

FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

March 6, 2018

WORK SESSION

Present: Councilmembers Rebecca Wayment, Doug Anderson, Cory Ritz, Brigham Mellor, City Manager Dave Millheim, City Development Director David Petersen, City Planner Eric Anderson, Police Chief Wayne Hansen, Lieutenant Parish Snyder, City Engineer Chad Boshell, City Recorder Holly Gadd, and Recording Secretary Tarra McFadden

Excused: Mayor Jim Talbot and Councilmember Brett Anderson; both joined the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Councilmember **Cory Ritz** called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

Police Department Salary Structure Adjustment Proposal

Chief **Wayne Hansen** presented information regarding the challenges of recruiting and retaining police officers. He noted that some of the challenges cannot be mitigated by City efforts alone such as retirement planning and negative public opinion, but the City can overcome challenges related to wages and benefits. **Wayne Hansen** shared that the Police Department currently staffs many dedicated officers, and would not want to lose them to cities offering more competitive compensation.

Keith Johnson supported efforts to review salary data of comparative Police Departments throughout Utah. The data demonstrated that the compensation for Farmington's officers was between 5% and 12% behind comparative salaries, depending on seniority. **Wayne Hansen** proposed an increase of 12% to the police department wage scale for Police Officer II, Police Officer III and Sergeant positions. He stated that this would help retain the staff currently in place, which will allow the department to build institutional knowledge and encourage existing officers to step into supervisory roles.

Councilmember **Doug Anderson** asked about turnover and was told by **Wayne Hansen** that most has come from retirement, rather than a loss to other departments. Lt. **Parish Snyder** noted that when new officers join, the hiring process takes four months, followed by four months of training and it is typically 20 months before an officer is on their own; if the City loses officers at that point, the time and money for training is lost. He said that the proposed adjustments would demonstrate that the City is invested and wants to retain officers long-term.

Wayne Hansen shared that the Police Department hopes to maintain a positive relationship with the public as the city continues to grow and demand for their services increases. They would like to look at proactive policing through a motor patrol for traffic concerns and increasing their school presence. **Cory Ritz** asked which officer will be assigned to the new high school. **Wayne Hansen** identified Dustin Bell as the School Resource Officer and noted that he has already begun his training and will be at the school full-time.

City Manager **Dave Millheim** noted that the proposal has minimal budget impact and reviewed the General Fund balance. As the Councilmembers indicated their support for the proposal, **Dave Millheim** said that a proposal will be drafted for a formal vote in an upcoming Council meeting. The ongoing funding will be discussed as part of the budget process. Councilmembers expressed appreciation for Chief Hansen and his staff.

Other Agenda Items

Cory Ritz asked why the Animal Control Contract with Davis County was in red font on the agenda and was told that it was added to the agenda after it was originally posted, so the amended agenda highlighted the item.

Dave Millheim noted that City Attorney **Todd Godfrey** would be present in the meeting to answer any questions related to a possible “down-zone.”

Cory Ritz asked **Chad Boshell** if he was comfortable with the bid winner for the concrete work at the baseball fields. **Chad Boshell** noted that he had no concerns and that the contractor was currently completing other work in town.

The work session concluded at 6:48 p.m.

REGULAR SESSION

Present: Mayor Jim Talbot; Councilmembers Brett Anderson, Rebecca Wayment, Doug Anderson, Cory Ritz, Brigham Mellor, City Manager Dave Millheim, City Development Director David Petersen, City Planner Eric Anderson, Police Chief Wayne Hansen, Lieutenant Parish Snyder, City Attorney Todd Godfrey, City Engineer Chad Boshell, City Recorder Holly Gadd, and Recording Secretary Tarra McFadden

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Jim Talbot** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call (Opening Comments/Invocation/Pledge of Allegiance)

The invocation was offered by Councilmember **Brett Anderson** and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout **Jacob Reeder**.

PRESENTATIONS:

Recognition of Heather Barnum for Years of Service on the Planning Commission

Jim Talbot thanked **Heather Barnum** for her years of service on the Planning Commission and presented a plaque of appreciation. He noted that the Planning Commission reviews items prior to them being presented to the City Council.

Heather Barnum shared that she loved the opportunity to serve in her City with the Arts Council and the Planning Commission. She gained an appreciation for the City and its leaders.

She was encouraged to see the Youth City Council serving the City as they develop their leadership capacity.

Introduction of Youth City Council Members and Administration of Oath of Office

Jim Talbot introduced the members of the Youth City Council who help with Festival Days and other events throughout the year. **Emily Pace** said that the group meets once a month to learn about leadership, respect, kindness, and unity.

Jim Talbot administered the Oath of Office to the members of the Youth City Council.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Jim Talbot noted that discussion related to the proposed office building on Main Street would take place at a subsequent City Council meeting and to watch the Farmington City website for future agendas. He also noted that an applicant withdrew the application for a rezoning to allow townhomes near Compton Bench and so the item would not be discussed.

Mountain View PUD Subdivision Schematic Plan, Preliminary (PUD) Master Plan, and Rezone - 650 West 250 South

Mayor **Jim Talbot** introduced the rules of the Public Hearing, made the request of those present to limit their comments to three minutes, and be mindful not to repeat information previously presented but rather add new information with their comments.

Eric Anderson noted that the staff received a revised schematic plan from the applicant just prior to the meeting and indicated that the applicant would review the changes in their presentation.

Applicant, **Randy Rigby**, 245 South Cobble Creek Road, presented on behalf of his partners Joe Kennard and Shane Smoot. He said that he appreciated that good dialogue that has taken place as the project has been in the planning stages and shared that there have been productive conversations with neighbors, the Planning Commission and the City Council. The revised schematic plan represents 31 buildable lots and 32 total lots, down from the originally proposed 40 lots. To address the concern related to increased traffic on 250 South, traffic will instead be concentrated to 650 West. The average lot size will be .225 acres, though lot sizes vary somewhat throughout the development. **Randy Rigby** said that they were taking a blighted property and turning it into a beautiful project of single family homes with quality builders and engineering that will add to the community. The homes are expected to start at \$400,000. The community will fit well with existing homes, retail, recreation and schools.

Randy Rigby acknowledged that change can be hard, but he is hopeful for the future and the positive change that this development will bring to the city with additional residents. He asked that the City Council support the rezone, schematic plan and preliminary (PUD) master plan.

Eric Anderson provided a summary of the review of the project by the Planning Commission and City Council. In September of 2017, the Planning Commission tabled the proposal over unresolved questions related to open space configurations and density. In October, the Planning

Commission recommended that the City Council deny the rezone application because the density concerns had not been resolved. In November, the City Council seemed to be moving towards a denial of the rezone so the applicant pulled the application temporarily to have time to meet with neighbors and make adjustments. The applicant then submitted a revised schematic plan. In December, the Planning Commission recommended the approval of the revised plan with a split vote of 3-1. In January of 2018, the City Council tabled the item to allow the applicant to review the possibility of a TDR. The applicant chose not to pursue that option and it was once again being reviewed by the City Council.

Jim Talbot asked if the changes in the schematic drawings were significant enough to necessitate a review by the Planning Commission. **Eric Anderson** noted that the schematic drawings now show less density and that the change is not significant enough to require a review by the Planning Commission, though the City Council could ask for a re-review.

