

## FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

November 18, 2025

### WORK SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,  
City Manager Brigham Mellor,  
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex  
Leeman,  
Councilmember Roger Child,  
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,  
Councilmember Melissa Layton,  
Councilmember Amy Shumway,  
City Attorney Paul Roberts,  
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,  
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,*

*Community Development Director Lyle  
Gibson,  
City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon  
Hansell,  
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad  
Boshell,  
Finance Director Levi Ball,  
City Parks and Recreation Director Colby  
Thackeray, and  
Fire Chief Shelby Willis.*

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the work session to order at 6:03 p.m.

### **DISCUSS FIRE DEPARTMENT MOVE TO EIGHT-HANDED STAFFING**

Fire Chief **Shelby Willis** approached the Council about moving the department to eight-handed staffing. She recently looked at data spanning 2023 to 2025 considering call volumes, staffing, opportunities, and challenges. Farmington switched to a new record management system in the middle of 2023. Since Interstate 15 (I-15) is in the dead center of Farmington, sometimes it is easier for Centerville to come from the north to handle calls. February and November are the months with the fewest EMS calls. Nationally as well as in Farmington, Tuesdays are the days with the most EMS calls, and Sundays are the least. Consistent call volumes on average come between 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. while the least active call volume is between 1 and 7 a.m.

**Willis** shared Farmington's annual call volumes. Considering Aug. 1, 2023, to Aug. 1, 2024, there were 555 fire calls; 1,395 EMS calls; 129 calls canceled enroute; and 2,079 total calls. Considering Aug. 1, 2024, to Aug. 1, 2025, there were 590 fire calls; 1,637 EMS calls; 148 calls canceled enroute; and 2,375 total calls. Compare these to Fruit Heights calls of 2024, with 35 fire calls; 156 EMS calls; 28 calls canceled enroute; and 219 total calls. In Fruit Heights in 2025, the totals were 43 fire calls; 148 EMS calls; 24 calls canceled en route; and 215 total calls.

When Farmington is called to do a blood draw at the Davis County Jail or Utah Highway Patrol office, it takes a unit out of service for an hour at a time. In 2023, Farmington did 72 such blood draws, with 132 in 2024, and 80 by August of 2025. Once the City began charging \$100 for blood draws, the jail decided to handle their own blood draws instead. Farmington Police Department has four officers who are phlebotomists.

Farmington participates in interfacility transports with the University of Utah, Davis County Jail, Bridgehouse, Legacy House, Country Care, and psychiatric transfers. They also transport to a variety of hospitals including University of Utah, Lakeview, Ogden Regional Medical Center,

McKay-Dee, IMC, Primary Children's, Holy Cross-Davis, and Layton IHC for a total of 71 in 2023, 277 in 2024, and a projected 304 in 2025.

Regarding response rates, the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standard is to arrive within 5 minutes and 20 seconds of the initial call 90% of the time. Farmington is only meeting that industry standard 33% of the time, as response times can run up to 8 minutes. This shows the need for a second station, and they may even need to add a third station in the future. However, additional staffing would be needed to staff the new stations.

If multiple calls come in at a time, Farmington needs help from other cities to handle them. In October to December of 2023, there were 39 concurrent calls. In 2024, there were 352 concurrent calls. From January to July in 2025, there were 189 concurrent calls.

Neighboring cities often aid each other in their calls, but Farmington receives aid more than they provide aid, which **Willis** said is a huge problem. From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, Farmington provided automatic aid to other cities 54 times. In the same timeframe in 2024 to 2025, Farmington provided aid 56 times. However, Farmington received aid from other cities approximately 350 times annually. This means that taxes and personnel from other cities end up running Farmington calls.

Farmington has six firefighters who work shifts 48 hours at a time. Those who are permanent part time usually work full time somewhere else, so they can't always come in and work for Farmington. She is scared of the instability that comes from having a part-time force. Having seven full time would allow Farmington to manage two calls at once, which is the goal. **Willis** is asking for eight firefighters: seven full-time and one permanent part-time. She said the Council could consider approving three additional full-timers for a total of \$170,000; a full-time fire marshall for a total of \$52,000; or six permanent part-timers (which wouldn't guarantee staffing) for a total of \$107,000. These costs include overtime, uniform costs, benefits, and salary. Because Farmington is building a new fire station and they are 18 months away from having two stations in the City, incrementally building staffing would be helpful. The City has room to house all existing and requested additional staffing in Station 71.

Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** said Farmington has more "things" than many other neighboring cities. This includes the County Courthouse, County Jail, Lagoon, and four freeways. This requires more firefighters and more calls per resident.

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** said there is very little Farmington can do to expand services without having a second fire station. Once the new fire station opens, they will have to consolidate all staffing there in order to retrofit and remodel the old fire station. He said the City will have financial resources to retrofit the old when the time comes.

Councilmember **Roger Child** asked if EMS services could be outsourced to Gold Cross for more help. **Mellor** said it would be more effective if Farmington ran it themselves, because Gold Cross does shift work for only 12 hours. An analysis would be needed. Because staffing issues are imminent, the hiring process should be started now to start use by the January budget. Increased staffing may result in a savings over time. Farmington is under contract with Fruit Heights not to increase charges for four years.

**Boshell** said eight-handed staffing will see Farmington posting better response numbers and relying less on other cities for aid. It will also help handle staffing issues created by sick and unexpected vacation days.

**Willis** said recently Intergovernmental Risk Management Agency (IRMA) began requiring annual fire inspections for all city facilities and businesses. This would require Farmington to have a full-time fire marshal instead of a part-time inspector who works full time somewhere else.

**Mellor** said a lot of firefighters aren't interested in inspecting buildings and plans. Farmington is lucky in that its part-time inspector is retiring soon from his full-time job at Hill Air Force Base (HAFB). The timing lines up that the City can bring him on full-time once he retires from HAFB.

