize water conservation and sustainable development. Expanding infrastructure and approving high-density housing in an area without established utilities runs counter to these sustainability principles.

5. Environmental and Conservation Context

This parcel historically carried a conservation easement, which was only vacated following litigation after UDOT split the land for the West Davis Corridor. Despite the court’s ruling, the property remains an environmentally sensitive area, bisected by a stream and containing wetlands and wildlife habitat.

The General Plan (Chapter 10) calls on the City to “*plan and manage growth carefully to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of Farmington’s context and surroundings*” and to “*maintain the best of both rural and urban living.*”

While the developer presents open space as a project benefit, most of it is non-buildable—under powerlines, within wetlands, or too narrow to be functional. Calling these “preserved areas” distorts the spirit of meaningful conservation. In contrast, the Farmington Ranches HOA, a 600-home development, permanently preserved over 55 acres of open space under similar conditions. Comparable expectations should apply here.

6. Precedent and Zoning Integrity

Approving this rezone from AA to AE/AP would set a concerning precedent. The AP Overlay is intended for unique cases with balanced trade-offs—such as integrating commercial or agricultural uses alongside residential density. In this case, the applicant has eliminated all commercial components, leaving density as the only benefit to the developer.

The City’s notes even acknowledge that the AP Overlay is being used solely to allow flexibility in lot count and setbacks. This is inconsistent with the zone’s intent and would open the door for other speculative upzonings on formerly restricted lands, eroding public confidence in Farmington’s zoning process.

7. Areas of Stability

Finally, Section 11.2 of the General Plan identifies much of western Farmington as an *Area of Stability*—where “few changes in land use are anticipated” and “new development should be compatible with and complementary to existing development patterns.” The Heritage proposal would represent a sharp deviation from that principle.

Conclusion

Farmington’s General Plan is both visionary and specific. It calls for balanced growth, protection of neighborhood character, and conservation of natural assets. The Heritage proposal fails to satisfy these standards.

I respectfully urge the Planning Commission to deny the proposed rezone and schematic plan and direct the applicant to revise their approach to align with Farmington’s General Plan, zoning intent, and long-term community vision.

To assist you in your decision making process, I have created an alternative motion for denial as I feel the staff’s Option 2 (Denial) is far too general and does not provide defensible, detailed findings for denial. For the Commission (and later, City Council) to justify denial under Utah land use law, their findings should tie clearly to specific, objective standards in the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and infrastructure policies — not just general statements about “inconsistency.” I have labeled this motion Attachment A - Proposed Alternative Findings for Denial

Thank you for your careful consideration and continued service to our community.

Sincerely,
Matthew Rodgers

Attachment A — Proposed Alternative Findings for Denial

The Heritage Subdivision (51 Acres, Request for AE/AP Rezone and Schematic Plan)

Prepared by: Matthew Rodgers, Homeowner – Farmington Ranches

Date: October 2025

Subject: Alternative Findings for Denial of the AE/AP Rezone and Schematic Plan

Recommended Motion:

Motion to recommend denial of the requested rezone to the AE zoning district and AP Overlay with the accompanying development agreement and schematic plan for *The Heritage*, based on the following findings of fact and conclusions.

Findings:

1. Inconsistency with the Farmington City General Plan and Vision for the Area

The *Neighborhood Residential* (NR) designation anticipates *medium-to-large lots or clustered developments with meaningful shared open space that protect sensitive areas*.

- The proposed 187-unit subdivision—with 80% of lots between 0.11 and 0.12 acres—fails to meet this definition.
- The proposal conflicts with General Plan Sections 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5, which prioritize:
 - Preservation of neighborhood character and compatibility;
 - Logical growth that utilizes existing infrastructure; and
 - Assessment of development proposals for compatibility and infrastructure adequacy.
- The proposed density is inconsistent with the surrounding residential pattern, where the 102 neighboring homes average 0.79 acres per lot, creating a sharp and incompatible transition.

2. Incompatibility with Surrounding Neighborhoods and Established Development Patterns

- Adjacent subdivisions (Farmington Ranches, Flatrock Ranch, and Farmstead) demonstrate a consistent pattern of conservation-oriented design and lot sizes averaging 0.3–1.4 acres.
- The Farmstead Subdivision (approved 2025) required 17 TDRs to achieve a 30-lot yield, reinforcing that reduced density and preserved open space are the standard for this area.
- The proposal would disrupt this pattern, contrary to General Plan Goal 5.4.3, which directs the City to preserve “the integrity, quality, and character of existing neighborhoods.”

3. Noncompliance with the Purpose and Intent of the AE Zone and AP Overlay

- The AE Zone (City Code §11-10-010) is intended to support residential development oriented toward a farming or equestrian lifestyle. The proposal includes no agricultural, equestrian, or open-space-oriented features in the building lots it creates with the 0.11 acre and 0.12 acre lots found in this proposal.
- The AP Overlay was originally intended to enable mixed agricultural/residential development or unique design integration—not simply to increase density.
- The use of the AP Overlay solely to modify density, lot size, and setbacks conflicts with §11-27B-020(E), which requires that deviations from the base zone *enhance the purpose* of the underlying zoning.

4. Infrastructure and Traffic Limitations

- All traffic will be directed to Buffalo Ranch Road/Clark Lane, a minor collector already at capacity during peak hours.
- The addition of 187 homes (≈400–500 vehicles) will significantly increase congestion, conflicting with General Plan Policy 5.5.4, which mandates adequate and context-appropriate street design standards.
- The absence of direct highway access amplifies local traffic burden and impacts residential livability.

5. Environmental and Conservation Conflicts

- The parcel includes a stream corridor / wetland areas and was previously subject to a conservation easement, reflecting its environmental sensitivity.
- General Plan Chapter 10 (Conservation & Stewardship) directs that growth be planned to preserve natural beauty, protect resources, and maintain the best of both rural and urban living.
- The applicant’s “open space” is largely non-buildable (under powerlines, irregular remnants, or wetlands) and does not constitute *meaningful conservation*.
- The proposal conflicts with Goal 10.4.1–10.4.3, which promote sustainable development, resource conservation, and environmental stewardship.

6. Negative Precedent and Erosion of Zoning Integrity

- Approving the AE/AP combination for this parcel would encourage similar upzoning through overlays, undermining the intent of Farmington’s zoning map and long-term land use strategy.
- General Plan Section 11.2 (Areas of Stability) identifies this portion of the city as an area where “few changes in land use are anticipated.”
- Approval would compromise the stability of adjacent neighborhoods and weaken Farmington’s credibility in applying zoning policy consistently.

