

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, July 29, 2026

Location: Fairfield Town Office, 121 West Main Street, Fairfield, Utah

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Minutes By: Recorder: Stephanie Shelley

Call to Order

1) Roll Call

Commissioner Taylor opened the meeting at 7:00 pm

David Riet, Wayne Taylor, Kyler Fisher, Jamie Mascaro, Kelton Butterfield

Staff Present:

Recorder: Stephanie Shelley, Mayor: Hollie McKinney, Treasurer: Codi Butterfield, Attorney: Brad Christopherson, Planner: Jim Spung (via Zoom).

Others Present: Grant Peterson (Grantsville), Michael Weber, Vern Carson, Krista Black, Glade Nielson (Nephi - Sunrise), Darwin & Lesa Bundy.

Via Zoom: Brenda, Kandice Johnson, Samsung SM-S938U

Public Hearing

The Planning Commission will conduct separate public hearings for each of the following legislative items. Public comment will be accepted during each public hearing. Following each hearing, the Planning Commission may deliberate and make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Text Amendment on Setbacks

1) Staff report and presentation, discussion on the Text Amendment 154.105(E) Agricultural Residential Zones. Setbacks, building height, lot size, frontage, parking.

Planner Jim Spung presented the proposed text amendment to Section 154.105(E), Agricultural Residential Zones, regarding corner lot setbacks. He explained that the current ordinance establishes front-yard setbacks but does not specify how those setbacks apply to corner lots. The proposed amendment clarifies that the required front setback applies to both street frontages of a corner lot.

Jim stated that the amendment does not change the existing setback requirements but clarifies how they apply to corner lots. He noted that the amendment is consistent with the way most communities regulate corner lots and would apply to both principal buildings and accessory structures. After the presentation, the Commissioners had no questions or comments.

2) Open public hearing on the Text Amendment 154.105(E) Agricultural Residential Zones. Setbacks, building height, lot size, frontage, parking.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

Chairman Taylor confirmed with Attorney Brad Christopherson that a formal motion was required to open the public hearing. Following that confirmation, Chairman Taylor opened the public hearing on the proposed text amendment to Section 154.105(E), Agricultural Residential Zones, regarding corner lot setbacks.

3) Receive Public Comment (two minutes per person).

No public comments were received.

4) Close Public Hearing.

Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing.

5) Planning Commission Discussion and Deliberation: Text Amendment 154.105(E) Agricultural Residential Zones. Setbacks, building height, lot size, frontage, parking.

After the public hearing closed, the Commissioners had no additional discussion. A Commissioner noted that the suggested motion language was included in the staff report, and the Commissioners proceeded to consider a recommendation to the Town Council.

6) Consider a recommendation to the Town Council regarding the proposed Text Amendment to section 154.105(E) Agricultural Residential Zones. Setbacks, building height, lot size, frontage, parking.

Commissioner Mascaro moved to forward a positive recommendation to the Town Council for a zoning text amendment to the Fairfield Code of Ordinances related to corner lot setbacks in Agricultural Residential Zones, based on the findings and recommendations of this Staff Report. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Roads Regulations Title 6 Chapter 3 has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways and Rights-of- Way Ordinance

1) Staff report and presentation, discussion on the Roads Regulations Title 6 Chapter 3 has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways and Rights-of- Way Ordinance

Chairman Taylor introduced the next agenda item regarding the Roads Regulations, formerly codified as Title 6, Chapter 3, which had been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways, and Rights-of-Way.

Attorney Brad Christopherson explained that the Roads Ordinance had already been incorporated into the Town Code during codification. During that process, the codifier relocated

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

the Roads Ordinance into the Town's land use regulations. Staff later determined that a public hearing was necessary to ensure the ordinance had been properly adopted within the land use regulations before recommending it to the Town Council.

Mayor Hollie McKinney added that the Roads Ordinance had been rewritten to incorporate the American Public Works Association (APWA) standards and that the ordinance had been placed in the land use section during codification, making the public hearing necessary.

2) Open public hearing on the Roads Regulations, Title 6, Chapter 3, has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways and Rights-of- Way Ordinance

Chairman Taylor opened the public hearing on the proposed Roads Regulations, Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways, and Rights-of-Way Ordinance.

3) Receive Public Comment (two minutes per person).

Chairman Taylor invited comments from those present in the meeting room and those attending via Zoom. After receiving no comments, he stated that one written public comment had been submitted by email and read the comment into the record.

In the proposed road ordinance, cul-de-sacs are prohibited. I support street connectivity as a planning goal. But a complete ban on cul-de-sacs — with no exception process — doesn't account for situations where connectivity is physically impossible: terrain, floodplains, or parcels bordered by land that will never develop, like airport runway protection zones, landfills, and water features like the sinks. Most jurisdictions that discourage cul-de-sacs still allow them through a variance or hardship exception for exactly these cases. I'd ask the commission to add an exception process rather than an absolute ban, so the ordinance can achieve its connectivity goal without creating undevelopable parcels where a through-street simply isn't feasible.

