



## SMITHFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES April 16, 2025

The Planning Commission of Smithfield City met in the City Council Chambers at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 16, 2025.

Opening Comments by Chris Olsen

**Members Present:** Jamie Anderson, Bob Holbrook, Lane Henderson, Jim Marshall, Chris Olsen, Sarah Price, Brad Thatcher

**Members Excused:** Klydi Heywood

**City Staff:** Brian Boudrero, McKenzie Nelson

**Others in Attendance:** Jeff Barnes, Michelle Anderson, Danielle Maughan, Joan Francis, Seneca Francis, Sue Hyer, Sara Workman, Kelly Frandsen, Caralee Stokes

**6:30 p.m. Meeting called to order by Chairman Anderson**

### **Consideration of the consent agenda and approval of meeting minutes**

After consideration by the Commission, Chairman Anderson declared the minutes from the March 19, 2025, meeting to stand as amended by Commissioner Marshall, who asked that the word “pollute” in his comments on page 2 be changed to “dilute”.

### **RESIDENT INPUT**

No comments.

### **AGENDA ITEMS**

Introduction and **Public Hearing** for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-07, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.12 “Supplementary And Qualifying Regulations”, adding Section 17.12.235 “Keeping Pigs”, amending Chapter 17.04 “General Provisions”, Section 17.04.070 “Definitions”, Chapter 17.14 “Animal Rights Regulations For R-1 Zones”, Sections 17.14.030 “Number Of Animals Permitted”, 17.14.080 “Prohibited Animals”, and Chapter 17.48 “Agricultural Zone”, Section 17.48.050 “Farm Animals”.

Mr. Boudrero summarized that this ordinance would allow pigs within the city limits, subject to regulations and conditions of approval. The number of permitted pigs would depend on the size of the parcel, with no more than four (4) pigs. Pigs must be located in a fenced area, permitted by the City, and the permit must be renewed every three (3) years. Multiple places within the City Code need to be altered if the ordinance is confirmed.

This ordinance does not change any other farm animals. If approved, the ordinance would only remove the prohibition of pigs in sections where it is currently written.

### **6:35 p.m. Public Hearing Opened**

Chairman Anderson received an email that just came in and wanted it read into the record:

*"Hello members of the Smithfield Planning Commission. Dianne and I were caught in traffic on I-15 and will likely miss the meeting tonight. We wanted to speak during the public hearing for ordinance 2025-07 which is agenda item 3 for tonight's meeting. Dianne and I strongly support the approval of allowing residents to raise pigs on their property for home food production, youth FFA and youth 4H projects. There are a number of residents currently doing this in the city already and would like to be able to do it properly, and are very happy this is a possibility. After reviewing city records there is 1 occurrence in over 5 yrs. where a situation involving pigs was raised and this occurrence was due to neighbor disagreements and not due to the pigs themselves. The constraints in this ordinance are limiting and prevent folks doing this on a larger scale and allow for citizens of the city to apply for the permit and continue forward and be in compliance with ordinances. We do wish we were able to be present and speak to the commission directly. We appreciate your service and ask for your approval on this ordinance Thank you Dianne K Campbell Wade C Campbell".*

Emails from David Russak, Rheanna & and Jacob Henry were received in support of approval. An email from Richard Jewkes was received in opposition to the ordinance. These emails were received before the meeting and were included in the meeting packet items for the Commission to review.

Danielle Maughan is not in favor of allowing pigs. She has a neighbor with ducks, which hatched last summer. There were 33 ducks in the area, and the odor was offensive. This can be frustrating for people who try to keep things contained. She has dogs, and although there will be rules, she is afraid it will cause issues for neighbors.

Joan Francis does not foresee a need for her family to raise pigs; she appreciates that the City is open to letting property owners use their land as they see fit if they are willing to abide by the restrictions. She is glad to live in an area where those freedoms are offered.

Seneca Francis appreciates the Commission discussing this option for individuals with an agricultural mind. The restrictions will help, and this would allow kids to have experiences. Since residents are allowed eggs, they should be allowed bacon.

Jeff Barnes said that pigs can grow to be large animals. The hog farms in Benson have quite a stench. People should have pigs in facilities rather than running around a yard.