Brett Anderson noted that previous discussions have included a waiver. **Eric Anderson** stated that because the overall lot count was reduced the applicant is no longer seeking a density bonus, so the waiver issue is no longer relevant. Councilmember **Rebecca Wayment** asked if the applicant would still need setback variances and if the development was still considered a PUD. **Eric Anderson** clarified that it was a PUD but he was unsure if it would require setback variances as planned. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if property could be rezoned to LR versus an R. **Eric Anderson** said the yield plan for an LR zone would be approximately 28 lots, and the proposed density is 32 lots. **Doug Anderson** asked how the lots compare to Miller Meadows and Kestrel Bay; **Eric Anderson** stated that lots for Kestrel Bay are an average of 6,000-7,000 square feet and **David Petersen** estimated Miller Meadows lot sizes to be approximately 11,000-13,000 square feet.

At 7:46 p.m., Mayor Jim Talbot opened the public hearing.

Donna Whitaker, 601 West State Street, spoke as a representative of Clark Water Company noting that the organization has an easement on the west side of the development parallel to 650 West. She asked for assurances that the development would not encroach on the easement, and expressed concern about the open ditch that would run along the property. She asked that the Council not approve the proposed development until assurances were made to protect the water easement.

Ryan Toone, 460 East 200 South, spoke in favor of the development arguing that it was a good use of land, and an improvement to the eyesore that is currently in place. He said that he hoped that the development would attract family friends in a similar demographic to him noting that his friends do not want large lots, but are attracted to the commercial development in the area.

Jim Checketts, 576 West 350 South, said that he has been a resident of Farmington for 19 years and was attracted to his property which allowed space to raise children and garden. The proposed lot sizes are too small and he argued that the 5 foot easement should not be included in the acreage size. He noted that a lot of concerned citizens have been attending meetings for months to ensure that the property was developed properly. He said that he has a loss of confidence and

feels misled. He stated that 1/3 acre lots to 2/3 acre lots are in demand so larger lots will sell. He asked the City Council to deny the request.

Brett Reese, 26 South Secretariat Way, spoke in favor of the development. He shared that he grew up in Davis County and as he has married and has a young family has moved to West Farmington for the lifestyle and neighborhood. He feels that the developer is taking land that neighbors agree is an eyesore and providing opportunities for others to live in Farmington.

Jason Chesire, 2029 Burke Lane, noted that he has lived in Farmington for 9 years in the Farmington Pointe Hunters Creek area. He spoke in favor of the zoning change and development and noted that the city is a great place to raise a family. He noted that he lives on Burke Lane, which is the thoroughfare into the development, and does not feel like traffic has been a concern.

Todd Gibbs, 595 West 350 South, said that those that have spoken in favor of the development do not live near the property suggesting that those in favor have a financial incentive or have been recruited to speak. He said that the last place that the City should change zoning is on 650 West as the impacts from the High School, Regional Park and Recreation Center have not been fully measured. People in the area have been reasonable and want the property developed if it is consistent with existing zoning and the Master Plan. If the project had been developed according to existing zoning, a lot of meetings could have been avoided. He asked that the City allow the “dust to settle” on 650 West before approving zoning changes.

Kristin Jaussi, 415 West Rigby Court, noted that she chose to live in Farmington for open space and large lots and built in Miller Meadows. She is currently looking for a larger lot, but probably won't find it in Farmington. She said that over the years she has opposed things like the Oakwood townhomes and the apartments near Chase Bank and the Council has approved them noting that the developments were consistent with the Master Plan. She wondered how the City Council could approve the proposed development by **Randy Rigby** and then deny the storage units, or vice versa and asked how both decisions could be consistent with the Master Plan. She suggested that if the Master Plan no longer worked for the city that a moratorium on development be considered until the Master Plan could be updated. She asked the City Council to make decisions consistent with the Master Plan.

Paulette Hewett, 541 West 250 South, clarified that Miller Meadows lots are from 11,000-15,000 square feet. She said that she was appreciative of the removal of the protection strips and the reduction in the lots. She noted that she is torn as she wants the property developed to get rid of the blight. She hoped that the TDR option could be an appropriate workaround. She asked that the City Council approve a plan that would allow little lots and big lots so everyone can have a “little piece of heaven on Earth.”

Krissy Guest, 553 West 250 South, shared that she appreciated the cooperation and consideration shown by the developers and was not concerned about the greater density along Legacy. She expressed concern with changing the zoning and “opening a can of worms.” She acknowledged it will be a difficult decision.

Lisa Webster, 732 West 500 South, said that she was opposed to the development. She said she does not understand why it is so difficult to stick to the zone and stay with half acre lots and said that she could guarantee that larger lots would sell. She is opposed to the zone change.

Chris Brown, 36 S. Rio Grande Avenue, noted that he has lived in various parts of Farmington and is currently living in the condominiums in the Avenues. He is grateful to have diversity of housing options in Farmington and thinks that the development increases the choices and options. He said that zones change and very few people live on property today that has maintained its original zoning. The City Council has to make decisions that will sustain a community and that means making zoning changes.

John Bilton, 1163 Alice Lane, noted that the community is changing and that is a difficult process. He mentioned a potential expansion of Legacy, US89 and the transportation demands as people travel to Salt Lake County to work. There will be continued pressure on the Wasatch Front which will double in population between now and 2050. He discussed the need for affordable housing and a variety of housing types and costs. The community needs to attract different demographics and stop putting additional pressure on existing infrastructure. He spoke in support of the development.

Natalie Hogan, 417 South 650 West, expressed concern for the disregard of the Master Plan. She suggested that the City should develop a plan that would foresee future development so that the process for approval is not deadlocked for six months. She said that she has attended meetings where every citizen spoke against a proposal and the Council approved it anyway. She feels that constituents are not being heard and she has difficulty putting her trust in City leaders. She is not opposed to development, but believes it should be constrained by the original zoning. She asked that the proposal be denied so that those who moved to the area for the agricultural areas and country life are allowed to keep the charm that is left in Farmington.

Mayor **Jim Talbot** closed the public hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Jim Talbot noted that Council has to make tough choices and noted that things are continuing the change in the City. He expressed appreciation for the way the public hearing was conducted and turned the time to the City Council for discussion.

Doug Anderson asked about the concerns regarding the water easement. **Eric Anderson** noted that the staff would typically review those concerns at the Development Review Committee stage and as part of preliminary plat approval. **Dave Millheim** asked for Donna Whitaker to follow-up with him. **Randy Rigby** also noted that their legal counsel is working with Clark Water Company to address the concerns.

Brett Anderson stated that using the PUD process allows the city to have some standards about the look and feel of the developments. As he weighs the decision, he is trying to determine what is “too dense” and that may be in the eye of the beholder. He noted that the original proposal was for 40 lots, then 34 lots with the option of a TDR and now at 31. He is not sure what the right number is, and what the yield plan would be under other scenarios. **Eric Anderson** explained that with a PUD the yield plan sets a threshold which may vary based on open space and density

bonuses so staff does not have a hard figure to consider. **Brett Anderson** said that the zoning change is a legislative decision that does not bind the future Council for the next parcel; every property can be considered separately. The property is unique as it abuts the freeway, is an in-fill lot and was a UDOT blight. He noted that his home is in an area originally zoned AE and asked about the Fieldstone Development and their density. **Dave Millheim** stated that the Fieldstone Development was allowed increased density because of exchange of the 11 acres of park land. He asked if any adjacent owners were opposed to the development and it was noted that none spoke at the public hearing. He reviewed that other standards for Preliminary PUD Master Plan Review from the City Code. **Brett Anderson** said that zoning vests rights, but it is also flexible so that zoning can be amended; the current zone does not have to be an eternal zone. He stated that the Master Plan should be updated, but the Council is not precluded from making decisions in the interim.