**Boshell** added that new State legislation will require inspection of the wildland urban interface by Jan. 1. Many residents living in the urban interface will have to get inspections in order to get out of paying an annual fee on their property taxes. This is in an effort to keep insurance fees down. **Willis** said the State has developed the wildland urban interface map and associated risk scores. A risk score of 7 to 10 will result in an annual fee on property taxes. However, the State did not identify who should be doing these inspections, which will likely fall to the City.

**Willis** said additional revenue could come from charging fire prevention fees including inspections, permits, and plan reviews; as well as ambulance transports. The City billed \$2 million in ambulance transport fees in seven months, but collect on average only 40% of those fees, higher than the 37% industry standard. She said Farmington has collected more in seven months this year than they did all of last year, and is about at 43%, which is unheard of in ambulance transport.

**Mellor** said the collection rate isn't because people aren't paying their ambulance bills. It is because Medicaid, Medicare, and the jail only pay 32 cents on the dollar. Fire impact fees are for facilities or equipment over \$500,000, or big purchases only.

**Willis** said the department wouldn't benefit from a volunteer force, as volunteers would have no obligation to the City. Training and outfitting them is difficult for the resulting unstable workforce. Gold Cross would be a contractual agreement and could not provide emergency service—just interfacility transportation.

**Boshell** said Staff looked at the trends to bring in a 12-hour paramedic ambulance service, and the data does not support it. It would have to be for a day shift only, because the City would not have the room to house them. If there was a hospital in Farmington's borders, it would be a different discussion.

**Child** said the concern is the seasonality of Lagoon, and the potential needs that the Western Sports Park (WSP) will bring. **Mellor** said **Willis** and the police department have both been keeping tabs on these things and will be monitoring it closely going forward. The WSP hasn't had a whole season yet, but they are getting booked out. Increased sales tax from WSP patrons may help cover the increased demand.

**Child** said **Mellor** promised to find the funds to fulfill Willis' requests, but he hates to go on a promise for a long-term commitment. He asked what budgets would have to shrink in order to

accommodate this. **Mellor** said the contribution to the fund balance was reduced \$200,000, but that couldn't be done to fund running at 10-handed. At the end of the day, it comes down to what elements the Council wants to prioritize. Lagoon has verbally offered to pay for a full-time officer. A lot will need to be sorted out by the end of the fiscal year. The City could find itself in a tough spot if employees leave, and there is always that possibility. He would like to bite the bullet now so the hiring process for new employees can begin before others decide to leave.

**Isaacson** said response times are a matter of public safety, and the current times are unacceptable and not sustainable. When it comes to public safety, the Council needs to do what is necessary. **Child** commended **Willis** for selling the Council on the need to run eight-handed. Now that the Council recognizes the need, the question is how to pay for it. **Boshell** said prior chiefs have advocated for it, but now the Council has the data it needs to make the decision.

Finance Director **Levi Ball** said that he anticipates more revenue from ambulance fee collections, which could lessen the blow to the General Fund when financing the new positions. **Boshell** said the annual building permit fees and business license renewal fees could help pay for the fire marshal's salary, as Farmington hasn't been collecting for that in the past. **Mellor** said the major change made to the Consolidated Fee Schedule in October helps the City get ready to fund these positions. Farmington has been contemplating moving to eight-handed, and they just need to pull the trigger.

**Child** said the only remaining question is if the new positions should be full- or part-time. **Mellor** said Staff's recommendations are that the part-time element won't resolve the issue. It needs to be full-time so that Farmington can be the employees' top priority.

The Councilmembers unanimously expressed support of moving to an eight-handed fire department. **Willis** commended the Council for having the political courage to have this discussion. As a taxpayer, full-time is the best way to run the fire department.

## **DISCUSS PARK RESERVATION POLICY**

City Parks and Recreation Director **Colby Thackeray** addressed the Council about a parks reservation system to run May 1 to Oct. 1 annually. Outside that window of time, the restrooms are closed down. The weather in both March and October is unpredictable, leading to the possibility of snow and wet fields. The Easter egg hunt has been done in a foot of snow before. He would like to hold a hard line of May 1 to Oct. 1 instead of leaving it open to weather and interpretation.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** said Farmington gets less rain and snow than it used to in the past, so she would like to see the timeframe be more flexible. **Thackeray** said if out-of-season requests come in, they can bring in their own infrastructure (such as port a potties) and insurance, as well as pay the special permit fee. Staff winterizes the parks so pipes don't break.

**Mellor** said another problem is lights can't be used unless a field is reserved. **Shumway** said if resident taxpayers want to use the field, and are willing to pay to have the lights on, the fields should be available for their use. The City is a customer service-based organization, and some people are not feeling very happy.

**Boshell** said if it is left up to interpretation or the discretion of an employee, then people wanting to use the fields will argue with the employee. **Mellor** agreed, saying some will come after the

City for the employee's discretionary call. They need criteria that is not arbitrary. **Thackeray** said fall is when the root systems grow, and the grass needs time to rest to allow that growth. If turf is damaged in November, it won't grow back.

**Child** said this is worthy of further discussion, because he has had people red in the face yelling at the City about this, and it wasn't a single incident. The new County WSP facility will put more pressure on Farmington, and the decision needs to be hard and fast, not wishy-washy.

**Mayor Anderson** said time should be set aside at the annual retreat to talk about this. Hard and fast criteria need to be presented to see if there is a workable solution. This should be administered so City employees aren't put on the firing lines.

## **REGULAR SESSION**

Present:

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

*City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,  
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,  
Community Development Director Lyle  
Gibson,  
City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon  
Hansell,  
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad  
Boshell, and  
Finance Director Levi Ball.*

## **CALL TO ORDER:**

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. Councilmember **Amy Shumway** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by City Manager **Brigham Mellor**.

## **PRESENTATION:**

### **Student Spotlight: Hailey Robinson**

Farmington Junior High's choir teacher nominated **Hailey Robinson** as student of the month. **Robinson** is hard-working, considerate, and friendly with a bright future ahead of her.