### **6:41 p.m. Public Hearing Closed**

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-07
---

Commissioner Olsen thinks this is a good idea and supports the ordinance. A few housekeeping changes he noted would be in 17.04.070 Definitions – striking *one* (1) before the sentence being removed, and no capitalization of the word "Not" at the end. He asked if the definition of swine (*including pigs, hogs, and boars*) is part of the Code. Mr. Boudrero said that it is already part of the Code. In other areas where it addresses pigs, it does not list swine. Mr. Boudrero said allowing pigs is the same as allowing swine.

Commissioner Olsen said there are a few places where the verbiage is “P&Z Administrator” and places where it is “City Planning Department”. Mr. Boudrero said he would make the changes so that they consistently reference the P&Z Administrator.

Commissioner Olsen thinks this provides a good opportunity for kids in 4-H. His children raised lambs, but they were in Amalga, so he feels that the chance for families to keep this opportunity local is a great benefit.

Commissioner Thatcher is grateful for those who voiced their opinions. He also noted that when this was initially discussed at the last City Council meeting, there were four people in favor, citing things such as 4H opportunities, self-reliance, and overall agricultural type mentality, and that even though the City is growing, there might still be that type of opportunity.

Commissioner Marshall supports the idea of home food production. He manages a 7-acre family farm in Richmond with goats, horses, cows, and chickens, but they have never had pigs. He had nephews who raised pigs for 4-H and had a good experience. Pigs are the one agricultural animal that he does not want to allow in the City. Any size of a pig pen put in will be quickly denuded of all vegetation and will turn into a mud/dust bowl. They should not be visible from the street. They can be noisy and smell bad; pigs tend to escape due to their rooting behavior. He looked at websites from Oregon State University, Oklahoma State University, and Penn State University, which are all land-grant universities, to try and understand how to manage pigs on smaller lots without impacting the adjacent neighbors to enjoy the use of their property, and he does not see a way for this to be done. If pigs were to be allowed, he would like to see it be a limited number on agricultural land, but not residential property, and possibly a provision to keep pens 200-300 feet from the property line, but that buffer might not be adequate. Unless he becomes better educated about how to manage the impacts, he is opposed to this ordinance.

Commissioner Price talked to her husband about this; he is a deputy and has had to try to catch escaped pigs. They have raised pigs together, but it was not at their residence. She is trying to determine the line between government overreach and what someone can and cannot do with their property, but she is also concerned about how it might affect others. A 0.25-acre lot seems too small for such large animals. She agrees with having the ability to be self-sustaining, so she sees both sides.

Commissioner Thatcher has 1/3 acre and sat in his backyard while contemplating this today. Looking at that amount of land, he hesitated to think he would have enough space for them. He shares the same sentiments – providing opportunities for people to raise quality meat and for educational purposes is great; however, he has a hard time housing such a large and dirty animal on a confined lot.

Commissioner Marshall said the government exists to secure property rights, and part of what securing those rights means is ensuring that one property owner’s activities on their property do not make it impossible for a neighbor to use or enjoy their property. The Commission considers and tries to prevent these types of conflicts with these types of ordinances. In most cases, he favors agricultural animals within the City limits; he does not see how pigs can be managed well in a residential area. Pigs can often weigh

hundreds of pounds and are prodigious poopers.

Commissioner Price would feel better if this started by allowing them to be on larger properties.

Chairman Anderson asked how many lots in the City still have “traditional animal rights”? Mr. Boudrero said there are two, which were existing farms and are relatively large properties.

Mr. Boudrero noted that there are differences between permitted animals in the agricultural residential zones and the traditional residential zones. Permitting chickens was separated from the standard animal code quite some time ago. Because pigs will be a permitted process, this will do the same thing and create a specific ordinance with regulations.

Chairman Anderson asked why this would be in 17.14.030, where it defines the size of specific animals. Mr. Boudrero said that medium- and large-sized animals are a generality of animal units. The City Council knew there would be some concerns about why a permitting process, like chickens, is being added and will not be considered in animal units. There is also not as much detail in the animal units as there is in this proposed ordinance.