Councilmember **Brigham Mellor** said that he understands the consternation that people feel about rezones contrary to the general plan. He clarified that the intent of the General Plan is not to know exactly what will be developed next to one's property, but the plan exists and is used for infrastructure planning. The burden to justify a change to the General Plan lies with the developer. There are many qualitative metrics that have to be considered before a zone change can be granted. He noted that 650 West is now a minor collector road but it is not seeing the same traffic as Main Street, Clark Lane and other minor collector roads, the increased traffic from the development will not be a statistically significant increase which would cause the road to fail. He said that the General Plan does not reflect the Recreation Center, the regional park, the elementary school and some of the infrastructure around it. He noted that he lives on a ¼ acre lot and many of his neighbors live on lots of a similar size and they are not a detriment to the community. Property owners of large lots on the East side of Farmington are now approaching the City with requests to subdivide the lots or to build accessory dwellings. He said that it is important as communities change for infrastructure to be sized appropriately. **Brigham Mellor** shared information from Kelly Maxfield about not being able to farm the property with limited water access. **Brigham Mellor** shared that apartments are planned near transit hubs and then density becoming more open as you move from a hub. He stated that an approval made good planning sense.

Rebecca Wayment stated that she is not a numbers person and tries to make decisions with her heart. She has seen the application from the Planning Commission side and originally did not feel quite right. She complimented the developer for his willingness to work through the process and work with the neighbors. She said that Miller Meadows got it right with large lots against the freeway and wondered if something similar shouldn't be done with this property. With a potential expansion of Legacy she wonders if people on small lots will feel encroached upon and not want to stay long. She understands that the City cannot stay the same forever and that the City should allow for a diversity of housing options. **Rebecca Wayment** said she can breathe easier with 31 lots but wonders if that is still too dense.

Cory Ritz shared that he agreed with much of what has been said and is torn on the development. He noted that a number of residents that had initial concerns are less so now that

the plans have changed. He said that the staff should work through the issue with the Clark Water company but that he was not particularly worried about the easement issue. He made comments about originally buying property under the AG zoning that changed to AA and then AE. He has seen consternation over various lot sizes throughout the City but noted that if zoning had remained the same as it was 25 years ago he would have few neighbors. He hoped that through the change the community will be bigger and better. He said that the Master Plan is a set of guidelines not rules. He was complimentary of the developers as they have sat with the tough issues and their responsiveness to neighbors. He expressed concern that if the proposal was denied that a future City Council could receive an application for apartments or a commercial use that may be favored by a future City Council. **Cory Ritz** asked City Attorney **Todd Godfrey** if the findings were strong enough to preempt the same arguments being used elsewhere. He noted that it is a unique piece of property as it is uniquely sited, and difficult to develop as a landlocked piece. **Todd Godfrey** noted that the findings in the staff report are detailed and tight and providing the cover that the City Council is concerned about. **Brett Anderson** suggested adding an additional finding to reflect the record of the Council discussions about the uniqueness of the property. **Cory Ritz** stated that he was concerned with the precedent that the decision would set for other infill properties in the City, but that if the findings provide legal cover to differentiate this property from others, that he is okay with an approval.

Jim Talbot stated that he had tried to manage the meeting as best as he could and appreciated citizens being involved in the community. He felt that those that wished to speak were given the opportunity to speak and that a chance was given to all Councilmembers to provide comment. He shared that when he moved in 27 years ago the City looked different. He said that there is merit to asking "What can we provide for the future?" He said that sometimes you take a stand and get slaughtered and he wants the City Council to take a stand on the important issues. **Jim Talbot** mentioned recent search and rescue efforts for a Farmington resident and noted that those activities were most important in the bigger picture.

Jim Talbot suggested considering a vote on the schematic plan before voting on the zoning. **Dave Millheim** said that it was a polling question to ask the Council whether they supported the schematic plan before taking a vote on the zoning. **Dave Millheim** expressed concern about contract zoning. **Todd Godfrey** clarified that the zoning should be addressed first as the schematic plan is dependent on zoning.

Motion:

Brigham Mellor moved that the City Council approve the rezone from AE to R, amend the General Plan from RRD and AG to an LDR designation for 11.93 acres of property located at approximately 650 West and 250 South as identified in the attached legal description, and approve the enclosed enabling ordinance subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, Conditions 1 and 2, and Findings for Approval 1-11.

Brett Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed with Councilmembers **Cory Ritz**, **Brigham Mellor** and **Brett Anderson** voting in favor, and Councilmembers **Doug Anderson** and **Rebecca Wayment** voting against.

Conditions:

1. The approval is subject to an approved preliminary PUD master plan.
2. The schematic plan yields 32 total lots (31 buildable lots).

Findings for Approval:

1. While the proposed rezone is not consistent with the General Plan, this area of Farmington is changing, and the General Plan is likely to be overhauled in the future to more accurately reflect the area's projected growth and accommodate the impending changes occurring within west Farmington, and the region at large, due to population growth trends and development patterns on the Wasatch Front.
2. The proposed rezone will provide a greater variety of housing types and densities.
3. The housing market along the Wasatch Front has been moving towards smaller lots and higher densities; this development will meet the market demand.
4. The proposed rezone will provide low to medium density housing and act as a transition between lower intensity single-family residential development to the south, and higher intensity mixed use development to the north.
5. The property is removed from 650 West and abuts the Legacy Highway; it is an in-fill development and is suitable for low to medium density housing as it is hidden by a row of homes on 650 West.
6. Making the rezone contingent on the approval of a preliminary PUD master plan ensures that vesting does not occur without the approval of a master plan for the area, protecting the city in the event that the applicant does not move forward with the subdivision.
7. Although at a higher density, the proposed development is still single-family residential, which is commensurate with surrounding neighborhoods.
8. Due to the size, shape, and location of the subject property abutting Legacy Highway, it is suitable for low to medium density single family residential.
9. The proposed subdivision provides the 10% open space requirement; additionally, the project is within a quarter mile of the Farmington City Regional Park and Gym.
10. The proposed trail connection to Legacy Parkway Trail provides the proposed development with a direct connection to commuter rail.
11. The property possesses unique characteristics noted by councilmembers in discussion.

Doug Anderson noted that he did not have a problem with the rezone, but 31 lots still felt like too many. He appreciated the comments of the Councilmembers and thanked the developers for their work and their negotiations and wished them the best of luck.

Motion:

Brigham Mellor moved that the City Council approve the schematic plan and preliminary PUD master plan for the Mountain View PUD Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, Conditions 1-3, and Findings for Approval 1-7.

Brett Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed with Councilmembers **Cory Ritz**, **Brigham Mellor** and **Brett Anderson** voting in favor, and Councilmembers **Doug Anderson** and **Rebecca Wayment** voting against.

Conditions:

1. The applicant shall enter into a development agreement memorializing the approved master plan prior to or concurrent with preliminary plat;
2. All outstanding comments from the DRC for schematic plan shall be addressed on preliminary plat.
3. The schematic plan yields 32 total lots (31 buildable lots).

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed plans meet the requirements of the subdivision and zoning ordinances of an R-PUD zone, if the rezone does occur.
2. Schematic plan does not vest the property, and will be null-and-void if the rezone is not passed.
3. The proposed development will provide low to medium density housing and act as a transition between lower intensity single-family residential development to the south, and higher intensity mixed use development to the north.
4. The property is removed from 650 West and abuts the Legacy Highway; it is an in-fill development and is suitable for medium density housing as it is hidden by a row of homes on 650 West, and abuts a major highway facility.
5. Although at a higher density, the proposed development is still single-family residential, which is commensurate with surrounding neighborhoods.
6. The attached landscape plan and building elevations are of a high design quality and meet the standards set forth in Section 11-27-070; additionally, the project will provide a connection to Legacy Parkway Trail, a turn-around on 250 South, and a trailhead for public use.
7. The applicant is providing 51,836 s.f. of improved open space (10% as required by the ordinance), including a trail connection to Legacy Parkway Trail.