### **Resolution renaming Kings Cross Trail to Ben's Berms**

**Mayor Anderson** presented this agenda item. **Ben Butterfield** has been an active supporter and promoter of Farmington's mountain biking community for years, including from the beginning in creating the Farm mountain bike park. He is now wrapping up his tenure as a Farmington High School mountain bike coach. There are 250 students on the high school team. The student team captains approached the Council with this special request in honor of his service to the

community. **Mayor Anderson** presented **Butterfield** with a plaque commemorating the occasion.

***Motion:***

Councilmember **Alex Leeman** moved that the City Council approve the resolution renaming the trail Kings Cross to Ben's Berms.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Consideration of a Rezone Development Agreement and Schematic Subdivision plan for the Heritage Residential Subdivision**

Community Development Director **Lyle Gibson** presented this agenda item. The 51-acre Heritage residential subdivision would be off the West Davis Corridor (WDC) stretching into Park Lane. It is agricultural property in the Buffalo Ranch area that the owner has been seeking alternate uses for since the new highway came through the area. The landowner has engaged Cole West to develop 187 single-family detached homes here, which is about four units per acre. This would require a rezone and Development Agreement to account for the desired uses and clustering. The Development Review Committee (DRC) considers technical issues on a high level, but the schematic level requires approval through the legislative process.

When the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this matter, several comments were received, as noted in the packet and minutes. The Commission was unanimous in its recommendation not to approve this subdivision. As the legislative body, the Council can concur with the Planning Commission or differ in its opinion. The applicant is looking for direction from the Council on what the right use is for this property.

Applicant **Darlene Carter**, representing Cole West, expressed appreciation for residents who will be sharing feedback tonight. She is not a resident of Farmington, but as a Fruit Heights resident, she considers herself part of the community. She has been involved in development in Farmington for the past 20 years. In the past 18 months, her company has gotten a lot of feedback from small group meetings and Farmington Staff. She appreciates this opportunity to explain why their project would be a great fit for the City. She would like to walk away tonight with specific feedback.

**Carter** said her company represents future homeowners, who are not in the room today to advocate for themselves. It is good to look back over the past year at real estate transactions and where people are moving. Farmington has done a good job providing luxury estate homes as well as townhomes averaging \$493,000 in price. But there is a "missing middle" of single-family homes.

New construction supply is not meeting current demand. The year 1995 is the average home construction age in Farmington. There is a lack of new housing construction in Farmington. The market is staying between the \$500,000 and \$900,000 price point. The current average newly constructed home is \$1.43 million on 0.26 acres, but there is no new construction between \$620,000 and \$1.06 million. The lowest price of a new single-family home is \$946,000 on 0.13 acres. The ability to move out of a townhome into a single-family home in Farmington is unattainable.

The Heritage helps fill in this “missing middle” gap in Farmington. The proposed subdivision is 51.24 acres. There are 10.98 acres of Right of Way; 10.88 acres of open space maintained by the HOA; 29.29 acres of lots; 187 total lots; 3.65 units per acre of density; an average lot size of 6,822 square feet; playground and picnic area; pickleball courts; and trail system connections throughout the community and beyond. To know what a 30-foot home looks like on a 40-foot wide lot, you can look at The Rose at 850 N. Lagoon Drive built in 2022. It represents this same product. Other examples are The Fairway of Oakridge, Kestrel Bay, and Moon Park.

Three lot sizes are proposed. Cottage Lot Type 1 fits homes on the 40-foot wide frontage with homes that are between 2,000 and 2,600 square feet. Cottage Lot Type 2 is 50 feet wide and would fit homes between 2,300 to 2,900 square feet. There would be 81 of these lots. Estate Lots are close to a third acre in size and would have homes that are 2,300 to 2,900 square feet.

**Carter** said Cole West is known for architectural design. She invites feedback from the Council but also reminded the full audience that they will not be able to get feedback from those who potentially want to live here and right now can't.

**Mayor Anderson** said that this proposal came up six to seven months ago. The Council is aware of what was presented to the Planning Commission, and has also reviewed emails that have been presented. Therefore, this is not new to the Council. He asked the audience for a raise in hands for those who are opposed to this request. More than half the audience raised their hands.

**Isaacson** asked that going forward during the public hearing, those in the audience who agree with the speaker could wave their hand in agreement, a silent way to show ongoing sentiment of the crowd.

**Mayor Anderson** opened the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.

**Bryan Bryner** (309 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) said his property borders this property. He sent a letter to the Council directed at the legal issues this proposal has. First, he addressed the requested rezone to the Agricultural Estates (AE) zone with the Agriculture Planned (AP) District overlay. After reviewing the ordinances, he feels the applicant should be denied because they do not comply with the AE zone or AP overlay requirements. The AP overlay standards are that lots can't be smaller than the underlying zone. In this case, the underlying zone is 1-acre lots. There are not Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), open space concessions, or moderate-income housing concessions. The minimum lot size in the Development Agreement is 3,000 square feet. Therefore, it does not comply with the zoning regulations. The AP overlay is not the right way to go forward with this development. If there are other ways to develop their land that complies with zoning regulations, they need to resubmit their application in order to collect public comment on their resubmitted application.

**Greg Daly** (1951 Buffalo Circle, Farmington, Utah) said this proposal does not meet the General Plan. One of the themes and priorities in the General Plan is preservation of neighborhood character; and this is not compatible with the neighborhood. Farmington has done a great job creating ample moderate-income housing and housing diversity in six to seven other areas of the City. Many people love the community and actually want more space, not less. They want bigger homes on half-acre lots. If the developer would sell these as half-acre lots, they would sell well. He mentioned that Planning Commissioner **Kristen Sherlock** is a realtor and she recently sold a half-acre Layton property. She was surprised that it sold so well, as it backs up to a freeway. However, it sold better than others in the area because it was a larger lot. Hers was a half acre, while the others were a third acre or less. Space matters. West Farmington is distinguished by its spacious lots, which is why everyone originally moved here in the last 20 years. Nothing about this proposal is cohesive or compatible with development patterns. The existing infrastructure is not set up for this level of density. He is worried about the traffic and safety on the corner of 1525 and Flatrock.