4) Close Public Hearing.

Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing.

5) Planning Commission Discussion and Deliberation: Roads Regulations Title 6 Chapter 3 has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways and Rights-of- Way Ordinance

Chairman Taylor stated that he viewed the concern as one that could be addressed through the proposed Site-Specific Development (SSD) process. He noted that an SSD could allow a cul-de-sac when warranted by the circumstances and did not believe the Roads Ordinance needed to be amended at this time. He added that if changes became necessary in the future, the ordinance could be amended.

Commissioner Riet stated that he believed the proposed Site-Specific Development (SSD) ordinance addressed the concern regarding cul-de-sacs. He noted that the SSD process would allow a cul-de-sac to be considered when appropriate for a specific development and, therefore, did not believe the issue required changes to the Roads Ordinance at that time.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

Jim Spung explained that many communities allow cul-de-sacs only under extenuating circumstances when connectivity cannot reasonably be achieved. He stated that the proposed SSD process would provide flexibility for projects meeting the SSD criteria and noted that allowing exceptions was ultimately a policy decision for the Town.

- 6) Consider a recommendation to the Town Council to adopt the Roads Regulations, Title 6, Chapter 3, has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways and Rights-of-Way Ordinance.**

Commissioner Mascaro moved to forward the Roads Regulations, Title 6, Chapter 3, which has been renumbered to Title 15, Chapter 152, Roads, Highways, and Rights-of-Way Ordinance, to the Town Council with a positive recommendation. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Site-Specific Development Zone (SSD)

- 1) Staff report and presentation, discussion on the Site-Specific Development Zone (SSD)**

Chairman Taylor introduced the agenda item and invited Planner Jim Spung to present the proposed Site-Specific Development (SSD) zoning district.

Jim explained that the Commissioners had previously reviewed the proposal and that only a few revisions had been made since the last meeting based on comments received from the Planning Commission, the Mayor, and Attorney Brad Christopherson.

Jim reviewed the purpose of the proposed SSD district, explaining that the General Plan establishes the Town's vision, the zoning ordinance provides the regulations to implement that vision, and the zoning map identifies where those regulations apply. He stated that the Town's existing zoning districts do not fully implement the vision outlined in the General Plan adopted the previous year. The SSD district is intended to provide a tool for projects with unique characteristics that cannot be appropriately addressed through the Town's existing zoning districts.

Jim explained that the proposed SSD district would apply only to projects meeting specific qualifying criteria, including a minimum project size. He noted that the proposed minimum acreage had been increased from 10 acres to 50 acres since the previous Planning Commission

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

meeting to reserve the SSD process for larger, unique developments requiring customized development standards.

Jim described the proposed two-step review process. The preliminary review would allow the Planning Commission and Town Council to evaluate a conceptual development proposal before significant resources were invested. If supported, the applicant would proceed with a final review, during which the Town would prepare the site-specific zoning ordinance, development agreement, and zoning map amendment for the project.

Jim explained that approving an SSD district would establish zoning regulations specific to the project but would not eliminate the requirement for future subdivision approval, site plan review, building permits, or other applicable development approvals.

2) Open public hearing on the Site-Specific Development Zone (SSD)

Before opening the public hearing, Chairman Taylor invited additional discussion regarding the proposed minimum acreage requirement for the Site-Specific Development (SSD) district and asked Planner Jim Spung and Attorney Brad Christopherson for their perspectives.

Jim explained that the minimum acreage requirement was intended to provide guardrails so the SSD process would be reserved for larger, unique developments rather than being available to every property owner seeking exceptions to the Town's zoning regulations. He stated that other provisions of the Town Code already provide mechanisms for addressing smaller-scale requests, such as setbacks or building heights.

Attorney Brad Christopherson agreed that Fairfield's rural character supported a larger minimum acreage requirement for the proposed Site-Specific Development (SSD) Zone. He explained that while a 10-acre threshold might be appropriate in a suburban community, a single residence in Fairfield could occupy a 10-acre parcel. Although he did not recommend a specific acreage requirement, he said the minimum should be greater than 10 acres and expressed support for the Planning Commission and Town Council in determining the appropriate threshold.

The Planning Commission discussed whether the minimum acreage should be 40, 50, or 100 acres. Commissioners noted that multiple property owners could combine property into a single development if necessary. Following discussion, the Commissioners reached a general consensus to recommend a minimum project size of 50 acres, recognizing that the Town Council could modify the requirement during its review.

Chairman Taylor then opened the public hearing on the proposed Site-Specific Development Zone.

3) Receive Public Comment (two minutes per person).