Jim Talbot called for a break at 9:19 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 9:28 p.m.

Farmington Greens PUD Master Plan Amendment-1525 West Clark Lane

Mayor **Jim Talbot** introduced the rules of the Public Hearing, made the request of those present to limit their comments to three minutes, and be mindful not to repeat information previously presented but rather add new information with their comments. **Jim Talbot** said that the City Attorney would present to clarify some of the zoning issues related to the Farmington Greens PUD.

Todd Godfrey introduced the agenda item and provided background information. He noted that the City entered into a development agreement in 2000 as part of the Farmington Greens PUD approval process. The agreement defined the area with residential density and approximately 3 acres of community commercial property which was not well-defined. The agreement did not

define the process for how commercial uses would be decided or approved, only that they would be approved at final plat. The City is following the same process which established the Master Plan for the area to define the commercial use. There has been an application to put storage units on the property; the City has no regulatory standards to govern that use, height, or setbacks. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow for a fair process to review the entitled commercial right, with community feedback and to determine regulatory framework.

Rebecca Wayment asked if the process was specific to the storage unit application, or commercial uses in general. **Todd Godfrey** noted that the developer is entitled to put a commercial project within that 3 acre area, but there are not any standards in place, so the review is about establishing that framework. **Brigham Mellor** asked if the entitlement granted through the development agreement is equal to a having a general commercial zoning ordinance in place. **Todd Godfrey** said that a general commercial zoning goes too far and that the development agreement references “community commercial use”, he explained that this use is similar to what could be called neighborhood commercial use today. His interpretation of the development agreement is that the commercial use was intended to serve the residential area as a general use. The vesting/entitlement goes beyond the traditional zoning ordinance because it is contractual.

Brett Anderson asked if the current zone allows for different commercial uses as a permitted or conditional use. **Todd Godfrey** answered that the agreement does not provide regulatory parameters. **Cory Ritz** asked if the commercial use would travel with an ownership change. **Todd Godfrey** answered that it would change to the new owner as a contractual right tied to the property.

Brett Anderson expressed the need to establish definitions and asked what the term “community commercial” meant at the time of the agreement. **Todd Godfrey** explained that the zoning map shows the area as community commercial, but there was no such zone defined in the City code at the time the agreement was enacted. **Todd Godfrey** said that he could not go so far as to say it was the original intent, but suspects that the neighborhood commercial designation were being used interchangeably.

David Petersen indicated that the Planning Commission wrestled with the same issues of definitions and vested rights. At the time the agreement was in place, the development was 15 blocks from the downtown area which had the closest commercial development. The property has been owned by the same owner. The City has heard from residents saying that they do not want a gas station or a convenience store in the area. The property owner’s agent held a meeting with residents seeking input on an application for multifamily units. That was not well received, nor did he have the density to allow for that. The owner is not interested in developing single family with a TDR as he is entitled to commercial development. Office space will not likely be successful without more exposure. The Planning Commission reviewed a number of uses with the applicant. When the application came in for Class A storage with the look of an office building, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions about not going taller than single family homes, the need for a conditional use permit which adds a layer of public hearing, and shall meet the neighborhood service establishment and limited to the 2.6

acres in this specific location. **Dave Millheim** noted that any definitions set could be confined to the Farmington Greens PUD or the Council could create a new zoning designation.

Adam Nash, 6076 South 900 East, Salt Lake City represented the property owners. He reviewed the development agreement noting that they developed 100 acres of property with multiple sizes of lots including cottage homes and equestrian lots. He noted that they developed everything they were obligated to do which included a couple million gallon water tank, updating the sewer systems. The property has a large percentage of open space and the commercial uses was to be a complimentary use for the community. He noted that additional residential or parks are not permitted uses in the commercial zone. The owners are not interested in building one house on 3 acres. He said that the owners have met with the HOA and the community to review a series of proposals which included a convenience store with gas islands and a car wash, apartments, and storage units. The community seemed to be opposed to apartments, and property owners furthest out from the property were supportive of a convenience store, but not adjoining owners. He and his partners have now proposed a commercial development that lessens impact and provides the community with the last “piece of the puzzle.” The proposed storage facility has residential components with the look and feel of the roof lines and the frontage business façade.

Adam Nash stated that the actual application is not about land use but a discussion about the setback. He noted that the applicant’s position is that they are entitled to the maximum, not the minimum, commercial use. He notes that they take exception to being limited to the bottom end of commercial, but are negotiating in good faith to develop something with minimal impact to the community. He said that the setback discussion was a good opportunity to resolve the definitions issue in the setback. They could not pursue a zoning change because of the contract in place, and with 97% of the project developed it did not make sense to renegotiate the contract. He said that if they were to renegotiate the contract then that could lead to revisiting open space obligations, and everything could be up for discussion if the parties were not held to obligations.

Adam Nash said that the proposal is Class A storage with an office/residential look and have asked for a 10 foot setback to allow for a bermed landscape strip. He noted that the commercial has lesser setbacks than the compromise proposed. He said that there had been discussion about a buffer, and that the original plan allowed for 3 acres of development, but that has been reduced to 2.6 acres with the road acting as a buffer to separate the commercial from the residential.

Adam Nash stated that their intent was to be a good member of the community and produce something that is wanted by most, acknowledging that they will not be able to make everyone happy. He reiterated that the owners were fully entitled and vested for the application and pursued a site plan approval without additional limitations to the commercial zone. He expressed opposition to additional limitations stating that the conditional use permitting process is adversarial to owners and potential tenants. It was suggested that the property owners create a list of what of things that they want to do with the property and have the parties agree to it. He said that they discussed limiting things that they know that they do not want to, and acknowledged that they do not want something detrimental to the community, such as a smoke shop, check cashing business, pornography store, or adult entertainment.

Adam Nash said that the owners are willing to comply with the 27 foot height limitation and include a landscape plan that is of better quality than typical residential landscaping. The owners want to make the property look great and after working in plans for years are ready to use the property.

Mayor Jim Talbot opened the public hearing at 9:59 p.m.

Keith Gold, 118 Country Bend Road, noted that his comments had already been addressed by Councilmembers **Brigham Mellor** and **Brett Anderson**.

Dave Dixon, 1047 North 100 West, served as former Chair of the Planning Commission. He shared that the original development agreement went through many meetings for the unique development with smaller lots and townhomes looking into open space. The idea was for it all to be walkable, with retail uses for residents of this and adjoining developments. The original discussion suggested that the basic retail services would be something like a dry cleaner or a little convenience store (but not a gas station). Over time there has been less demand for retail with other development. He noted that the development agreement not defining the use is a disadvantage to the City and the developer. He reiterated that the intent was for walk-up service and storage units do not fit the intent. Storage is better suited for a warehouse area and not an office or a retail area. He suggested the need for more of a buffer from the residential area with 20 foot setbacks and denser landscaping.

Mike George, 38 Bonanza Road, addressed the comment by the applicant of providing a complimentary use or a piece of the puzzle. He said storage is not something anyone is seeking and that the puzzle has grown and storage is a mismatch. He expressed opposition to the proposal and use.

Steve Sherlock, 1371 Longhorn Drive, delivered a petition with 337 signatures of people affirming that they do not want retail on that corner. He noted that he has an additional petition that asks for the setbacks to remain at 20 feet. He echoed previous comments noting that the intended project is contrary to the look and feel of the neighborhood. He is concerned about children walking to Canyon Creek Elementary School and having to contend with increased traffic. He said that even if the storage units do not increase traffic, the retail component will. He is concerned about the traffic and trucks that would accompany a UPS store and other potential tenants.