Conclusion

The proposed AE/AP rezone and schematic plan for *The Heritage* are inconsistent with the General Plan, incompatible with surrounding neighborhoods, and fail to satisfy the purposes of the AE Zone or AP Overlay. The Planning Commission should recommend denial to ensure future development aligns with Farmington's established vision for conservation-minded, context-sensitive, and sustainable growth.

From: Angelle Salway <angellesalway@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 11:35 AM
To: Roger Child; Scott Isaacson; Melissa Layton; Amy Shumway; Alex Leeman; Carly Rowe; Shannon Hansell; Lyle Gibson
Subject: 10/9 planning commission agenda item for Heritage 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.

Dear Planning Commission and City Council,

I am writing in regards to the upcoming Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2025, where the proposed "Heritage" development will be presented for public hearing and possible approval (the land owned by Mr. Plummer and used as Buffalo Ranch. Plummer would like to sell the property to CW for development).

The land in question is currently zoned AA (agricultural use) and CW and Mr. Plummer are petitioning for the land to be rezoned to AE (Agricultural Estates) with AP (Agricultural Planned) Overlay. Please do all you can to **reject the petition to rezone this land.**

As a resident of Farmington city who lives just feet away from the land in question I would like to give my opinion on maintaining the current zoning of the land because it will greatly affect my family's quality of life. Here are the reasons why I would like the planning commission to reject the proposed zoning change

-
-
- The development is not congruent with the surrounding area
-

The homes currently existing around Buffalo Ranch sit on 0.3 to over 2 acres of land. My home sits on 0.67 acres of land. We specifically bought our property for the large lot size that allows for the "farming-town" feel. We love that the homes are not packed together with little green space. Our neighborhood's lots were designed to be used in conjunction with Agricultural use. Many of our neighbors have barns, horses and other livestock.

The existing AA zone would allow for development of 1 unit for every 5 acres of property. I am not opposed to development of the land with the current zoning. However, the proposed project, Heritage, is approximately 3.7 units per acre. If approved as proposed, this project would include predominantly 0.11-acre lots—a substantial increase in density compared to my surrounding neighborhood.

If you drive along the West Davis Corridor you will notice that there are no other developments like this along that freeway. This area of land should be maintained AA to fit with the other pieces of property currently along WDC where it is mainly open fields or used for Agricultural uses.

-
-
- We need to protect our remaining "open" Agricultural land

-

Our city needs to protect some open areas so we still feel like a “farming” town where people enjoy living and feel like they have space to do so. Cities put priorities on building and maintaining city parks, but agricultural land should also be made a priority. The agricultural land in Farmington is the roots and heritage of our city. We need to protect one of the last open agricultural areas we have left in Farmington. If the land were to be developed with the proposed zoning change, it would effectively wipe out 80% of the existing equestrian and open space in our city.

-

-

- The current roads cannot support the additional traffic

-

Mr. Plummer and CW are proposing to construct 187 units which could bring in 200-400 additional cars onto our roads assuming about 1-2 cars per household. The proposal only has 2 outlets for all of those cars. There has not been a traffic study done for this proposal, but I would expect that the proposal would fail the traffic study based on the lack of adequate outlets for the proposed amount of cars. Another large problem is that the south outlet that is next to exits directly into our neighbor’s

As a parent I am worried about the additional traffic on our roads. We have many children in our neighborhood that use the sidewalks and roads to get to and from school and after school for recreation. That many additional cars on our roads would be a hazard. That many houses and cars would also add the pollution that our neighborhood is exposed to. We have already faced a burden of being next to the new West Davis Corridor which is not something I am happy about the pollution from the freeway. I would like to be protected from the pollution that 187 units and upwards of 400 plus cars would create.

-

-

- This housing is not needed based on the proposed development in North Station Park

-

The city will have reached their goal of adding new housing with the high density housing in the new North Station park. The 187 units proposed in this development are not needed for our city’s housing plan or city revenue, and would not outweigh the costs of adding this development.

As a neighbor of Buffalo Ranch, I am not opposed to Mr. Plummer using his property or further developing his property within the current zoning laws/rules for AA zone. If he would like to sell his property for development that is also appropriate, but I urge you to maintain the existing AA zoning to protect those who live around Buffalo Ranch.

Thank you for your time,

Angelle Salway

468 Comanche Rd.
Farmington, Utah

From: Chris Salway <csalway1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:59 PM
To: Roger Child; Scott Isaacson; Melissa Layton; Amy Shumway; Alex Leeman; Carly Rowe; Shannon Hansell; Lyle Gibson
Subject: 10/9 Planning Commission Statement- Heritage 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.

Dear Planning Commission and City Council,

I am writing in advance of the October 9, 2025 Planning Commission meeting regarding the proposed “*Heritage*” development on the Buffalo Ranch property (owned by Mr. Plummer). Mr. Plummer and CW are requesting to rezone the land from AA (Agricultural Use) to AE (Agricultural Estates) with an AP (Agricultural Planned) overlay. I respectfully ask that you deny this rezoning request and preserve the current zoning.

As a Farmington resident living just a few feet from this property, I believe this change would significantly impact my family and our neighborhood. Below are my main concerns:

1. The proposed development does not fit the surrounding area

Our neighborhood consists of large lots, generally between 0.3 and over 2 acres. My own property sits on 0.67 acres, which we chose for the space, rural feel, and opportunity for light agricultural use. Many neighbors keep horses or livestock, maintaining the character that makes this part of Farmington unique.

The current AA zoning allows one home per five acres, which still supports limited, thoughtful development. However, the *Heritage* proposal would build about 3.7 units per acre, primarily on 0.11-acre lots, a dramatic increase in density and inconsistent with nearby properties. Along the West Davis Corridor, no similar dense developments exist, and this land should remain AA to align with its surroundings.

2. Protecting Farmington’s remaining agricultural land

Farmington’s agricultural areas are part of the city’s identity and history. While city parks are important, protecting open, agricultural land should also be a priority. Rezoning this property would eliminate roughly 80% of the city’s remaining equestrian and open agricultural space, erasing one of the few remaining areas that reflects our community’s heritage and small-town feel.

3. Infrastructure cannot support the added traffic

The proposed 187 homes could bring 200–400 additional vehicles to local roads, yet the plan includes only two access points. This will create congestion and safety risks, especially for children who walk or bike to school or play in the area.

