



**MAPLETON**  
U T A H  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
March 27, 2025

---

**PRESIDING AND CONDUCTING:** Melanie Bott

**Commissioners in Attendance:** Alece Nelsen  
Lily Graham

**Staff in Attendance:** Sean Conroy, Community Development Director  
Jeni Crookston, Planner

**Minutes Transcribed by:** April Houser, Executive Secretary

---

Acting Chair Melanie Bott called the meeting to order at 6:00pm. A prayer and Pledge of Allegiance was given.

**Item 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – January 23, 2025.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Nelsen moved to approve January 23, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

**Second:** Commissioner Graham

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Item 2. Consideration of a Preliminary Plat application for the Harmony Ridge Plat "I" subdivision consisting of 31 lots in the Planned Development (PD-3) Zone.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Nelsen moved to approve the Preliminary Plat application for the Harmony Ridge Plat "I" subdivision consisting of 31 lots in the Planned Development (PD-3) Zone with the condition that all outstanding Development Review Committee (DRC) comments be addressed prior to plat recording.

**Second:** Commissioner Graham

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Item 3. Consideration of a request to rezone approximately 7.3 acres of property located at 795 South Main Street from A-2 to RA-1 with a concept plan for 4 new 1-acre lots. The applicant is Grace Huffaker.**

**Jeni Crookston**, Planner, went over the Staff Report for those in attendance. The applicant owns 4 separate parcels in this area that total 8.3 acres. Portions of the property are in both the A2 and RA-1 Zones. The General Plan shows this area to be in the Low-Density Residential designation. Staff support the rezone of the property behind 795 South Main

Street but would like the Commission to discuss whether rezoning the two lots in the Maple Farm Estates would conflict with the policy of protecting established neighborhoods. The subdivision is not part of this rezone request and will require approval in the future based off the outcome of the rezone.

**Steven Lord**, Engineer representing the applicant, felt staff did a good job describing their rezone request this evening. The Huffaker's plan to have their children to build on the new lots being created.

**Acting Chairman Melanie Bott** opened the Public Hearing. **Tom James** lives across from the proposed Lot 7. His concern is that this subdivision was planned and approved with 2 acre lots. If a change is to be made, he feels the residents in the Maple Farm Estates subdivision should have to agree with what takes place. The smaller lots could lower the value of his property and would change the layout of the development they moved in to. A gentleman asked for clarification on where the proposed street would be built. **Sean Conroy**, Community Development Director, stated that typically the street would be installed at a width of half plus 7' on the applicant's property. The remaining portion of the street would be completed with the adjacent property owner develops. **Esther Brophy** thinks this could be a good thing but would put their property on the corner of 2 streets once developed. The metal building on their property would then be located approximately 10' off the street, which she was not sure if that would be an issue or not. Esther had concerns with the possibility of having to relocate their driveway, altering the current landscaping in that area. **Grace Huffaker**, the applicant, loves her neighbors and is not trying to cause issues with any of them because of this development. They are not sure when they will actually develop the property, but wanted to get the rezone in place at this time. Sharee Killpack asked if this would create a flag lot, which Sean stated it would not. More discussions in regards to the road would take place with the subdivision request. No additional comments were made and the Public Hearing was closed.

**Steven Lord**, Engineer representing the applicant, reiterated that the layout being shown is strictly just a concept plan. No final layout has been put together at this time. Initial discussions have taken place with UDOT, which is the reason for the possible curve of the street is being shown in order to meet their requirements. The property line along the Brophy's property would not change with the street installation, so their setback would not change from where it currently is. There are no deed restrictions in the Maple Farm Estates subdivision, so he believes the rezone of that portion of the proposed rezone should be allowed.

**Commissioner Nelsen** does not agree with allowing the rezone of the property currently located in the Maple Farm Estates subdivision. She is passionate about leaving the current subdivision layout in place. **Commissioner Bott** felt that the General Plan allowing this area to be in the RA-1 Zone needed to be considered when discussing the rezone. The boundaries of the General Plan have not changed since 2010 in this area. The Commission does have the discretion to determine if this area should be allowed to rezone.

**Motion:** Commissioner Nelsen moved to recommend the below to City Council for the rezone of approximately 7.3 acres of property located at 795 South Main Street from A-2 to RA-1 with a concept plan for 4 new 1-acre lots with the conditions below:

1. Recommend approval of the rezone for the 2.31 acres located behind the existing home on 795 South Main Street.
2. Recommend denial of the rezone of lots 7 and 8 of the Maple Farm Estates subdivision.

**Second:** Commissioner Graham

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Item 4. Consideration of an ordinance amending Mapleton City Code Title 18 regarding standards for Residential Accessory Buildings.**

**Sean Conroy**, Community Development Director, went over the Staff Report for those in attendance. The city has seen a significant increase in requests for accessory building permits. With current concerns from certain neighbors behind some of these accessory structures, the City felt a possible ordinance amendment should be discussed. Staff are proposing a reduction of rear yard coverage to 20% from the current 30% allowance. For structures over 24' in height, the property owner would have to comply with the same side and rear setbacks as a residential home. Structures less than 15' tall would have a 3' setback. Structures between 15' to 24' tall would have a 10' setback, and structures over 24' tall would require a 25' setback.

**Acting Chairman Melanie Bott** opened the Public Hearing. **Sharee Killpack** feels the proposed changes sound more appropriate, but felt 2-story buildings should not be able to be located that close to the property line. She felt that buildings over 15' should need to meet the 25' setback as well. She felt CC&R's should be part of the building permit process when reviewed by the city. **Bob Friel** feels the city failed the residents in the Monta Vista subdivision when allowing one of the residents to construct an accessory building in their back yard. He felt the neighbors should have been contacted before the structure referred to was built. **Rance Hutchings** thanked the Commission for looking at changes to the setbacks. He felt the 15' height should be allowed with the 3' setback, but if it exceeded that he felt it should be increased from the current 10' allowance. He wondered if the ordinance would allow for these types of industrial buildings in residential areas to be addressed, feeling they are not being used under the current residential guidelines. **Mac Cory** is planning to build a larger building and felt that maybe these larger structures should be required to beautify the exterior, not allowing metal buildings. No additional comments were made, and the Public Hearing was closed.

Sean went through some of the comments that had been made. CC&R's are private restrictions that are placed on the property, and the city is not tied to them. From the city's standpoint the subdivision where some of the stated concerns take place, no HOA has been in place, or contact made with the city. Therefore, there has never been a reason to contact residents about proposed accessory buildings. Design standards could be put on accessory buildings, but it would be challenging to regulate. Building Permits, under Utah State Code, are administrative in nature and if the standards are being met the permit must be approved. Height is determined from the main elevation of the property.

**Motion:** Commissioner Graham moved to continue approval of an ordinance to City Council amending Mapleton City Code Title 18 regarding standards for Residential Accessory Buildings with the directive to have staff come up with a variable on the setback requirement based off the size and height of the

**Second:** proposed accessory building.  
**Commissioner Nelsen**  
**Vote:** Unanimous

**Item 4. Adjourn.**

---

April Houser, Executive Secretary

---

Date