Jerald Taylor, 1517 Longhorn Drive, said that he was troubled about the plan to put storage and retail on corner, even if the owner has a legal right that does not mean it is the right thing to do. The property has been vacant all of this time; if it had been developed as retail prior to now, adjoining property owners would have made different decisions. He referenced the petition not wanting retail in the area. He said that retail space would need to rely on "low dollar high volume transactions" which would mean increased traffic. With Station Park nearby and planned commercial development near the trail, the risk of retail failure is high. He expressed concern about what would then turn into blighted property in a nice residential neighborhood. He noted that his family wanted a low-key residential neighborhood and expressed regret that the realtor informed them that the corner was zoned AE, and overlooked this potential commercial property.

He said that the parties and the neighbors should work together to find a better solution. The decision will impact the neighborhood for the next ten or twenty years.

Kimberly Burgess, 46 Bonanza Road, shared that she was one of the first homeowners in the area and liked the strict covenants in place with the HOA. The four way stop adjacent to the proposed development is a gateway to hundreds of homes and the proposal does not feel like a good representation of the feel of the neighborhood. She noted that 8% of U.S. households utilize storage facilities, so the demand is not justified. She said that the property has not been maintained and is mowed once a season so she has little faith that the developer will live up to the promises of a property that looks good. She said that she applied for an 8 inch variance for an addition on her home, which was denied by the Planning Commission citing the setback rules. The setback for this property should be in line with residential setbacks to maintain the residential look and feel. The property will not be able to compete with Station Park. She said that as a member of the Farmington Ranches HOA she has heard nothing about the proposals or community meetings.

Todd Magee, 1599 Saddlehorn Circle, said that he is across the street from the property and feels that this is an incongruous development. He noted that setting aside the retail/commercial use issue, the areas around the property have large green areas and or marsh area that separates homes from Clark Lane. He said that building close to the borders is unsightly and referenced Tanner Clinic on Antelope Drive in Layton as being too close to the curb and displeasing. He said that the property in question has not been maintained and the weeds have made it difficult for his yard to be weed-free. He expressed concern that whatever is developed would be maintained properly. He further expressed concern about noise and light pollution with the addition of a large building with minimal setbacks in the area.

Ken Rivas, 23 South Countryside Road, said that as a business owner he finds the permitting and development process to be frustrating and understands the need to monetize an investment. He stated that developers will push as hard as they are allowed to for variances and that the City Council needs to determine what is best for the community. Just because a plan is feasible, does not make it appropriate. He spoke in favor of a twenty foot setback.

Ross Kesler, 58 South 1860 West Bareback Road, mentioned the option to swap other commercial land with the owner. He suggested asking the residents what they would like in the area. He noted that when the apartment proposal came forward two homeowners sold homes. They did not want commercial in front of their family homes. He suggesting working with the owner to satisfy resident and owner needs.

Jen Hogge, 1722 Country Bend Road, said that she agreed with what previous citizens had expressed.

Jeanne Sifre, 1591 Homestead Circle, said she opposed the development.

Monica Bell, 1581 Saddlehorn Circle, said that she loves Farmington and the sense of community. She noted that the contract was entered into 18-20 years ago, and presented by the developer as benefit, and accepted by City. With Station Park in place, the original agreement is

no longer necessary and the understanding of 20 years ago should be weighed against commercial needs today. She cited Millcreek meeting minutes which categorized storage units in the same category as tattoo parlors. She said that west of the railway trail there is no other commercial property so this looks like spot zoning. She expressed concerns about traffic at the corner, and sad that residential is the best use for the property and no storage is needed. She said the contract was redundant and unnecessary and that it was entered into 20 years ago under different circumstances and no longer applies.

Stuart Reeder, 1534 Spring Meadow Lane, said that he moved from Reno to Farmington, but grew up in Davis County. He said that good change is good. He said that the owner has a contractual right to build something for the betterment of the community, and this is not a betterment of the community. The 10 foot setbacks would decrease safety and cohesiveness of the neighborhood. He understands that decreased setbacks maximizes the owner's investment, but not for the betterment of the community. He referenced the Farmington City seal depicting a hand holding a scale and noted that the City leaders need to carefully hold the scale and not allow it to be tipped. He asked that the Council deny the 10 foot setbacks and stated his opposition of commercial development, unless for the betterment of the community.

Nisa Hancock, 317 Ironside Way, acknowledged that the contract indicates it is zoned for community commercial which she interpreted to mean something that the whole community can use like a pool or gym or something that would be consistent with the HOA. She asked if the contract did not have a time limit on when the property could be developed. She also questioned how the owner would determine what types of establishments could be in the retail space if such uses are not defined by the City.

David Larsen, 1481 Mare Drive, said that he regularly deals with contracts and noted that the intent of the contract is important and the term "community commercial" needs to be defined. He asked if only the buffer zone is being reviewed or the whole development. He suggested that 20 year ago the intent was for the property to be developed immediately for the benefit of those in the community. He argued that the developer did not honor the intent of the contract by not developing sooner. He stated that there is no longer a need for community commercial and if we did it is not defined. He suggested that a zone be created to stipulate what could or could not be put there for the benefit of the community.

Jacquelyn Watson, 1497 Citation drive, is the Greens HOA president. She said that many homeowners have been opposed to commercial property. She questioned if the 10 foot setback was approved, if the developer would ask for variances for height or other development standards. She asked the Council to look at the surrounding areas and consider the needs of the neighborhood. She suggested that a compromise may be to allow an assisted living facility, which is a commercial use, but would not impact schools. She opposed the 10 foot setback variance.

Mayor Jim Talbot closed the public hearing at 10:39 p.m.

Brigham Mellor said that he lives close to the development, but tries to make a decision considering the needs of the City as a whole and not for personal benefit. He referenced the

Mountain View PUD decision and said he approved the zoning change because it made sense from a planning perspective. The Farmington Greens property with a commercial component does not make sense from a planning perspective. He said that the City can change zoning of a property, although it is risky from a legal standpoint. He said that bad zoning is worth having a discussion about and worth fighting. **Brigham Mellor** shared his experience attending a meeting where **Adam Nash** proposed multi-family units and noted that the attitude of the property owners was that they were entitled to move forward, and that they were going to get what they wanted, and if apartments were not approved that commercial development would go in. **Brigham Mellor** said that 90% of cities do not have storage permitted in their general commercial zone. He acknowledged that when there is ambiguity of entitlement around development, it is usually decided in the developers favor. He reiterated that the City should not make a poor land use decision but should push for a more pragmatic and productive discussion.

Brigham Mellor stated that not all neighbors are entirely opposed to commercial development but have felt that the property owner was dismissive of their ideas. He said that the Council should do whatever it takes to hold this issue up until the right product can be in place on the property. If that is commercial, it should be commercial that works with the community and the existing retail and commercial development in the City.

Doug Anderson expressed agreement with what **Brigham Mellor** expressed. **Cory Ritz** said he reviewed the audio of the February 8 Planning Commission meeting and agreed that the attitude mentioned **Brigham Mellor** was demonstrated at the meeting. He said that it angered him that the owners would approach the City and the neighbors with an entitled attitude. He suggested that the commercial zoning on that corner is tantamount to bad zoning. **Cory Ritz** shared that he was on the neighborhood committee that provided input about the development and noted that at the time, commercial concept made sense as it was understood to be for the benefit of the community. He acknowledged that the questions raised during the public hearing about the delay in developing the property for twenty years is a valid one. If the corner had been completed when the housing was completed, this would be a different conversation. He discussed needing to find the highest and best use for the property which would likely be residential. He noted that **Todd Godfrey** believes that the property is encumbered with the promise of commercial zoning. **Cory Ritz** reiterated Jerald Taylor's point about finding a use that does not include retail, and expressed concern about the traffic on the corner where many children cross to get to school. He said that he has observed the failure of the property owners to maintain weeds and has no faith in future maintenance of the property. He stated that he does not want to grant variances to setbacks and feels it is important for the approval of the space to be vetted through the conditional use process. **Cory Ritz** agreed with Jacquelyn Watson that an assisted living facility could be a good fit for the neighborhood while remaining lucrative for the property owners.