Additionally, our neighborhood already experiences the noise and air pollution from the new West Davis Corridor. Hundreds of new vehicles would further degrade our air quality and overall quality of life.

4. The city's housing goals are already being met

The new high-density housing planned for North Station Park already fulfills Farmington's growth and housing objectives. Adding another dense development provides limited benefit while introducing unnecessary infrastructure, safety, and environmental burdens.

I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to responsible development or to Mr. Plummer selling his property. Development under the existing AA zoning would be reasonable and consistent with our community's character. I simply ask that the city maintain the current zoning to protect the integrity and livability of the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Salway
468 Comanche Road
Farmington, UT 84025

From: Lindy Kartchner <lindykartchner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 3:47 PM
To: Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell; Carly Rowe; Brett Anderson
Subject: Opposition to the Proposed Buffalo Ranch 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.

Lindy Kartchner
1779 W Flatrock Dr
Farmington, UT 84025

October 8th, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission
160 S Main Street
Farmington, UT 84025

Re: Opposition to the Proposed Buffalo Ranch Development

Dear Members of the Farmington Planning Commission,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Farmington to express my opposition to the proposed Buffalo Ranch development. While I understand and support thoughtful growth within our community, the proposed density of this project—at approximately two and a half times that of the surrounding neighborhoods—is not compatible with the existing character of our area and would fundamentally alter the balance and livability of West Farmington.

The current zoning was carefully established to reflect the city's long-term vision for this area, maintaining a balance between growth, open space, and neighborhood consistency. That zoning should be respected and upheld. The land in question was never intended to become a high-density subdivision, and such a change would disregard the original planning principles that have helped preserve Farmington's unique character and quality of life.

Equally important, there are currently no apartment complexes or townhome developments along Legacy Highway. That precedent has preserved the visual and community appeal of Farmington's west side and should guide decisions along the West Davis Corridor as well. Introducing multi-family housing or high-density projects along this corridor would create a visual and developmental inconsistency, set an undesirable precedent, and strain the infrastructure designed for lower-density use.

Farmington has always taken pride in balanced, intentional growth—growth that respects the character of existing neighborhoods while still accommodating future needs. Upholding the current zoning and rejecting this proposal would be in line with that tradition.

I respectfully urge the Planning Commission to maintain the current zoning standards and deny any requests to increase the density for the Buffalo Ranch property. Doing so will ensure that Farmington continues to develop in a way that is consistent, sustainable, and reflective of the values of its residents.

Thank you for your time, service, and thoughtful consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely,

Lindy Kartchner

A concerned resident of Flatrock Ranch
and a proud Farmington resident

From: Andersons <anderson5506@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Shannon Hansell
Subject: Bufallo Ranch 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.

Dear Mayor Anderson and Members of Community Development,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Farmington to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed CW development near my home located in Buffalo Ranch.

While I understand the need for responsible growth in our city, this development raises several serious concerns for me and many of my neighbors. Chief among them are:

- **Increased Traffic and Congestion:** Our streets are already experiencing high traffic volumes, and the new development would only exacerbate this, leading to safety concerns, especially for children and pedestrians. We are especially alert to street safety right now and want to keep our children protected from unnecessary traffic.
- **Not a necessity:** Our current city planning already includes multiple high density housing units which is more than enough to satisfy the states requirement.
- **Change to Neighborhood Character:** This development is not in keeping with the established character of our community. The scale, density, or use does not align with the surrounding residential area and could negatively affect property values and quality of life.
- **Does Not Align with City Plan:** Farmington's development has been dramatic over the last few years which has included Station Park and surrounding areas. The higher density has always been planned for the Station Park area and gradually decreases further out. In Buffalo Ranch, the density proposed would not align with this.

As a taxpayer and engaged citizen, I urge the City to reconsider approval of this development or any change in zoning. We deserve a say in what happens in our own neighborhood, especially when it directly impacts our daily lives and long-term well-being.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. I hope you will choose to prioritize the voices of the community you serve.

Sincerely,
Lyndee Anderson

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 8:20 AM
To: Michael Shifflett
Cc: Shannon Hansell; Lyle Gibson
Subject: Re: Public Hearing on Proposed 187-Unit "Heritage" Development

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Michael Shifflett <michael.shifflett@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 2:30 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Hearing on Proposed 187-Unit "Heritage" 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.

Hello,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Heritage Development project scheduled for October 9, 2025, at 37 N. Buffalo Road.

As a current resident of the area in Farmington Ranches, my primary concerns are as follows:

1. **Traffic Impact:** The project would exacerbate traffic congestion on Clark Lane, particularly in the vicinity of the elementary school.
2. **Project Impact:** The project will likely overwhelm the existing traffic capacity and strain the resources of the current elementary school in the area.
3. **Lot Size Suggestion:** The proposed lot sizes deviate from those of the surrounding area, with a minimum of 0.25 acres per home and potentially reaching up to 1 or more acres per home.

I urge the community to consider these concerns carefully before making a decision on this matter.

Sincerely,
Michael Shifflett
352 Lonestar Dr.
Farmington, Utah

From: Erin M. Mikkelsen <mikkelsenmin@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:36 PM
To: Carly Rowe; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Cc: Alex Leeman; Amy Shumway; Melissa Layton; Roger Child; Scott Isaacson
Subject: Thursday's Planning Meeting Regarding Proposed Buffalo Ranch Zoning Change

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,

Thank you for your consideration of the neighborhood concerns being raised related to the very large change proposed to Buffalo Ranch. We have one other concern we hope you will take into account as a part of your decision.

We are all aware of the zoning history for Buffalo Ranch having started as a conservation easement that would have never allowed changes of this magnitude. The residents on Buffalo Ranch Road who abut Buffalo Ranch bought their properties with that understanding in mind. These abutting lots are large acreage lots with about 50% of those residents having horses. A real concern for these homeowners is that the having so many homes going in directly adjacent to their properties where the new residents will not be familiar with horses will place undue legal ramifications on the current residents and create numerous issues from several sources including children wanting to pet or feed the horses, children climbing through fences to be in with the horses, people climbing through the fences to take pictures, or homeowners dumping their lawn clippings in our pastures to feed the horses. All of these items put the current residents in an uncomfortable position of having to constantly police their properties to avoid these concerns. Additionally, current neighbors worry about the possibility of complaints arising from the new neighbors who may have concerns themselves about being adjacent to horses once they move in.