**Denise Poulos** (16 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) said she is speaking for the animals such as sheep, horses, goats, and birds that all need refuge and space.

**Monica Bell** (1712 W. Flatrock, Farmington, Utah) said all the other developments that the applicant mentioned have something that this one doesn't, and that is access to roads. The proposed subdivision will have a negative impact on access and existing roads.

**Chris Salway** (468 Commanche Road, Farmington, Utah) wanted to share some direct quotes that did not make it into the Planning Commission minutes. A unanimous denial from the Planning Commission is rare. The density is astronomically too high. It looks like a trailer community and doesn't fit the community. If it is not half-acre lots, it should be denied. It doesn't match the neighborhood by any stretch of the imagination.

**Sarah Martin** (2054 W. Buffalo Circle, Farmington, Utah) said she and her husband have attended every meeting about this, careful to point out to Cole West that the entryway to this community is directly across from her driveway. They don't listen when this is pointed out and don't acknowledge that this is affecting people, as they are not willing to change it. She understands that the landowner only owns so much frontage, but that is not her fault. They are infringing on her and her whole neighborhood.

**Christine Mikklesen** (17 N. Buffalo Road, Farmington, Utah) said Cole West did a great job trying to sell their proposal about the "missing middle." However, it overlooked the fact that many people want to move up and want more property. There are no horse properties to be found in Davis County. This area is supposed to be rural, and nobody here planned for a freeway to come through.

**Angelle Salway** (468 Commanche Road, Farmington, Utah) pointed out that the traffic study was performed on Aug. 1 when school was not yet in session. Traffic here looks completely different when school is in session and everyone is home from vacation. An increase of 175 vehicles per day is huge for this existing neighborhood, and the roads will not be able to handle the increase traffic.

**Sabrina Plummer** said she and her son currently live on this property; she grew up on the ranch her grandparents built. She runs this property and is in charge of the horses. She takes lots of



business calls because many ranches are closing due to development. She is an animal love and wants to keep some property for horses and other animals, as they have the right to have a place to live.

**Jeremy Willden** (304 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) said he has three acres of horse property. He moved here from Layton for the space. He agreed with **Plummer** (landowner) that a lot of horse facilities are closing because of development. There is already flooding here due to the new highway, and putting houses there will cause even more flooding. He works for the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and predicted that the new highway will be widened to three lanes in the future, so houses may be bought and demolished to make room for that future expansion.

**Leeman** said it may take the developer 187 homes to get the return they need to get.

**John Poulos** (16 S. Buffalo Ranch Road, Farmington, Utah) said the Agricultural Very Low Density (AA) zone should still be available to people with horses.

**Curt Workman** (1 N. Buffalo Road, Farmington, Utah) grew up in Farmington and has lived here his whole life. He knew the **Plummers** (landowners) while growing up, and was welcomed onto their property. He understands the need to develop this area. However, like the Planning Commission mentioned, current zoning should be taken into account. This area gets massive flooding issues when it rains and snows, and there must be proper consideration for that. The feedback they have provided the developer has not been considered.

**Lindy Kartchner** (1779 Flatrock Drive, Farmington, Utah) said the 10 acres of proposed open space are due to the power lines and the fact that there is no way to develop on that property. She believes the traffic study variables were controlled in order to affect the outcome. She would like the developer and Council to listen to the concerns.

**Jonathon Miller** said he was against the WDC affecting his living environment. Farmington now is not what it was 25 to 30 years ago. Because home prices now are ridiculous, the product proposed is needed.

**Matthew Rodgers** (1919 Old Fort Road, Farmington, Utah) said while the comments tonight have been great, the General Plan doesn't care about thoughts and feelings. All that is needed is to consult the General Plan that was updated just this year. Roads have changed everything, and the General Plan needs to be changed to reflect that. Farmington's governing documents don't allow certain things, and the General Plan is clear. This is not right. He asked the Council to use the General Plan that was created as a guide and do what the Planning Commission did: unanimously deny this proposal. Good development will follow the General Plan.

**Andrew Brough** (1933 Old Fort Road, Farmington, Utah) said he is the Vice President of the existing HOA in the area, and he hasn't heard from anyone who is in favor of this. He is definitely opposed to it. He moved from 1914 Clark Lane to this area to avoid traffic, and his would negatively affect the area's traffic.

**Mayor Anderson** closed the Public Hearing at 8:17 p.m.

**Mayor Anderson** said he is becoming more density sensitive over the last two to three years as the City has seen all the approvals take root north of Station Park. Farmington is one of the cities in Davis County that has become progressive in inventory. This will help pay for the fire station.

The west side was farmers when the WDC was thrown in, and then the rug was taken out from underneath those residents. He said he is density sensitive, and development ought to be congruent with what is existing, not a hodge podge or an injection of high density that seems out of place. Traffic is a concern.

Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** said **Bryner**'s comments were correct that a lot size can't be lower than the underlying zone when using the AP overlay. City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said this is unsettled since there is no precedent, so the ordinance has tied the Council's hands. The developer can exclude any requirement in the zoning code, so there is a good faith argument on both sides. If it is a close call, the judge would be instructed to side with the applicant due to property rights.

**Isaacson** said he has lived on 1100 West for 20 years, and he started out having no houses on three sides of him. He could see to the Great Salt Lake. Now there is a major sports park at the end of his street and he is near a high school. So, he feels the pain of those offering public comment tonight. When the freeway came through, it was horrible and he donated money to fight it. It is a tragedy that UDOT built through conservation easements. The City defended those easements in court, but they lost. It honestly was a raw deal that was dealt to the City. Frankly, he likes this proposal, but not in this location because it is so different from the neighbors. Farmington needs housing like this because they do have a "missing middle." It is amazing to him that people are willing to build estate homes next to a freeway. What is proposed would be a better use for this land, with more transitional zoning next to the freeway.