Rebecca Wayment said that she has wondered what community or neighborhood commercial means and has long wondered what would be developed on the property. She stated that if it has to have a retail use, then the City should require conditional use permitting for the benefit of the community to require buildings that close down in the evenings, or have low-traffic impact. She said storage units do not make sense and that if setback variances are needed to make the project

work, then it is not the best use for the corner. **Rebecca Wayment** said that she understands entitlements, but the public comments, and comments from other Councilmembers suggest that storage units are not what the community wants and the City should work with the owners to find something that fits better and is a benefit to all parties.

Brett Anderson asked **Adam Nash** if he was part of the original execution of the development agreement or if the current owners were part of the original agreement. **Adam Nash** indicated that he was not, but that Wayne Petty has owned the property for the entire period. **Brett Anderson** said that the agreement was not consistent throughout and asked **Adam Nash** what his understanding of the word community is, as it relates to the development; was it just the surrounding houses or all neighborhoods in the whole area. **Adam Nash** said that it was a general concept, or title, and that if it had been zoned as C1 or C2 there would have been specific uses attached. **Adam Nash** said, that although it was not what the Council wanted to hear, that because the owners are entitled to commercial development, they could apply for zero setbacks as allowed in other commercial zones. **Brigham Mellor** pointed out that this is the attitude he was referencing. **Adam Nash** suggested that the City was considering a taking and wondered if they would seek condemnation, and that the owners would be prepared to fight such decisions.

Brett Anderson asked **Todd Godfrey** to clarify whether the Council was to consider language around zoning or contractual rights related to the property. **Todd Godfrey** said that the contractual right relates to the use, but that the parameters are unspecified in the development agreement. **Brett Anderson** listed the inconsistent terms used in the agreement which need to be defined: community commercial service, commercial support service, community support and services. He stated that he does not agree with the applicant that they are entitled to broader commercial development. **Todd Godfrey** said that at the time of the development, the design of these properties emphasized walkability with small service areas, markets, or dry cleaners, but not a broad commercial entitlement. **Brett Anderson** said that the application presupposes that the use is permitted by contract, and that the premise of the application is flawed. He is unsure of what action to take and wondered if the Council should deny the application. **Brett Anderson** summed up the discussion by stating that storage units are not a community service anticipated by the development agreement.

Jim Talbot said shared some of his background in real estate development. He suggested that it would be difficult to create a commercial enterprise that could compete with Station Park or the 65 acres approved to be developed within the City. He also noted that two large storage units were coming on board and that adding additional storage may not be successful. **Jim Talbot** asked about what community meetings were held. **Adam Nash** stated that two meetings were held to discuss three different scenarios. **Jim Talbot** said that he was getting the sense that the community did not feel like they were being involved in the process.

Dave Millheim suggested two courses of action because of the lateness of the hour. First, deny the application which could have potential legal challenges. Second, table the item to allow time for the City Attorney to review entitlement rights and case law, and take time to poll residents about what citizens want on the property. **Dave Millheim** said that not having consensus is not good for the community or the developer.

Dave Millheim suggested the poll would allow for the community to be heard and have input about what neighborhood services they do want which will inform the decision of the City Council. He said that the Planning Department could prepare a simple ballot which would allow services to be ranked and it could be distributed to the two HOAs in the area. A logical boundary would be determined to ensure the results were meaningful and not skewed.

Motion:

Doug Anderson moved that the City Council table the Farmington Greens PUD Master Plan Amendment to allow the City attorney to review the contract and related case law and to direct City staff to conduct a poll of residents within the Farmington Greens and Farmington Ranches HOAs for their feedback related to use of the area. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Dave Millheim noted that residents should watch the public notices on the City website about the poll for uses on the Farmington Greens property.

Zone Text Amendment to Chapters 3 and 28 of the Zoning Ordinance

David Peterson noted that the intent of the text is to use a TDR to support efforts to clean up blighted property and incentivize historic preservation. **Dave Millheim** noted that Staff had no specific applications or properties in mind with the development of this ordinance amendment, but thought that this would be a good tool for future use.

Mayor Jim Talbot opened the public hearing at 11:23 p.m.; with no one signed up to address the Council on the issue, he immediately closed the public hearing.

Motion:

Brett Anderson moved that the City Council approve the ordinance as contained in the staff report as recommended by the Planning Commission amending Chapters 3 and 28 of the Zoning Ordinance, with finds for approval 1 through 3. **Brigham Mellor** seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Findings for Approval

1. The changes provide an incentive to sub-dividers to develop and improve blighted properties that otherwise may not be cleaned up.
2. The elimination of blight improves the general welfare of Farmington citizens.
3. Those owners of un-blighted properties wishing to let their holdings deteriorate in order to apply for TDRs--for purposes of blight-do in violation of the City's "demolition by neglect" provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

NEW BUSINESS:

Contractor and Contract for the 650 West Softball Complex Concrete

Chad Boshell reviewed the six bids received, and noted that they were in line with unit costs. He noted that the work being contracted is the concrete between the fields, around concessions and a patio around pickleball courts.

Motion:

Doug Anderson moved that the City Council approve construction services and contract for the 650 West Park Softball Complex Concrete with Associated Brigham Contractors for the amount of \$292,985. **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

Financing of Remaining Park and Ball Fields

Dave Millheim shared information about the financing for the completion of the regional park. The goal is to finish the park before 2018. He referenced the memo contained in the staff report noting that the park will not be completed if impact fees are not collected. It is likely that the Residences at Station Park will be completed in two phases. The City could bond for the shortfall after the first phase is completed, or could borrow from the General Fund after the first phase is paid and then be reimbursed by Park Impact fees as they are collected until fully paid. **Dave Millheim** committed to keeping the Council informed as this was a discussion only item which requires no action at this time.

Jim Talbot said that it was still possible that sponsorships for the park and the ball diamonds were forthcoming.

SUMMARY ACTION:

1. Approval of Minutes from February 20, 2018
2. Animal Control Contract with Davis County

Rebecca Wayment moved, with a second from **Doug Anderson**, to approve summary action item 1 through 2 as contained in the staff reports.

The motion was approved unanimously.

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

City Manager Report

Doug Anderson clarified that the Council was looking for information related to text notifications that could be sent to citizens, on an opt-in basis, to keep them informed about public hearings and other City business. **Dave Millheim** will discuss this further with **Doug Anderson** and provide the Council with information regarding this possibility.

Mayor Talbot & City Council Reports

Councilmember Cory Ritz

Cory Ritz noted that a resident approached him about problems with Comcast installers and property damage. **Dave Millheim** committed to follow-up with the resident and Comcast.

Councilmember Doug Anderson

No updates to report.

Councilmember Brett Anderson

No updates to report.

Councilmember Brigham Mellor

Brigham Mellor had a request from a resident to do something in the park similar to the Green Ribbons for Nellie. **Brigham Mellor** asked **Dave Millheim** to follow-up with the resident or have Neil Miller follow-up.

Councilmember Rebecca Wayment

No updates to report.

Mayor Jim Talbot

Jim Talbot shared that the University of Utah has agreed to support the roundabout beautification efforts. He stated that he has signed the contract for the horse sculptures and received the contract from the University of Utah for \$125,000.