If development is allowed, and if so, I hope you will consider making the lots much larger to match this part of the existing neighborhood, would it be possible to require the developer to place a substantial, solid fence between the proposed "new" neighborhood and the existing homes to reduce these issues? A substantial solid fence should also be required at the two entrances into the "new" neighborhood to spare the current homeowners' constant traffic in and out directly adjacent to their properties.

I understand that the development of the WDC created ramifications for all parties that could not have been foreseen, and we must now all work to come to the best solution in the given circumstances. However, I sincerely request that you please not cause further adverse impacts to our homes above what has already been done by the WDC. Those who purchased here did so specifically with the intention of being next to open agricultural space that should never have changed so that we could enjoy our animals. It is not easy for us to just move because finding horse property anymore is

very, very difficult which is why we further believe that large lots allowing others to have and enjoy horses would be the best option.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen and Christine Mikkelsen
17 N Buffalo Rd
Farmington, UT 84025
970-397-6344

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 8:23 AM
To: Hayley Rosenbaugh; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Hayley Rosenbaugh <hayley@rosenbaugh.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:43 PM
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch

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 Members of the City Council,

I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Buffalo Ranch property from AA to AE.

This land was originally intended to remain conservation easement, consistent with the agricultural and equestrian character of our community. While the conservation easement has been dissolved, keeping the land zoned AA would best honor that original intent.

A few key points:

- **We prefer the current property owner, Mr. Plummer, to the proposed development.** Contrary to what may have been suggested, residents would rather continue to have Mr. Plummer as a neighbor than see 187 new homes built on this land.
- **Mr. Plummer is welcome to develop the land under its current zoning.** We would welcome like-minded neighbors who value larger lots and the ability to keep agricultural animals.
- **The proposed density is incompatible with the proposed zoning.** CW cannot build 187 homes if the land is rezoned AE, and the Planning Commission should not entertain a request that contradicts established zoning limits.
- **Mr. Plummer's portrayal as a victim is misleading.** He voluntarily sold unbuildable land to UDOT for \$6.6 million. This was not an eminent domain action.
- **Residents have already borne the greatest impact.** While both Mr. Plummer and the City have received remuneration from UDOT, the Ranches residents—many of whom paid a premium for property adjacent to what was meant to remain undeveloped—have received no reparations. Rezoning would compound this loss.

I urge the Council to reject the rezoning request and uphold the current zoning designation. Doing so protects the integrity of our community and honors both the spirit and history of this land.

Thank you for your time and for your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Hayley Rosenbaugh

1696 W Flatrock Dr

From: Amelia Mun <mun.amelia@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:55 PM
To: Carly Rowe
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch Property ("Heritage" Development Proposal)

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,,

I'm writing as a Farmington resident and direct neighbor to the land known as Buffalo Ranch—owned by Mr. Plummer and currently under consideration for the "Heritage" development project. This project is scheduled for public hearing and potential approval at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2025.

Mr. Plummer and CW are requesting to rezone the property from AA (Agricultural) to AE (Agricultural Estates) with an AP (Agricultural Planned) Overlay. I respectfully ask that you reject this request and preserve the current AA zoning for the following reasons:

1. The Proposed Density is Incompatible with the Surrounding Area

Our neighborhood was developed intentionally with larger lot sizes to preserve Farmington's agricultural character. My own property sits on 0.88 acres, and many surrounding homes are on lots ranging from 0.3 to over 2 acres. Residents in this area value open space, agricultural use, and a rural feel—many even keep horses and livestock.

The current AA zoning allows for one home per 5 acres, which is in keeping with the area's character. In contrast, the proposed Heritage development would allow for approximately 3.7 homes per acre, with most lots as small as 0.11 acres. This level of density would dramatically alter the existing landscape and community atmosphere.

Moreover, a quick drive along the West Davis Corridor clearly shows that this stretch of land is primarily open space or used for agriculture—nothing resembling the high-density development being proposed.

2. Agricultural Land is a Community Asset Worth Preserving

Farmington's agricultural zones are a living reminder of the city's heritage. While city parks are valued, agricultural land offers a different but equally important type of open space—one that contributes to the rural identity and peaceful environment residents cherish.

This proposed development would eliminate roughly 80% of the existing equestrian and open agricultural space in the city. Once lost, this character cannot be restored. We need to be deliberate in protecting what remains.

3. Existing Infrastructure is Not Equipped for This Level of Growth

The Heritage proposal includes 187 housing units, which could introduce between 200–400 additional vehicles into our local streets. With only two planned access points—one of which empties directly into a quiet residential neighborhood—the impact on traffic would be significant.

To my knowledge, no traffic study has yet been conducted. Based on local conditions, it's reasonable to assume the plan would not meet safety and capacity standards. Beyond congestion, this poses real concerns for the safety of children who walk and bike to school and for the overall air quality in a neighborhood already affected by proximity to the West Davis Corridor.

4. Additional Housing is Not Necessary at This Time

Farmington is already meeting its housing goals with the high-density development planned in North Station Park. Adding 187 more units in this area—especially with such high density—does not serve a critical need for the city, either from a housing policy or economic perspective. The costs to neighborhood livability and city infrastructure far outweigh any potential benefits.

5. Residents Should Not Bear a Double Burden for the West Davis Corridor

It's important to note that Mr. Plummer received \$6.6 million from the voluntary sale of land associated with the conservation easement—land that was largely unbuildable due to its restrictions. This was not a case of eminent domain. In addition, the city received \$5 million through a legal settlement with UDOT. Both the landowner and the city have been compensated for the impact of the West Davis Corridor.

In contrast, local residents have received nothing—despite being directly affected by the construction of the freeway. Many of us paid a premium to live near what was once a protected conservation easement, with the expectation of open space and a rural environment. That promise has already been compromised by UDOT's decision.

To now rezone the adjacent land for high-density housing would compound the impact on our neighborhood, further eroding the qualities that drew us to this area in the first place—while allowing Mr. Plummer to profit again. It would be deeply unfair to ask the community to absorb yet another major disruption so that a private landowner can extract more value from land that has already been compensated.

Conclusion

I want to be clear: I do not oppose development altogether, nor do I oppose Mr. Plummer selling his land. However, any development should occur within the framework of existing AA zoning regulations. This ensures growth is aligned with the surrounding community and protects the unique rural and agricultural identity that makes Farmington special.

Thank you for your attention and service to our city. I urge you to vote against the rezoning proposal and help preserve the character, safety, and quality of life for current residents.