He said **Plummer** deserves to be treated like any other citizen who has the right to ask for a rezone and develop their property. Like most of the property on the west side, Station Park was a horse field in the AA zone when he moved here. While **Isaacson** is in favor of rezoning this land to AE, he is not in favor of increasing housing in an agricultural area. He would vote to rezone it without the AP overlay.

**Shumway** said she was here when the City first established the AP overlay, and this was not in the sphere of what was passed. That overlay needs to be looked at again. She lives in the Oakridge neighborhood that was used as an example in the applicant's presentation, and she does not think it is comparable with this development because of the quantity and size of lots. The proposed development doesn't seem to fit in that location. She does like cottage type of development in certain areas. Although the provided traffic study says this area could handle the influx of traffic, she doesn't think that it actually could.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** said that developments like this are needed due to the "missing middle," but this is not the right place. The biggest concern is the access road. The other examples provided dump traffic onto main roads that can handle larger volumes. She appreciates how everyone handled the meeting and public hearing tonight. She said all should be very cautious of vilifying anyone. The **Plummers** are good people who have every right to advocate to get the most out of their land. Also, Cole West is a great partner in Farmington City.

Councilmember **Roger Child** said he is a strong proponent of personal property rights, as the ability to develop properties in this country is eroding. At the same time, there has to be a balance of property rights while considering the impact of the proposed development. The contrast here couldn't be more wide and broad, and this would create distinct neighborhoods. The proposed density shouldn't be put up next to large density. He would propose estate lots

instead, allowing a single-loaded road to border adjacent property so owners they could have access to develop their own property in the future. They are currently dealing with landlocked property with no access.

Cole West is an amazing developer, and Farmington has had good relationships with them in the past. This is not about the property owner or the proposed developer. It is more about what is presently there and what is being proposed in contrast. Half-acre lots are too much for some people to maintain, but too small for any other use. To be considered an agricultural use, they need to be 1 and 2 acres. He feels this should be allowed to be an AE zone, but the proposed density is not the intended use for the AE zone. He thinks the developer and property owner either go back and discuss a blend of uses, or give the neighbors the opportunity to develop the back of their properties by accessing a single-loaded road. The density needs to be lowered. This neighborhood was impacted by the freeway against their will, and putting this proposed development on them would be too much of an ask, in his opinion. He likes this product, but not on this property. There should be a way for adjacent property owners to benefit.

**Mayor Anderson** said he is a code nerd, and the purpose of the AE zone is expressed as establishing residential use for farming and noncommercial uses.

**Leeman** said he is a lame duck City Councilmember who has been on the Council and Planning Commission for more than a decade, so it is time to hang it up. That being said, Cole West does a nice job and provides a good product. He wishes the City could get more of this product and formatting, but not in this location. It is important for developers to listen to City Staff and the property owner also. The proposed development doesn't work in this spot because it doesn't match the area. They are trying hard to make an awkward parcel make sense. This is a nightmare, and he wishes the WDC had gone on the west side of the pond. While he doesn't have a problem rezoning the property, an actual different plan would be needed. Although they are entitled to develop, he would vote for denial on this particular proposal. The AP overlay does not work as a way to get more density.

**Shumway** said this is an awkward lot, so it would be appropriate to deviate for weird angles, which would allow for a few quarter-acre lots here and there.

**Isaacson** said he is worried about potential flooding, and more studies would be needed addressing this. However, these are only preliminary discussions. The new freeway is creating a dike, and it is a real concern that should be taken into account as development proceeds in this area. Affordable housing and a range of different housing types are not being discussed. He likes the idea of existing property owners having a road along the back of their property, providing frontage that would open up the opportunity to develop further to the west. Living on one of several deep lots on 1100, 11 miles from an international airport, he knows his neighbors will develop eventually.

### ***Motion:***

**Shumway** moved that the City Council deny the rezone, Development Agreement, and Schematic Subdivision plan for the Heritage residential subdivision.

### **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. Reasons vocalized by those in attendance at the public hearing and otherwise submitted to the record.

**Leeman** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

### **Issuance of Series 2025 Sales & Franchise Tax Revenue Bond**

Finance Director **Levi Ball** presented this agenda item. The parameters were set at a prior meeting, and the City is not planning to bond for the full \$8 million as it would be more like \$6 million.

**Mellor** said the property on Main Street was sold to the Boyer Company for \$10.5 million, and \$700,000 has to be kept in escrow until things get through the Army Corps of Engineers. The Fire Station will cost around \$16 million. Although the land could have been developed out to maximum density, that was not the direction the public wanted to go. Therefore, development was scaled back, and the City will need to use impact fees from commercial and other development over the next 20 years to finance this bond. The debt service will be \$460,000 annually. He said the City has enough resources built up to cover this payment for three years. If interest rates go down, Staff intends to refinance bonds for the fire station and water project, possibly combining them into one. There is no sense in paying the bond off too soon if there are plans to refinance it in the next three years anyway.

**Mayor Anderson** said many cities bond to pay for their fire stations.

**Mayor Anderson** opened and closed the Public Hearing at 9:05 p.m., as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

### ***Motion:***

**Leeman** moved that the City Council approve the issuance and sale of not more than \$8,000,000 aggregate principal amount of Sales and Franchise Tax Revenue bonds.

**Child** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

**BUSINESS:****Consider approval of SIRQ Construction to be the Construction Manager/General Contractor for Fire Station 72**

City Manager **Chad Boshell** presented this agenda item. Using the same Request For Proposal (RFP) process Farmington used for North Cottonwood Park, Staff hired a construction manager/general contractor. The City received 13 proposals, which was a lot, from which they chose to interview four. Price isn't the only element to consider, and SIRQ wasn't the lowest or highest proposal. All four proposals were close, within \$60,000 for a \$16 million project; Big D had a higher bid. SIRQ is currently doing the North Cottonwood Park. In the next two months, SIRQ will consider constructability, affordability, and cost saving issues in order to come back with an amended agreement that will set a more firm price.