Chairman Taylor invited public comment.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

Vern Carson addressed the Commissioners and referred to the previous discussion regarding the difficulty of administering multiple SSD districts, each with different development standards. He suggested that, in addition to establishing a minimum acreage requirement, the Commissioners consider the number and configuration of SSD districts and the need for consistency among them.

Mr. Carson also asked whether developments approved through the SSD process would be required to comply with the Town's roadway standards, including the 66-foot right-of-way and APWA standards. He then asked about the process for establishing an Agricultural Protection Area, expressing concern about future development adjacent to his property and the potential for conflicts with his existing agricultural operations.

Jim Spung responded that the Town would have discretion to determine which development standards it was willing to modify through the SSD process. He explained that the Town's baseline standards would apply unless an applicant demonstrated that a proposed deviation would benefit the Town and the Town approved the change through the rezoning process. Regarding the Agricultural Protection Area, Jim stated that he would need to research whether the Town or Utah County administers the process and would follow up with additional information.

Brenda Tanner commented remotely that a 50-acre minimum initially seemed small to her. After hearing Jim's explanation of the Town's discretion in approving SSD applications, she said she was less concerned about the proposed acreage. However, she remained concerned about the possibility of a larger property being divided into multiple 50-acre SSD districts with different development standards.

No additional public comments were received.

4) Close Public Hearing.

Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing on the proposed Site-Specific Development (SSD) Zone.

5) Planning Commission Discussion and Deliberation on Site-Specific Development Zone (SSD)

Following the close of the public hearing, Chairman Taylor asked if there were any additional comments or discussion. No further discussion was offered.

Planner Jim Spung informed the Commissioners that, since the meeting packet had been distributed, Attorney Brad Christopherson and Mayor Hollie McKinney had reviewed the draft ordinance and recommended three additional revisions:

1. Replace references to the Airpark with the Airpark Mixed-Use Zone on lines 23 through 25 and renumber the section accordingly.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

2. Update the minimum project size from 10 acres to 50 acres.
3. Replace references to Town Staff with Planning Director or the Mayor's Designee throughout the ordinance.

Mayor McKinney also suggested using Google Docs for future draft reviews to make it easier for Planning Commissioners to provide comments. The Commissioners indicated they were comfortable using that format.

6) Consider a recommendation to the Town Council to adopt Site-Specific Development Zone (SSD)

Commissioner Mascaro motioned that we forward a positive recommendation to the Town Council for a zoning text amendment to the Fairfield Code of Ordinances, establishing a new Site-Specific Development (SSD) zoning district and corresponding review procedures, based on the findings and recommendations of this Staff Report. With the following, replace references to the Airpark with the Airpark Mixed-Use Zone on lines 23 through 25 and renumber the section accordingly. Update the minimum project size from 10 acres to 50 acres. Replace references to Town Staff with Planning Director or the Mayor's Designee throughout the ordinance. Commissioner Riet seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Commissioner Riet - Yes

Commissioner Fisher - Yes

Commissioner Mascaro - Yes

Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

Business Items

The Commission will discuss (without public comment) and may either make a recommendation to the Town Council or approve the following items as needed:

1) Approve the July 16, 2026 minutes.

Chairman Taylor presented the July 16, 2026 Planning Commission meeting minutes for approval.

Chairman Taylor presented the July 16, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes for approval. After confirming that a comment in the draft had been addressed, the Commissioners proceeded with consideration of the minutes.

Commissioner Mascaro stated that she would abstain from voting because she had not been present at the July 16 meeting.

Commissioner Riet made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 16 meeting.

Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 yes and 1 abstention.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

Commissioner Riet - Yes
Commissioner Fisher - Yes
Commissioner Butterfield - Yes
Commissioner Mascaro - Abstained

2) Review and may approve Darwin Bundy's site plan.

Chairman Taylor introduced the agenda item and explained that when the site plan was previously reviewed, two items remained outstanding: the fire protection requirements and approval of the septic system by the Utah County Health Department.

Chairman Taylor reported that since the previous meeting, Mr. Bundy had elected to install a fire sprinkler system, which would be addressed during the Fire Marshal's review of the building permit. He also noted that the required approval from the Utah County Health Department for the septic system had been received. Chairman Taylor commended Darwin Bundy and Grant Peterson for completing the remaining requirements sooner than anticipated and stated that he was satisfied the outstanding items had been resolved.

Chairman Taylor invited any additional comments.

Grant Peterson acknowledged that the project presented unique circumstances because of the water protection zone and thanked Mr. Bundy for his cooperation throughout the review process and his willingness to address the Town's requirements. Mr. Peterson also complimented Mayor McKinney for including suggested motion language in the staff reports, noting that it made the Commissioners' work easier.