Sincerely,

Amelia Mun

1886 West Buffalo Circle, Farmington

From: Jeff Rosenbaugh <jeff@rosenbaugh.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 11:32 PM
To: Carly Rowe
Cc: Roger Child; Scott Isaacson; Melissa Layton; Brandon Hellberg; Alex Leeman; Amy Shumway; Lindy Kartchner
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch Property

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 Members of the Farmington Planning Commission and City Council,

I'm writing as a Farmington resident and in my capacity as the President of the Flatrock Ranch HOA to express strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Buffalo Ranch property to accommodate Cole West's aggressive development plans.

While we support responsible growth, the current proposal by Cole West (CW) represents a dramatic and incompatible departure from the established character and infrastructure of west Farmington.

1) Density and Zoning Incompatibility

Based on the information available to residents, the CW proposal includes approximately 186 homes on a ~51-acre parcel. Because a portion of that land is undevelopable under high-tension power lines, the effective buildable area is smaller—pushing the true density higher.

- Conservative assumption (full 51 acres): ~0.27 acres per home
- Likely scenario (excluding non-buildable/open-space areas): ~0.18–0.20 acres per home

By comparison, the adjacent Buffalo Ranch Road corridor—from Carter to the Mikkelsens, including the Schmid property—comprises roughly 37.7 acres with only 18 homes, or about 2.09 acres per home. Even conservatively, the CW plan is 7–8× denser than the surrounding area; realistically, closer to 11–12× denser.

That magnitude of change would *fundamentally alter the character of this community and run counter to the intent behind the city's existing zoning framework.*

This land was originally intended to remain a conservation easement, aligned with the agricultural and equestrian identity of west Farmington. While that easement has since been dissolved, maintaining the AA zoning best honors that original intent and the careful planning that has guided this area's development.

2) Traffic and Infrastructure on Flatrock Ranch Road

The most direct and serious impact of this proposal will be felt on Flatrock Ranch Road, which is a local road designed to accommodate no more than 1,500 vehicles per day.

Using national averages (1.9 vehicles per household, about 3 trips per car per day), 186 new homes would generate roughly 1,000–1,100 additional vehicle trips each day on a road already serving:

- the 40 existing homes within Flatrock Ranch, and
- an additional 30 lots south of our neighborhood that CW has already received approval to build.

That level of traffic would overwhelm Flatrock Ranch Road's intended capacity and materially affect both safety and livability for residents.

The developer's traffic study appears narrowly scoped and does not reflect these realities. A responsible study should specifically measure Flatrock Ranch Road traffic patterns over at least seven consecutive days, including both weekdays and weekends, to capture representative use. Anything less risks significantly underestimating the impact on local infrastructure and emergency-access reliability.

3) Property Rights and Community Impact

Contrary to some suggestions, residents are not seeking to remove Mr. Plummer, the current landowner. The overwhelming sentiment is that this proposal would create far greater long-term disruption than his continued ownership.

Mr. Plummer is welcome to develop the land within its current AA zoning, as many of us have. We would gladly welcome like-minded neighbors who value larger lots, open space, and the agricultural traditions that define west Farmington.

It's also relevant that Mr. Plummer voluntarily sold portions of his property to UDOT for \$6.6 million—a transaction not initiated through eminent domain. Both the City and Mr. Plummer realized benefit from those sales, while nearby residents bore the loss of open space and increased traffic without compensation. Rezoning now would compound that inequity.

4) City Stewardship and Affordable Housing Context

Governor Cox recently commended Farmington as a state leader in affordable housing. While CW may position this project as contributing to that goal, these homes are neither priced nor designed as affordable housing. Farmington has already met its state-level commitments in this area, and the city can maintain that leadership without approving developments that compromise established neighborhoods.

5) Our Request

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Planning Commission and City Council to deny the rezoning request and preserve the existing character of our west Farmington community. Doing so protects the integrity of our neighborhood, preserves our investments in our homes (the single largest investment the vast majority of us will ever make), upholds the city's standards for responsible growth, and honors the original intent of this land.

Thank you for your time, your service, and your commitment to listening to the residents most directly affected by these decisions.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rosenbaugh
President — Flatrock Ranch HOA

1696 W. Flatrock Dr.
Farmington, Utah

CC: Flatrock Ranch HOA Vice President & Finance Chair

Brian and Melisa Hill

73 Wagonwheel Circle

Farmington, Utah 84025

October 8, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission

160 South Main Street

Farmington, Utah 84025

**Re: Opposition to Rezone and Schematic Plan for “The Heritage” Subdivision – 51 Acre Parcel
(Request for 187 Units, Rezone from AA to AE/AP)**

Dear Commissioners

I am writing as a homeowner in the Farmington Ranches Subdivision that is adjacent to the conversation subdivision. We would like to oppose the proposed plan for “The Heritage” Development. We feel that 187 units on 51 acres zoned for AA does not align with our surrounding development patterns.

Neighborhood Character and Density Mismatch:

- Current Homes are low-density
- Lots average half acre to 1.5 acres

Inconsistency with the general plan

- This plan was not originally set up for high density homes. The original plan was for medium to large lots.

Traffic and Roadway

- No new roads will be built to support these homes. Traffic will be dumping onto Clark Lane and Ranch Road. The 4-Way stop at 1500 South and Clark Lake will become a major issue.
- Speeding on Clark Lane is already an issue, putting a minimum of 250 more cars a day will only increase the risk of fatality. This road was not built to be major Thorofare.

Infrastructure and Water Supply

- The expense and operational strain on existing city systems. This request does not make the new subdivision self-sustaining.

Environmental and Conservation

- The property should remain a conservation easement and not re-zoned for habitation.

Precedent and zoning Integrity

- Property should not be re-zoned. The re-zone will only benefit the developer not the community.

Conclusion

We would like the proposed property not be allowed to re-zone, but to meet the current standard of homes in this area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brian and Melisa Hill

Nicole Knowles
42 South Buffalo Ranch Road
Farmington, Utah 84025
Nickknowles84@gmail.com

October 5, 2025

Farmington City Planning Commission
Farmington, Utah 84025

Re: Opposition to Rezoning of Buffalo Ranch

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of the Buffalo Ranch property. I strongly oppose this change, as it represents irresponsible city planning that does not prioritize the best interests of current residents, landowners, or the long-term character of our community.

Rezoning Buffalo Ranch away from AA zoning would erode the rural lifestyle that Farmington has always valued. Larger lot sizes attract like-minded residents who appreciate open space, animals, horses, and the rural way of life. Reducing lot sizes to 2–3 acres butting directly against 0.10-acre lots creates a jarring and incompatible development pattern. Such an approach undermines the integrity of our existing subdivisions and fails to protect property values or quality of life.