Councilmembers had no objections to the contracts moving forward.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

At 11:41 p.m., **Brigham Mellor** moved to adjourn the meeting.



Holly Gadd, City Recorder

Posted 04/18/2018

**FARMINGTON CITY
CERTIFICATE OF POSTING**

I, the duly appointed and acting Recorder for the City of Farmington, Utah, hereby certify that copies of the **Farmington City Council Minutes for March 6th, 2018** were posted on the Farmington City Website and the State Public Meeting Notices website this 18th day of April, 2018

DATED this 18th day of April, 2018.

FARMINGTON CITY

By: _____


Heidi Bouck
Deputy City Recorder

change.org

Recipient: Jim Talbot, Brigham Mellor, Brett Anderson, Doug Anderson, Corty Ritz,
Rebecca Wayment, Richard Conover

Letter: Greetings,

SE Corner 1525 W & Clark Ln - Request retail component be eliminated
from this project.

March 6th, 2018

Dear Mayor Talbot,

We are concerned about the proposed storage unit and retail space project at 1525 W. and Clark Ln. In the March 6th City Council meeting, the request from the property owner will be presented for a variance to city code to change the setbacks to 10 feet. Please do not approve this proposal. Doing so will allow the owner to move forward with this project, which is not in the best interest of the immediate neighborhood, nor Farmington in general.

We realize that the owner has a contract from 1998, which permits him to commercially develop this lot. However, West Farmington has changed dramatically since 1998. Such a development no longer makes sense in the middle of a residential neighborhood. Such a development is anticipated to have the following negative effects. Among other things, it will:

- Detract from the wonderful look and feel that has drawn so many people to Farmington.
- Increase the traffic count to this already busy intersection, which is the main artery for West Farmington.
- Increase the safety risk to the many children who cross that street, and walk along that sidewalk that will have vehicles entering/exiting the retail parking lot.
- Lead to a sustained, gradual degradation in the quality of the neighborhood, as neighbors move to get away from the commercial area; two neighbors in front of the vacant lot have already moved in anticipation of the project; at least one of these vacated homes is now filled with renters), property values will likely decrease as pride of ownership decreases, and more properties will likely become rentals, which are generally are not as well-maintained.

Please reject this proposal, so that the following alternatives can be explored with the owner, neighbors, and the city, to arrive at a more beneficial outcome:

- Swap a city-owned commercially zoned property with the owner.
- Eliminate the retail portion of the storage units to decrease the safety risks and prevent increased traffic congestion.
- Keep the setbacks at 20 feet to diminish the “fortress look” of the development walls.

Please help us to arrive at a solution that will be better for Farmington City, one that won't detract from the neighborhood for decades to come, and that will protect the city we've come to know and love.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Undersigned Residents of Farmington

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
Stephen Sherlock	Salt Lake City, UT 1371 Longhorn Drive, Farmington, UT 84025	2018-02-11
Chelsie Hatch	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Melissa Coley	Evanston, WY	2018-02-11
Jason Murphy	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Jennifer Hogge	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Kevin Hixson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Eric O'Toole	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Tammy Wright	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Andrew Wright	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Anthony Tanner	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Leslianne Groves	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Don Smith	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Justin Nichols	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Jordan Call	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Krystal Powleson	US	2018-02-11
Megan Elwell	Kaysville, UT	2018-02-11
Angel Schwieter	US	2018-02-11
Maryam Altaf	US	2018-02-11
Brenna Curtis	US	2018-02-11
kindyll scott	US	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Danny Reynoso	US	2018-02-11
Kamri Kinard	US	2018-02-11
Eroxis Brito	US	2018-02-11
Deavin Roe	US	2018-02-11
Adan Sanchez	US	2018-02-11
Sam Lally	US	2018-02-11
Shay Darwin	US	2018-02-11
Jami Gunn	Clearfield, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lori Kalt	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Jennifer Kono	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Laurie Call	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-11
Tami Taylor	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Wendi Wangsgard	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Howard Dygert	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Natalie Larson	Farmington, US	2018-02-11
Angelle Salway	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
A. Jackson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Ashley Van Emmerik	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Jamie Francom	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
SHAUNA JONES	Woods Cross, UT	2018-02-11
Brenda Keegan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Carrie Headley	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Nate Erickson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lindsay Biddulph	West Jordan, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Zoey Karimzada	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-11
Cindy Growcock	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Chantel Bingham	Clearfield, UT	2018-02-11
Nicholas Ottley	Eagle Mountain, UT	2018-02-11
Lori Conover	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Brooke Dye	Utah Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Brad Moore	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lisa Webster	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Zachary Pinnau	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Natalie Perkins	Layton, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
STUArt Reeder	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
David James	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Farmington Gaerte	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Stacey Roylance	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Carson Niederhauser	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Andreas Kalt	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Natalie Niederhauser	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Shawna DeRuiter	Anaheim, CA	2018-02-11
Ryan Ennis	Salt Lake City, US Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Melanie Duke	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Angela Randall	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Justin Downs	Ogden, UT	2018-02-11
Deborah Fourie	Layton, US	2018-02-11
Sosha Tanner	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Melisa Hill	Washington, UT	2018-02-11
Theresa Briggs	US	2018-02-11
Kobi Duet	US	2018-02-11
Duane Ford	US	2018-02-11
Jared Beviano	US	2018-02-11
Liz Casey	US	2018-02-11
Sal Giani	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
John Deshler	US	2018-02-11
Shawna Mahan	US	2018-02-11
Yecson Aguilar	US	2018-02-11
Olivia Nay	US	2018-02-11
Nabeela Zakir	US	2018-02-11
elizabeth huffstetler	US	2018-02-11
JoEllen Nelson	US	2018-02-11
Greg Annunziata	US	2018-02-11
Haley Dee	US	2018-02-11
Lucretia Connor	US	2018-02-11
yjhbg bbjvb	US	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Gretchen Houle	US	2018-02-11
Grace Holt	US	2018-02-11
Hailey Pointer	US	2018-02-11
Darius Hawkins	US	2018-02-11
Kayla Novotny Novotny	US	2018-02-11
Barbara Eisenhut	US	2018-02-11
Sherwin Davis	US	2018-02-11
Ashley Willey	Kaysville, UT	2018-02-11
Joann Barber	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Andrea Fry	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Heather Smith	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Maria Greene	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Courtney Allan	Anaheim, CA	2018-02-11
Kristy Powell	US	2018-02-11
James Harwell	Meridian, MS	2018-02-11
Kristin George	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lisa Lampe	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Jane Johnson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Bernice Litka	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-11
Miranda Turpin	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lindsay Bryner	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Colby Poulson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Amy Todd	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Erika Munns	Ogden, UT	2018-02-11
Paden Shelley	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Joseph Nay	Roy, UT	2018-02-11
Wyatt Turpin	US Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Mitchell Anderton	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Kathy Milton	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Nate Cook	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Angie Nowling	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Holly Abel	Bountiful, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Mike George	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Mark Jucha	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Ryan Baylis	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Betsy Borden	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Rebecca Sullivan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Lee Pyper	Antioch, CA	2018-02-11
Angie Waldron	Draper, UT	2018-02-11
Brian Goodwin	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Kesha Parker	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Kimberley Rivers	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-11
Julie Martin	Utah Farmington, UT	2018-02-11
Rocky Halterman	Farmington, UT	2018-02-11