**Isaacson** said the general conditions seemed high to him. **Mayor Anderson** noted that SIRQ was so confident in their abilities that they were willing to agree to a "not to exceed" amount.

***Motion:***

**Child** moved that the City Council approve the contract with Sirq Construction to be the construction manager and general contractor for the Farmington Fire Station 72 subject to amendments satisfactory to the City Attorney.

**Leeman** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

Councilmember Roger Child

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

Councilmember Scott Isaacson

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

Councilmember Melissa Layton

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

**Consideration of a sub Project Master Plan (PMP)/Development Agreement for the Concept Site Plans and Schematic Plat for C3 QuikTrip, including sign details**

**Gibson** presented this agenda item, where Stack controls the land under contract. This fuel center convenience store would be on the northeast corner of Innovator in the Office Mixed Use (OMU) mixed use area, in an auto-centric area off the interchange. A pedestrian plaza is proposed for the corner. While the use is permitted, there are rigid design standards. Whether their design accommodates those standards is up for legislative approval. The Planning Commission had two requests for changes, as the original design didn't include any windows on side that faced the main street.

**Braxton Kee**, Real Estate project manager for QuikTrip, addressed the Council. This Farmington location will be one of the first QuikTrips in the Salt Lake City market. The original family still owns the business, which started in 1958 in Oklahoma. They are currently operating 85 stores in the Tulsa area, and have never laid off an employee. Each store creates 20 to 25 jobs upon opening. The average store manager makes an annual salary of \$110,000 while an entry-level assistant would make \$55,000. Each store is also a safe place location for endangered

youth. Food items that would be offered for sale include donuts, breakfast pizzas, sandwiches, fries, mozzarella sticks, etc. Cost would be about \$3.99 to \$6.99 per sandwich, but cheaper with their app program. Farmington's location would have 14 fueling positions, and this would be one of the "fancier" designs.

**Leeman** said he grew up in Iowa where QuikTrips were part of his childhood. It is a great company in the Midwest, much like Maverik is here in Utah. **Isaacson** said he did not see the PMP attached. **Gibson** said this is a detailed initial plan. If things remain consistent with this initial iteration, Staff will have the final approval. However, if there are significant changes, it would come back to both the Planning Commission and City Council.

***Motion:***

**Leeman** moved that the City Council approve the PMP/Development Agreement, concept site plan, sign details, and schematic subdivision for QuikTrip as included in the Staff Report, subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met.

**Findings 1-3:**

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.
2. The stated concept site plan, elevations, and signage align with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan, and original Stack Development Agreement from 2020.
3. Per the recommendation of the Planning Commission, the applicant has added fenestration to the south façade of the building and reduced the proposed sign height.

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

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

**Consideration of a Project Master Plan and schematic subdivision plat for The Violet**

**Gibson** presented this agenda item. Since this is a residential piece of the Development Agreement in the OMU district, it requires legislative approval. The Planning Commission recommends approval with conditions, with Staff handling technical issues. This townhome development will require multiple access points based on the number of units. The length of the dead end determines fire access. Front doors will be on the street, and access will be to the back, which creates desired aesthetics. The Council must determine if the proposed angle parking stalls on the road are appropriate in this area. Although it would add more parking, the DRC had some concerns. The HOA would handle maintenance and snow removal. Issues such as garbage removal and possible flooding near the creek will be handled at the preliminary plat level.

Applicant **Taylor Alvarez** with Cole West addressed the Council. These are 39 for-sale, three-level townhomes, each with 1,700 square feet. The proposal represents the highest and best use of the property, and fits the intent of the area.

**Isaacson** said not seeing commercial or office buildings makes him nervous. **Shumway** said their plans are contingent on Rocky Mountain Power providing more power. **Child** said he liked the architecture and that the product will be offered for sale instead of for rent.

***Motion:***

**Child** moved that the City Council approve the Development Agreement and Schematic Subdivision plans for The Violet, subject to all applicable Farmington City standards and ordinances, and that all Development Review Committee conditions are met subject to the following changes or conditions 1-2:

1. The street network provides for a secondary point of access satisfying the ordinance limit of no more than 24 units on a dead-end street. This access should be in addition to any emergency access that may be required to manage the length of Street D north of its intersection with Street B.
2. A public access easement be provided over the trail along Shepard Creek.

**Findings 1-2:**

1. The Subdivision design aligns with the North Station Area Master Plan, the General Land Use Plan, and original Park Lane Commons master plan from prior agreements.
2. With the proposed changes, the project will enhance safety and access.

**Isaacson** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

**White Horse Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD)**

City Planner **Shannon Hansell** presented this agenda item. This is 0.95 acres with an existing home that was built in the 1960s. Since it is older than 50 years, it qualifies for historic eligibility. In the Large Residential-Foothill (LR-F) zone, the conventional lot size is 20,000 square feet, so this site could yield up to two lots. However, the applicant would like an alternative 10,000 square foot lot size—yielding three lots total—in exchange for becoming a PUD and preserving the historic home.

Since creating the Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU) ordinance, it has become common in Farmington to have 10 to 15 applications for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per year, half of which are detached. **Hansell** said all they need is a building permit, online application, and staff-level approval. A Subordinate Single Family (SSF) unit can be sold, but it is deed restricted to be owner-occupied for two years after the creation of the SSF, meaning the property owner has to live on site. This is part of the moderate-income housing strategy. If the

applicant is allowed three lots, two could have DADUs, for a total of five. Otherwise, they could have two lots, each of which could have a DADU for a total of four.

**Isaacson** said he doesn't see anything unique or historic about the existing split level home.

**Layton** said with this being directly on Main Street, it will be difficult handling many additional vehicles as well as garbage cans for five different homes.

**Leeman** said when this ordinance was originally passed, he remembers saying it would basically double the density of the entire City. While he thinks it is ridiculous having five lots on a property of this size, the bed was already made for this. The idea was for one house on a big lot to have a smaller lot. The concern is it allows a development double the density.