Infrastructure is already strained. Our secondary schools are overcrowded, yet new developments continue without consideration for long-term capacity. Growth west of I-15 should be paused until the second fire station is completed. With the county jail, the amusement park, the new sports complex, and Station Park already demanding significant police and fire resources, it is clear that public safety cannot keep pace with unchecked development.

The builder has argued that high-density housing belongs next to freeways. This is simply not the case in our city. Established neighborhoods such as Flat Rock, Chestnut Farms, and Miller Farms — located directly along Legacy Highway — are comprised of large lots and mini-estates, not high-density housing. The precedent in Farmington has been rural estates along the freeway corridor, not high-density subdivisions.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to development or even to a new subdivision at Buffalo Ranch, so long as zoning is respected and continuity with the surrounding area is preserved. What I strongly oppose is a zoning change that introduces high-density housing next to farmland and agricultural properties. Such development inevitably creates conflict: new residents unfamiliar with rural life will complain about flies, manure smells, and the presence of large animals, while long-time rural residents are forced to defend practices and values that have always defined our community.

Finally, I ask the Commission to consider a broader question: must every inch of Farmington be developed? Our city has experienced years of relentless growth, often prioritizing quantity over quality. It is time to pause, refocus on the quality of life for existing residents, and ensure safety, infrastructure, and rural heritage are protected before more high-density projects are approved.

For these reasons, I urge you to reject the proposed rezoning of Buffalo Ranch. Please protect the integrity, safety, and rural character of Farmington by keeping AA zoning in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Nicole Knowles

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:46 AM
To: Dale Majors
Cc: Brittany Majors; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: High Density housing

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Dale Majors <dale@ventureanyway.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 10:34 AM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Cc: Brittany Majors <a.girl.named.britt@gmail.com>
Subject: High Density housing

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.

Hey there,

I live on 1678 W Ranch Road, Farmington Utah 84025 and moved to Farmington in 2010.

We love it! All of the high density housing going in near station park seems to make lots of sense, and it's close to the freeway, I have no issues with that.

Adding a bunch of homes in the deep recesses of Farmington changes the neighborhood dynamic in a major way. I want to state a firm opinion and vote that I do not support changing the zoning of that parcel, especially with all the high density that's being added elsewhere in Farmington.

Thanks!
Dale Majors
8016042211

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:38 PM
To: Joshua Hall; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Buffalo Ranches Proposed Build

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Joshua Hall <josh@saltlakeanimalphysicaltherapy.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:00 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Buffalo Ranches Proposed Build

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 Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning and build in the Buffalo Ranches area of Farmington. When we moved in, the land behind us was on a 100 year conservation lease, but was then changed due to UDOT acquiring the road. Now we are facing a build with proposed .11 acre lots. We live on a 2 acre lot, with most houses in the area being the same or more with horses. The proposed build does not fit the neighborhood or the vision of what we bought into. We thought we built our forever home, with the dream quickly being wiped out by money hungry developers. The proposed build and lot sizes do not fit the neighborhood. Also, we have serious concerns about the traffic this will cause in the neighborhood and the children that live there. I would like to express my strong opposition and overall disgust with the proposed build. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

--

Joshua L. Hall, DPT, OCS, CCRT
Certified Canine Rehab Therapist
josh@saltlakeanimalphysicaltherapy.com
Phone: 385-354-7272
Fax: 385-231-1352
Salt Lake Animal Physical Therapy
2285 S Main St Suite J, South Salt Lake, UT 84115



SALT LAKE ANIMAL
PHYSICAL THERAPY

"We help injured and aging animals, live their best lives with their owners..."

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:38 PM
To: Gina Catenzaro; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Heritage

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
☎ 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Gina Catenzaro <gina.catenzaro@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:11 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: RE: Heritage

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 whom it may regard:

I cannot attend the public hearing this evening, so I am submitting my vote via email. I am OPPOSED to the Heritage Master Plan community by Cole West as it was congest our Farmington area. The Station Park on-ramp is already a nightmare with the amount of cars we currently have and this new development will negate the feel we Farmington-ers want to have: open space!

Gina Catenzaro
1736 W Ranch Rd
Farmington

Sent from my iPhone

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:38 PM
To: Erika Priest; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Public Hearing Tonight

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Erika Priest <erikadpriest@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:15 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Hearing Tonight

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 - I am unable to attend the hearing tonight but I just wanted throw in my voice/opinion as well. As a resident in the Ranches I am opposed to changing the zoning to allow for so many small lots/homes. I can support development of homes on 0.30+ size lots, but 0.11 acre "cottages" just seems entirely too high density and doesn't fit the neighborhood feel of larger homes/lots. I worry about traffic and impact on schools. I know all the neighbors I have talked to about this also hope you consider not changing the zoning to allow for such high density development, and hopefully change zoning to agricultural estates like everything else around it is currently zoned for.

Thanks for all you do,
Erika Priest

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Jake Young; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Comments - Heritage Project – Public Hearing October 9, 2025

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Jake Young <lotojake@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:34 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Comments - Heritage Project – Public Hearing October 9, 2025

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.

Please share this with the PC

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As a resident of the Ranches neighborhood and a professional planner, I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts regarding the proposed Heritage Development of 187 homes. I have reviewed the staff report, city documents, and the developer's presentation materials.

While I recognize the ongoing need for additional housing in west Farmington—particularly to support young families and professionals at a time when Eagle Bay Elementary enrollment is shrinking to around two classes per grade—I urge the City to deny the project in its current form and instead work collaboratively with the developer to create a plan that better fits the surrounding context and community goals. The proposed project of getting closer but not there yet

This area deserves thoughtful growth that strengthens the west side, complements existing neighborhoods, and ensures long-term sustainability. To that end, I offer the following recommendations for consideration:

- **Lot Variety & Size:** Require a mix of lot sizes ranging from 9,000 to 14,000 square feet, providing diversity in home types while maintaining the area's character.
- **Attainability Commitment:** Include a developer agreement requiring at least 30% of homes to be priced for households earning 80–110% of the Area Median Income (AMI), ensuring attainable options for families and local workers.
- **Buffering & Design:** Strengthen buffering between the Legacy Trail and the highway, using berms, landscaping, and trailside design to enhance safety and visual quality.

- Parks & Recreation: Incorporate a small neighborhood park with pickleball courts, shade structures, and open play lawn, creating needed amenities for both new and existing residents. I'm sure this item isn't an issue.