Commissioner Riet made a motion to approve the site plan for the Darwin Bundy property.
Commissioner Mascaro seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Taylor - Yes
Commissioner Riet - Yes
Commissioner Fisher - Yes
Commissioner Mascaro - Yes
Commissioner Butterfield - Yes

3) Update from Oquirrh Wood Ranch.

Jared Westhoff provided an update on the Oquirrh Wood Ranch project. He explained that, based on the direction received from the Planning Commission at the previous meeting, the proposed development had been reorganized using the Site-Specific Development (SSD) framework. The project had been divided into three primary components: the business park, ranch units, and commercial area. Mr. Westhoff stated that restructuring the project in this manner had simplified the drafting process and made it easier to develop project-specific standards. He expressed appreciation for the Commissioners' guidance and said the project team found the direction helpful.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

For the business park, Mr. Westhoff explained that the Town's Technology Overlay Zone served as the foundation for the proposed standards. The project team then incorporated project-specific provisions where appropriate. He presented a draft summary identifying the modifications, additions, and revisions made to the Technology Overlay Zone, noting that portions of the draft remained highlighted where the project team was still evaluating options and refining language.

Mr. Westhoff stated that the project team was continuing to evaluate water use, transportation, and roadway design. He explained that while the Town's standard 66-foot right-of-way was appropriate for many roadways, the draft plans proposed wider rights-of-way in certain locations to accommodate anticipated traffic and industrial uses. He stated that some industrial roads were proposed to have 70- or 76-foot rights-of-way, and that 900 North was proposed with a 94-foot right-of-way because the project team believed additional width would be necessary. He noted that these roadway sections remained in draft form and would continue to be evaluated.

Chairman Taylor suggested that the project's water rights be submitted to the Town's water engineer for verification early in the development process so their validity and transferability could be confirmed before significant time and expense were invested in project review.

Mr. Westhoff responded that the project team had already begun gathering that information and would follow up with the Town. He stated that the business park standards had also been simplified by limiting the list of permitted uses to those already contained within the Technology Overlay Zone, with only project-specific modifications where necessary.

Mr. Westhoff reported that the project team hoped to return by the end of August with near-final drafts for the business park and ranch unit portions of the project, as well as an initial draft for the commercial area. The goal was to refine the documents sufficiently for Planning Commission consideration in September, while recognizing that additional revisions could still be made if needed.

The Commissioners then discussed the proposed transition between commercial and business park uses. Chairman Taylor noted that previous discussions had emphasized creating a gradual transition from lighter commercial uses to more intensive commercial and industrial uses rather than an abrupt change in land use. Mr. Westhoff responded that the project had been revised to reflect that concept. He explained that an area of approximately 30 acres along the Pony Express (trail), previously identified as part of the business park, was now proposed as commercial property to provide a transition between commercial development and the business park. The Commissioners agreed that the layered approach was appropriate.

The Commissioners also discussed proposed building heights. Chairman Taylor asked how the proposed building heights compared with those permitted in Eagle Mountain. Mr. Westhoff explained that the proposed ordinance retained the Town's existing 50-foot maximum building

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Fairfield Planning Commission
Regular Session / Public Hearing
July 29, 2026

height for principal buildings. However, the project team was requesting that the conditional maximum height be increased from 80 feet to 90 feet to accommodate a prospective industrial user that anticipated needing a 90-foot air-cooling tower rather than a taller building. He stated that the project team was still confirming whether the additional height would actually be necessary and emphasized that the proposal remained in draft form.

Commissioners discussed potential impacts associated with taller structures, including whether a 90-foot tower might require aviation marker lights and whether taller structures could affect fire protection requirements, including the possible need for ladder truck access. Mr. Westhoff agreed to compare the proposed standards with Eagle Mountain's regulations, verify the height requirements with prospective users, and consult with Unified Fire Authority regarding any fire protection considerations before returning with the next draft.

The discussion concluded with additional comments regarding water rights. Mr. Westhoff explained that the project team held a block of water rights that had already been converted to municipal use but would require a change in the point of diversion. He stated that their goal was to drill wells on the east side of the project to move the point of diversion as far as possible from potential interference with the Fairfield Spring. Chairman Taylor explained that the Town's objective was to verify that sufficient transferable water rights existed before investing significant time in the development review process. Mayor McKinney added that the Town's water engineer could review the water rights to verify the certificates and confirm they were transferable.

Mr. Westhoff then asked about the Town's water banking ordinance and discussed the possibility of transferring a portion of the water rights into the Town's water bank and adding additional water rights as development progressed. The Commissioners indicated that this approach could be helpful.

Mr. Westhoff thanked the Commissioners for their guidance and stated that the revised approach had significantly improved the project. The Commissioners expressed appreciation for the update and looked forward to reviewing the next draft as the project continued to progress.

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Mascaro to end the meeting. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion. Meeting end time: 7:52 pm.

Minutes Approval Date

Stephanie Shelley Recorder/Clerk