**Shumway** said Lot 1 and 2 are in the spirit of the ordinance, but Lots 4 and 5 are not. She would like to consider some changes for when this ordinance sunsets in about a year. **Isaacson** said Farmington adopted the ordinance as an experiment, and they are struggling to find ways that it provides affordable housing. The theory was to try it, but it has been very challenging. This is why a sunset was put on it.

**Child** said the alternative could be to come in with a normal subdivision with three lots, each sold off to individual buyers. Since the lots would be of adequate size, those buyers could each come in and build DADUs. Nobody would squirm if it was phased and developed over time like this. Today's proposal presents a problem because it would all be done at once. **Shumway** said if it is planned from the beginning, utilities could be part of it. **Child** said the State has allowed DADUs in all cities, and they can be handled by Staff. Being able to offer for-sale DADUs will result in more quality builds compared to rentals, which can be shed and garages converted into living quarters.

**Roberts** said that while the State is onboard with Internal Accessory Dwelling Units (IADUs), cities are resisting it, and then the State is pushing harder. Ultimately this unlocks potential units someone could buy and use to build wealth. It is on the way for the State to allow DADUs like they have IADUs, as long as the lot is big enough.

**Leeman** said someone could get wise to this and make a mockery of Farmington, leading to a political disaster and controversy like Buffalo Ranch. Therefore, the ordinance needs to be looked at.

Applicant **Ben White**, who lives in the existing home, addressed the Council. He said he would like homes for his children, as well as less yard work. Housing affordability is a big deal. His plan is to sell the lot on Main Street to pay for the required infrastructure. Since he does not want parking on Main Street, each of these lots would have a driveway with room for two cars, and every home would have a garage. The DADUs would be between 1,300 to 1,500 square feet and have basements.

**Hansell** said the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item. Neighbors showed up wanting details. **Leeman** said this design does let vehicles pull onto Main Street facing the street rather than backing onto it.



***Motion:***

**Leeman** moved that the City Council approve the schematic subdivision plan and preliminary PUD master plan for the White Horse PUD, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances, and the following Conditions 1-4:

1. All remaining DRC requirement must be addressed, including Fire Department requirements.
2. Access and utility easements are recorded on the driveway portion of Lot 3.
3. Any work on Main Street is subject to UDOT Permitting.
4. All other requirements of 11-28-200 pertaining to SSFs are addressed.

**Findings 1-4:**

1. The project meets the purpose of the Planned Unit Development Chapter, which allows flexibility for infill lots.
2. The creation of SSF lots aligns with the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan.
3. The creation of SSF lots has a similar impact to that of the already permitted detached accessory dwelling unit use.
4. Access to Lots 2 and 4 are granted access via Lot 3 as part of approval.

**Isaacson** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

**Amendment to Development Agreement for the Hess Farms Subdivision**

**Gibson** presented this agenda item. This subdivision north of Lagoon Drive was previously approved three to four years ago and is back to be updated. Wright Development completed all the subdivision improvements, and another company will be doing the vertical construction. It was originally planned as commercial and rental townhomes, with the end units deed restricted and dedicated for moderate income housing. This is now being proposed as a for-sale model instead. The applicant was not able to pull off deed restricting the moderate-income housing for sale as eventually the deed restriction would wear off and someone would get the windfall of market rate values. The proposed amendment also corrects a requirement for the improvement of part of 700 West, which is actually part of approved plans for a neighboring project that recently received preliminary plat approval.

**Isaacson** pointed out a complication that because there is no eligibility requirement, a wealthy person could end up living in the moderate-income housing that has to be owner occupied.

Applicant **Logan Johnson** with Wright Development said it didn't make sense to be obligated to build on property they didn't control, so he would like that removed from the agreement.

**Cameron Scott**, land acquisition manager with David Weekley Homes, said his company is purchasing the property from Wright Development. Since his company is taking a loss of \$8,000

per unit, he thinks it is fair to have the deed restriction last for 30 years, the same length of restriction for owner occupancy.

**Isaacson** said there are some technical problems on the deed restriction form including unclear cross references and language. He shared these with **Roberts**.

***Motion:***

**Isaacson** moved that the City Council approve the Amendment to the Development Agreement for the Hess Farms Subdivision as drafted, subject to changes to the form of the deed restriction attached to the Development Agreement as discussed with the City Attorney, subject to the City Attorney approving the final form.

**Findings 1-2:**

1. The 700 West improvements referenced in the agreement are part of the approved plans for The Ana subdivision so the existing requirement is unnecessary.
2. The change to the Moderate Income housing program to allow “for sale” moderate income units rather than “for rent” units continues to meet the intent of the requirement while offering a desirable less common option for providing housing which can help residents build equity.

**Child** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

**Packer Subdivision Alternate Lot Size and Sidewalk Installation Considerations**

**Gibson** presented this agenda item. The Packer family owns this property on 100 North with a newer home with a garage on the far east side as well as a historic ADU built in 1861. Both Staff and the Planning Commission are in favor of this conventional subdivision in the OTR as it fits the neighborhood.

Generally, the City wants developers to install sidewalks for their projects, even if it is done in a piecemeal manner. Since there are no sidewalks on 100 North and a sidewalk here would not connect to anything, the tough ask is requiring the applicant to put in sidewalks. **Gibson** said the City would probably never need sidewalks in that area. The ordinance allows the Council to consider alternatives in specific cases.

The Planning Commission is split on which option to require of the applicant. One option is that instead of installing sidewalks now, the developer could pay a fee in lieu, putting money in an account so if in the future the City is ready to do sidewalk improvements in the area, they have already paid their fair share. Another option is to not collect money up front, but record it against the property that money could be collected when the City is ready to do improvements in the area.