Farmington's strength lies in its balance between growth and community character. I believe this project can succeed if revised with these principles in mind. Thank you to the Planning Commission and City staff for your time, effort, and continued service to our community.

Respectfully,
Jake Young
Ranches Neighborhood Resident
Farmington, Utah

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Karie Linford; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Public hearing- Heritage project

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Karie Linford <linfordzoo99@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:43 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Public hearing- Heritage 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.

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of West Farmington, we are very concerned about the new proposed development of small homes next to West Davis Corridor. The proposed project does not match the aesthetics of the neighborhood that we built our forever home in. The increase in the traffic that would travel into that neighborhood would inundate us and bog down travel. We have already had to deal with a new highway that we were told would not be there when we moved in 13 years ago. This plan is devastating to us that live here. And just up and moving to find what we thought we had found here is really not an option in today's world. If you could at least require the lots to match the current neighborhood, this would be a much easier pill to swallow. There is plenty of small housing going in near Station Park.

Thank you,

Mike and Karie Linford

Sent from my iPhone

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Greg Daly; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Request for planning commission meeting tonight

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Greg Daly <skidaly@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:49 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Request for planning commission meeting tonight

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.

Hi Carly,

First of all, thank you for what you do for the city as a whole, I know days like today can be hectic to say the least.

Second, I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed development for the Buffalo Ranch property because it does not meet any of the criteria outlined in the General Plan for Farmington.

Third, can you please provide an account of the number of emails in favor and against this proposal at tonight's meeting? Is that something you can share when the topic comes up on the agenda?

Thanks,

Greg Daly
1951 West Buffalo Circle
Farmington, UT 84025
801-200-6573

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Sean Martin; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: CW Request for Zoning Change

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Sean Martin <shonboy182@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:58 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: CW Request for Zoning Change

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.

Thanks for taking the time to read and try to understand my thoughts and concerns.

My name is Sean Martin. I live at 2054 W Buffalo Cir, 84025.

According to the plans that are being presented, my house/driveway will become an intersection for 300+ vehicles coming and going multiple times a day.

I have 2 main concerns:

1. I feel this would put a lot of undue risk to the health and wellbeing of my family. Imagine trying to back out of a driveway in the middle of an intersection where 1,000+ vehicles (300+ vehicles multiple times a day) are trying to navigate to their homes.
2. 2+ years of construction vehicles blocking my house/driveway.

I stand with the rest of the community in that we need to keep the zoning the way it is. I purchased this land with the understanding that the zoning around my home would remain the same.

Overall, this proposal has a disproportionate amount of negatives to it. In fact, I can't think of a single positive that couldn't be accomplished keeping the zoning the same.

I have lived in Farmington for 40 years now. I love Farmington...please don't be the ones to change my opinion.

Thanks,

Sean Martin
801-856-1554

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:04 PM
To: greg martinez; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Public Hearing

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: greg martinez <gregmartinez2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:45:27 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Hearing

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 Members of the City Council,

I wanted to share some context ahead of tonight's Planning Commission meeting regarding the Plummer property proposal. As it stands, the plan is being presented this evening at Plummer's insistence—and to be fair, he has the legal right to do so.

Despite ongoing opposition from the neighborhood regarding the proposed density, it's clear that Plummer does not see this current plan as final. His primary concern remains achieving a specific financial return on the property, and CW has modeled a development that meets that target. However, the only thing likely to change his expectations is a clear "no" from the Planning Commission and/or the City Council.

This is now the third developer Plummer has approached. Each of the previous efforts stalled because his demands were simply too high to make a project viable.

While I understand that there are lingering trust issues between residents and the City, tonight's meeting presents an important opportunity for both sides—and for Plummer himself—to be heard. Ultimately, no development can move forward without a zoning change, and the City is under no obligation to accommodate Plummer's preferred terms or density.

My ask is to maintain the current zoning that is in place.

Thank you for your attention and for continuing to prioritize thoughtful development that reflects the community's character and long-term vision.

Sincerely,

Greg Martinez

1950 Buffalo Circle

Gregory S Martinez, PT, DPT, CIDN

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:05 PM
To: Tiffany; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Public Hearing regarding Agricultural Zoning or Buffalo Ranch Property

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Tiffany <jessandtiffany@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:45:40 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Hearing regarding Agricultural Zoning or Buffalo Ranch Property

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, my name is Tiffany Manning. I live on Ranch Road in Farmington. This email serves as my voice as I cannot make it to the mtg this evening. I do NOT want more homes and\or townhomes going up in Farmington! Enough is enough! We have only a few main roads in our neighborhood and the traffic that would be added is asking for trouble! Adding to our population in our neighborhood is not something I and many others are interested in.

Thank you for reading and taking my concerns to the hearing this evening.

From: Russ Porter <rustava78@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:28 PM
To: Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell; Carly Rowe; Brett Anderson
Subject: CW Rezoning - West Farmington

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.

Farmington City Planning Committee,

I am sending this email to address concerns I have with the rezoning behind Buffalo Ranch Road. If I am being blount, I think the proposed design is not only ridiculous, but a slap in the face to those of us who live here in West Farmington. Everyone out here is on larger parcels of land. I don't understand why someone would look at that and think "let's just throw a ton of housing on tiny parcels right next to these huge parcels". It is truly almost insane to think that someone would think that is a good idea. Moreover, I would rather have to deal with Mr Plummer and his antics, than the insane amount of traffic that this many houses and this many people would create. Please consider these concerns from a local residents perspective.

Thank you!

Russell Porter

1719 Flatrock Drive

From: Bethany Lewis <bdawn2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:55 PM
To: Brett Anderson; Shannon Hansell; Lyle Gibson; Carly Rowe
Cc: Thayne E. Lewis
Subject: Buffalo Ranches concerned citizen opinion

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,

My name is Bethany Lewis and I live at 1853 W Buffalo Cir in West Farmington. I am writing to ask you to please advocate for us in the situation regarding the Buffalo Ranch property.

My husband and I feel that squeezing nearly 200 homes into that space is a bad idea for many reasons.

We are concerned about the possibility of rezoning -- mixing lots where animals are allowed with lots where they are not could cause problems for both sides. We also do not feel that adding many extra houses in the small space proposed will fit in with the current feel of the area and doesn't seem to make sense with the way the city has planned out the overall structure of Farmington.