Name	Location	Date
Kim Hunt	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-11
Jamie Reese	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-11
Jenn Davidson	Layton, UT	2018-02-11
Logan Brinton	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-11
Stephen Hunt	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-11
Andrea Porter	US Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Alison Wood	Kaysville, UT	2018-02-12
Alison Dunn	US Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Sheila Kilian	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jodie Fisher	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jill Brown	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Christina Whittier	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Lindsey Harrison	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Jen yancey	kaysville, UT	2018-02-12
Rachelle Wall	kaysville, UT	2018-02-12
Steve Smith	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jeanene Porter	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Lauren Humbert	Farmington, ID	2018-02-12
Duane Bentley	Layton, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Tracie Fawcett	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Tawnie Larson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Laura VanderToolen	Layton, UT	2018-02-12

Name	Location	Date
Holly Clark	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Rachel Amidon	Kaysville, UT	2018-02-12
Damon Sant	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-12
Rachel Creery/Hunsaker	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Cheryl Lewis	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Kellee Grose	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Alysia Duke	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Tyler Poulsen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jamie Jenkins	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Debbie Holje	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-12
Julie Walkenhorst	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Chad Higley	San Francisco, CA	2018-02-12
Andy Pavlovich	Salt Lake City, US	2018-02-12
Bethany Higley	Utah	2018-02-12
Whitney Allen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jessica Duncan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Krystal Kovac	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Clairlyn Francis	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Chandra Allen	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Kristen Sherlock	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Andrea Duncan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jacob Henrie	Layton, UT	2018-02-12

Name	Location	Date
Nathan Remington	Ogden, UT	2018-02-12
Nate Remington	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Shane Thomas	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Candy Allen	Salt Lake City, US	2018-02-12
Evan Donaldson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Ashley Rogers	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Anne Morris	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-12
Tanya Adams	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Marissa Roberts	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Heidi Robb	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Carla Oliver	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Chris Mecham	Pico Rivera, US	2018-02-12
karen Lozano	Ogden, UT	2018-02-12
Katie Killpack	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington	2018-02-12
Kristen Williams	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jessica Merrill	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Maranda Huffines	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Ashley Larson	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Stacy Foster	Ogden, UT	2018-02-12
Emily Koster	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Linda Seely	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Korie Browning	Alpine, UT	2018-02-12

Name	Location	Date
Sarita Owen	Winnemucca, NV	2018-02-12
Reid Hogge	farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Alex Woods	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Lisa States	Centerville, UT	2018-02-12
Sheri Sedgwick	Logan, UT	2018-02-12
Nicole Knowles	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Shaunee Ericksen-Lamb	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Eric Larson	Garden Grove, CA Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Chris Langeveld	Herriman, UT	2018-02-12
Pamela Heiner	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Aubrey Reese	Utah	2018-02-12
Ken Duncan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Sam Dunford	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Jesus Herrera	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-12
Brent Carroll	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Quinn Heiner	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-12
Heather Singley	Farmington, UT	2018-02-12
Christopher Thompson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Jacob Chavez	Layton, UT	2018-02-13
Mricia Flores	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Steffanie Wigren	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-13
Courtney Owens	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-13

Name	Location	Date
Max Jonas	Sidney, MT	2018-02-13
Emily Astill	West Jordan, UT	2018-02-13
Walter Baker	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Mollee Steele	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Monica Bell	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Becky Murphy	Ogden, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Jessica Anderson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Scott Benedict	North Las Vegas, NV	2018-02-13
Traci Harward	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Kipp Kovac	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Stephanie Sears	Ogden, UT	2018-02-13
Karen Bitton	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Brittney Hall	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Andrew Brough	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Aubrey Sackett	Salt Lake City, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Jennifer Beardall	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Kerri Neville	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Brady Wood	Alpine, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Chantelle Barker	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Michelle Nelson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Jen Smith	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Shelley Neville	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13

Name	Location	Date
Lyndsey Reese	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-13
Ann Neville	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Anikka Dewsnup	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-13
Lisa Larson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Barbara Simcox	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-13
Tim Meyers	San Jose, CA	2018-02-13
Kyle Harward	Layton, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-13
Laurie Myers	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-13
Diana Neff	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Andrew Ord	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Ray Seely	FARMINGTON, UT	2018-02-14
Shelley Woods	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Erienne Poulson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Jennifer Despain	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Kymberly Burgess	Farmington, UT	2018-02-14
Zach Dye	US	2018-02-14
Shane Roylance	Farmington, UT	2018-02-15
LeeAnn Thorne	Farmington, UT	2018-02-15
Kelly Beckstrand	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-15
Dustin Evans	Farmington, UT	2018-02-15
Nisa Hancock	Farmington, UT	2018-02-16
Megan Griffin	Farmington, UT	2018-02-16

Name	Location	Date
Mindy Rees	Kaysville, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-24
Ben Butterfield	Farmington, UT	2018-02-24
Rebecca Cason	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-24
Passelly Rasmussen	Mexico Farmington, UT	2018-02-24
Adam Nash	Farmington, UT	2018-02-24
Holly Watkins	American Fork, UT	2018-02-24
Jami Lewellen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-24
Sean Oliver	Sandy, UT	2018-02-27
Rob McMaster	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Blythe Kasai	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Heather Christensen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
McCall Hollingsworth	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Melissa Morris	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Mary Crump	Norwalk, CA	2018-02-27
Janett Saavedra	Antioch, CA	2018-02-27
Jon Hunter	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Trish Packer	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-27
Wayne Baker	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Sandra Flynn	Oakley, CA	2018-02-27
Marlon Duke	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Chris Burns	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Scott Bass	Layton, UT Farmington, UT	2018-02-27

Name	Location	Date
Ruth Schow	Ogden, UT	2018-02-27
Jaime Steele	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-27
Natalie Hogan	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Debbie Reese	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Michael Heining	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Kristi McMullin	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Susan White	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-27
Kami Stewart	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Brenda Stoney	Farmington, CA	2018-02-27
Jennifer Gibb	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Brandee LeRoy	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Tauni Hill	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Rebecca Petersen	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-02-27
Heidi Pitkin	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Stacy Harker	Richmond, UT	2018-02-27
Ryan Davis	Bountiful, UT	2018-02-27
Ashley Christensen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
David Hernandez	Grand Prairie, TX	2018-02-27
Teresita Villasenor	US	2018-02-27
Milagros Pacheco	US	2018-02-27
Nancy Nielsen	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Boni Peterson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27

Name	Location	Date
Allison Croft	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Allison Keller	Farmington, UT	2018-02-27
Summer Bench	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Andrea Bush	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Sara Raines	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
David Miller	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Richard Conover	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Joshua Jenks	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Merilee Anderson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Anna Louise Nelson	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Diana Schwab	Kaysville, UT	2018-02-28
Cristina Eastman	Farmington, UT	2018-02-28
Buffy Madsen	Layton, UT	2018-02-28
Michelle Finley	North Salt Lake, UT	2018-03-01
Carolyn Kocherhans	Framing, UT	2018-03-01
Misty Hales	Bountiful, UT	2018-03-02
Nina Ogden	Farmington, UT	2018-03-02
Brad Wiseman	Farmington, UT	2018-03-03
Nancy Mismash	Salt Lake City, UT	2018-03-03
Eulale Dixon	Farmington, UT	2018-03-03
Lana Dennis	Farmington, UT	2018-03-03
C W	Ephraim, UT	2018-03-03

Name	Location	Date
Lynne Christopher	Farmington, UT	2018-03-03
Nancy Glover	Spanish Fork, UT	2018-03-03
bonnie dennis	Bountiful, UT	2018-03-03
Rochelle Beatty	Taylorsville, UT	2018-03-03
Lou Jean Cressler	Moab, UT	2018-03-04
Jackie Schmidt	Farmington, UT	2018-03-05
Casey Eberhard	Farmington, UT	2018-03-06

Farmington Residents = 203
Unconfirmed & Other Residents = 134
Total Signatures = 337