Applicant **Chaney Packer** said she does not prefer to install sidewalk at this time, but she is willing to sign an agreement about paying for it if it is installed in the future, which she feels is

unlikely. She would rather have the money now to build the new house. Pedestrians can find an existing sidewalk on the west side of 200. The lot is sloped, and ripping up an existing rock retaining wall there would take a lot of money. With a nearby trailhead, only hikers use this street, and they run on the road.

**Child** said this is on his block in his neighborhood, and the children walk on the sidewalk on the west side of 200 to go to school. There is no need for additional sidewalk in this historic neighborhood. The Packers have done an amazing job preserving the old rock home and putting in new landscaping, and now they will be allowed to build a newer home. Asking them to put in sidewalk would be unreasonable, because it would go nowhere.

**Mayor Anderson** said this feels different than when a new development is coming in. This is an ADU coming into an existing historic neighborhood.

**Isaacson** said the City has experienced how divisive and difficult it can be to enforce agreements that require landowners to pay to put in a sidewalks 30 years after an agreement is signed. The easiest thing would be for the applicant to give the City money now, which would be held in an account in case it is needed in the future.

**Gibson** said sidewalks would be about \$48 per foot, which would total roughly \$15,000. It could cost more than that to tear out the existing retaining wall.

**Leeman** said it can be a slippery slope to not enforce a policy that is in place, and he hates to ignore it. If the City doesn't care about sidewalks in this area, then they should change the ordinance. The Packers have put in brand new landscaping, and there can't be more than a foot of park strip installed there anyway. The argument that a sidewalk here wouldn't connect to anything doesn't hold water with him, because at some point, the City needs to start putting them in everywhere. If the City doesn't care about sidewalks in Old Town, they should do the deferral agreement option.

**Mellor** said if Farmington had money in the future for sidewalks, they likely wouldn't start in Old Town. They would instead start in other areas like 1525, 1100, and Main Street. If the applicant put in the sidewalk now, it would be a liability for the City to maintain it. Farmington already has a list of sidewalks to prioritize. From a maintenance side, sidewalks in Old Town would be low on the maintenance priority list.

**Child** agreed, saying this is not a typical subdivision and they don't require sidewalks to DADUs. There are not sidewalks on State Street east of Main. His whole neighborhood is used to having no sidewalks in Old Town. **Mayor Anderson** said any crumbly old chunks of sidewalk in the area are not connected. **Shumway** said they should be cautious of setting precedence.

***Motion:***

**Isaacson** moved that the City Council approve the Packer Subdivision Alternate Lot Size Agreement subject to the following Condition 1:

1. All remaining DRC requirements must be addressed at subsequent steps prior to recording.

Findings 1:

1. The existing historic building on site qualifies per the provision of the City's ordinance to use alternate lot standards and the proposed agreement is sufficient to ensure this preservation occurs.

**Leeman** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

***Motion:***

**Isaacson** moved that the City Council approve a deferral agreement requiring that the landowner to pay for the installation of sidewalk at a future date when the City determines it is time to have sidewalk installed.

Finding 1:

1. Collection of fees in the future will more accurately account for construction of sidewalk improvements.

**Leeman** seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

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

**BOARD OF MUNICIPAL CANVASSERS**

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,  
City Manager Brigham Mellor,  
Board member Roger Child,  
Board member Scott Isaacson,  
Board member Melissa Layton,  
Board member Alex Leeman,  
Board member Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,  
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,  
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,  
Community Development Director Lyle  
Gibson, and  
City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon  
Hansell*

***Motion:***

Board member **Alex Leeman** made the minute motion to adjourn to the Board of Municipal Canvassers Meeting.

Board member **Amy Shumway** seconded the motion. All board members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Board member Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Board member **Mayor Anderson** called the meeting to order at 11:03 p.m.

### **General Election Results:**

In the general election, 5,188 ballots were cast including 5,089 by mail; 2 early in person; 94 in person on Election Day; and 3 provisional. There was a 35.35% turnout.

For the mayoral race, **Brett Nathan Anderson** had 4,381 votes, and **Jorge Quinones** had 722 votes. For the two City Council seats, **Melissa Allphin Layton** got 4,123 votes; **Kristen D Sherlock** got 3,574 votes; and **Laverne Schraedel** got 1,158 votes.

### ***Motion:***

Board member **Scott Isaacson** moved that the Board accept the Canvass report as presented.

Board member **Melissa Layton** seconded the motion. All board members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Board member Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

### ***Motion:***

**Leeman** moved that the Board adjourn and reconvene the City Council Meeting.

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

Board member Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Board member Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

### **SUMMARY ACTION:**

#### **Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List**

The Council considered the Summary Action List including:

- Approval of October 21, 2025 City Council meeting minutes. **Isaacson** said on page 2 of the minutes (page 379 of the packet), it should read: The Mosquito Abatement District is planning to raise taxes to update their buildings, specifically adding women's restrooms; as well as tearing down and replacing a pesticide storage building; and minor remodeling.
- Monthly Financial Report
- Surplus Property List

***Motion:***

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

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

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

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

**GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:**

**City Manager Report**

**Mellor** said he would send an email to Councilmembers.

**Mayor Anderson and City Council Reports**

**Layton** said she may be out of town during the upcoming regular swearing in ceremony.

**Isaacson** said the mosquito abatement board approved a contractor for their new building. They stopped spraying for mosquitoes after September.

**Mayor Anderson** said the State should not punish cities who are doing things right regarding moderate-income housing. For example, if the city has a certain ratio of multifamily, they should not be penalized. If those doing it right get punished for everyone else doing it wrong, then there is no incentive.

**Leeman** said he heard that the Shepard overpass would open this week. **Mellor** said he would confirm.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion:***

**Layton** made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:14 p.m.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman  
 Councilmember Roger Child  
 Councilmember Scott Isaacson

X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay  
 X Aye \_\_\_\_ Nay

Councilmember Melissa Layton  
Councilmember Amy Shumway

**X** Aye ☐ Nay  
**X** Aye ☐ Nay

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "DeAnn Carlile". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

**DeAnn Carlile**, Recorder