Those of us who moved to the West edge of The Ranches were willing to live with the aggressive mosquitos and the floodplain risks in order to have property surrounded by less homes and people. We took a BIG hit when UDOT decided to build the Highway right next to our previously quiet yards and nature trails. We hope that you will do what you can to help us keep the impact of this project from further destroying the country feel of our neighborhood!

We are also concerned about the increased number of cars driving on our streets and the surrounding ones (1525 and Clark Ln) with so few access points into the new development.

We would rather deal with having Plummer in place than having many extra houses and traffic and added busy-ness to our quiet neighborhood.

Thank you for taking time to consider this request.

-Bethany and Thayne Lewis

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:05 PM
To: Bryan Bryner; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Comments on Heritage development (Cole West/Buffalo Ranch)

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Bryan Bryner <bryan.bryner@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:34:35 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Comments on Heritage development (Cole West/Buffalo Ranch)

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.

Hi Carly,

I have a few additional comments to submit to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed Heritage development.

I am concerned about the increase in traffic that the 187 unit development will cause. The applicant's traffic study found there would be about 1700 new daily vehicle trips. This is a significant number. The traffic study indicated that there would be little impact, but that only looked at time delays at intersections. The reality is that the traffic on the streets will significantly affect our neighborhoods.

Our kids and neighbors' ride bikes, scooters, longboards, skateboards, one-wheels, e-bikes, e-scooters, etc., all over the neighborhood. They often use the streets because sidewalks have cracks that are not safe for skateboards, etc., or wide enough for multiple riders. They ride and walk to school, to friend's houses, to church, to walk the dogs, to go piano lessons and robotic lessons, to go to the park, to go to Station Park or Maverick. And it's not just kids - adults do all of these things, too.

Adding thousands of vehicles to the streets every day significantly increases the risks of accidents in our neighborhood.

I'm also concerned with the impacts to traffic and safety in the school zone in front of Eagle Bay Elementary. The traffic study did not address any impacts to safety at the school zone. Too many extra vehicles on Clark Lane will increase traffic delays at crosswalks, as parents are dropping kids off at school, etc. The density of the project is just too high to not cause any impacts to the school zone, especially during morning peak hours.

On another note, the proposed development would include a 12-foot sound wall along the West Davis Corridor. That kind of structure is not compatible with the wide open nature of our neighborhood out here. The developer believes that the highway changed everything, but they're wrong. Many people consider the WDC to be an extension of Legacy Parkway. Notably, the State of Utah designated Legacy Parkway as a State Scenic Byway. Visitutah.com states: "This beautiful area connects the Salt Lake City International Airport with view of the world-famous Great Salt Lake. ... Millions of migratory birds enjoy Great Salt Lake as a huge cafeteria as they pass through from South America and Canada each spring

and fall. Visitors enjoy the white sand beaches of Antelope Island State Park ... The scenic byway and trail system along the Great Salt Lake has provided a new way to experience its cultural and ecological importance." Although the WDC has not yet been designated a State Scenic Byway, it is every bit as scenic as Legacy Parkway, with views of the Farmington Bay waterfowl management area, Antelope Island, and the shores of the GSL. A sound wall would completely detract from the scenic nature of our community right in our own backyards. A sound wall should not be permitted. Natural berms are okay, but 12 foot sound walls make it look like a concrete jungle, like the urban areas of Salt Lake County along I-215. That's not what our neighborhood is here.

Thanks,
Bryan
801-450-9310

From: Addy Chandler <ayachandler@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell; Carly Rowe
Subject: City Planning (Flatrock Drive) Concerned Citizens

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 there,

As residents (very proud residents) of Farmington we are quite concerned about the new developments proposed around us. We fear for the safety of our children and selves. The added traffic to our little street would make our neighborhood feel like main street and not a neighborhood and I just dont think its big enough to handle the added traffic. I would think that if a new community was to be built it would include its own road for entrance and exits.

We adore and love Farmington City and feel so grateful to have found what we believe to be the best city to raise a family in. Thank you for all you do and for taking such great care of us all.

Sincerely, Addy and Jordan Chandler

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:06 PM
To: Keaton Hyde; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Buffalo Ranch/Cole West Development

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Keaton Hyde <keatonhyde@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:59:45 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Buffalo Ranch/Cole West 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.

Hi,

My name is Keaton Hyde, and my family and I are residents of the Flatrock Ranch community at 1930 W Flatrock Dr, Farmington, UT 84025. I am writing to share my concerns regarding the Cole West proposal for the Buffalo Ranch land west of our neighborhood.

My primary concerns are:

1. Lot sizing and density

The proposed development does not align with the surrounding communities or the city's master plan. I am not opposed to development of this land, but I ask that the City Council and Planning Commission honor the existing plan and the precedent for lot sizes and zoning in this area. Introducing 0.13-acre lots in a neighborhood surrounded by 0.5 to 2+ acre lots is not consistent with the character of Farmington or the surrounding communities.

2. Safety and traffic

One of the main reasons we chose to raise our young family here is the sense of safety. We feel comfortable allowing our children to play outside and ride their bikes. Adding 187 homes, however, would create significant traffic increases that our roads are not designed to handle. This raises serious safety concerns for families and children in our community.

I appreciate your time and consideration, and I respectfully urge you to take these concerns into account when deciding on this matter.

Respectfully,

Keaton Hyde

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:39 PM
To: Tim Pace; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: Oct 9 Planning commission meeting

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

CARLY ROWE
BUSINESS LICENSING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY
O 801.939.9215
160 S MAIN, FARMINGTON UT 84025
FARMINGTON.UTAH.GOV



From: Tim Pace <pace587@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:22 PM
To: Lyle Gibson <gibson@farmington.utah.gov>; Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Oct 9 Planning commission meeting

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 we are unable to attend the meeting tonight. Wanted to put our support for the approval of the Mattison Driveway width extension.

Tim and Jenny Pace
141 S Bonanza Rd, Farmington, Utah 84025
801-699-5074

From: Carly Rowe
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:04 PM
To: Justin Brown; Lyle Gibson; Shannon Hansell
Subject: Re: 10/9/2025 Meeting: Mattison Driveway

Thank you, we will forward this to our planning commission.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Justin Brown <justinbrown456@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:33:23 PM
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: 10/9/2025 Meeting: Mattison Driveway

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,

My name is Justin Brown and I live across the street from the Mattison's. My address is:
146 Bonanza Rd, Farmington, UT 84025.

I am in favor of granting the driveway width extension at the property located at:
131 S. Bonanza Rd.

Please include my vote for approval in your decision.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me at any time.

My phone number is (801) 631-4663

Sincerely,
Justin Brown