Mr. Boudrero confirmed for Chairman Anderson that currently, no pigs are allowed anywhere within the city limits. Chairman Anderson said this would be a significant change from being prohibited to being allowed anywhere in the city.

Commissioner Marshall noted that a square one-acre lot will be about 200-210 feet per side. If a pen is put in the center of the area, it would only allow approximately 100 feet from the next property.

Mr. Boudrero pointed out that the chicken ordinance requires the coop to be a certain number of feet away from a residential structure. Before it is approved, it is confirmed by the Code Enforcement Officer, who goes out to check it.

Commissioner Marshall said when he served on the Planning Commission years ago, a building permit for a home was denied because there was no way to fit the home on the property without violating the 100-foot radius from a barn with animals. This requirement may have changed over the years. Regardless, he is generally opposed to this ordinance, but it might be better if someone wants to make changes to address lot sizes and add more provisions on managing the use. This proposed ordinance is too vague; the day that his neighbors put two pigs on a 0.25 lot is when he would sincerely believe that his property value would decrease, and he does not usually make this argument.

Commissioner Holbrook is supportive of Commissioner Marshall's comments. Regardless of the restrictions, some people will push it to the max. He has a neighbor who has chickens and other animals which are all legally permitted, but the odor from the coop is horrible, especially on a warm summer day. There are always complaints about the smell. He is concerned that two pigs being allowed on a lot is too much and too close. He agrees that pigs do tend to get out and are often difficult to catch. He is not in favor of this proposal.

Chairman Anderson is fine with property rights until they impinge on others' rights. Even something as simple as a barking dog can result in complaints. He believes there should be some recourse in the ordinance for complaints, or if someone does not want that next to their home. He suggested possibly obtaining approval from adjacent property owners. The ordinance needs to be more defined and stringent. Mr. Boudrero said there could be more restrictions put in place.

Commissioner Olsen asked about the current nuisance laws. Mr. Boudrero said citations can be issued for non-compliance. Commissioner Olsen said he understands the desire for this, especially for residents knowing their meat quality. He would think the current nuisance laws would help with many concerns. Having an option is a good thing.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Olsen to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2025-07, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.12 “Supplementary And Qualifying Regulations”, adding Section 17.12.235 “Keeping Pigs”, amending Chapter 17.04 “General Provisions”, Section 17.04.070 “Definitions”, Chapter 17.14 “Animal Rights Regulations For R-1 Zones”, Sections 17.14.030 “Number Of Animals Permitted”, 17.14.080 “Prohibited Animals”, and Chapter 17.48 “Agricultural Zone”, Section 17.48.050 “Farm Animals” with the change to “P&Z Administrator”, strike out of one (1) and not capitalizing the word not in Section Commissioner Henderson seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 2-5.

**Vote:**

**Yes:** Henderson, Olsen

**No:** Anderson, Holbrook, Marshall, Price, Thatcher

Introduction and **Public Hearing** for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-12, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Construction & Design Standards, Part I “Design Standards”, Chapter 5.0 “Culinary Water System Design”, Section 5.1 “General”.

Mr. Boudrero explained this ordinance would add the following paragraph:

*N. All subdivisions, including Intra-Blocks and Minor, that have a water main that fails the water model or is included in the Capital Improvement Project Plan, (e.g. less than 8-inch) shall replace the main waterline from the nearest connection to an adequate main waterline and continue the new replacement main line to the end of said subdivision.*

### **7:12 p.m. Public Hearing Opened**

There were not any comments or questions.

### **7:13 p.m. Public Hearing Closed**

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-12

Chairman Anderson said this makes sense, and he has no concerns.

Commissioner Olsen thinks this is a good time for this to happen.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Marshall to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2025-12, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Construction & Design Standards, Part I “Design Standards”, Chapter 5.0 “Culinary Water System Design”, Section 5.1 “General”. Commissioner Price seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

**Vote:**

**Yes:** Anderson, Henderson, Holbrook, Marshall, Olsen, Price, Thatcher

**No:** None

Introduction and **Public Hearing** for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-11, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.92 “Accessory Dwelling Unit”, Section 17.92.020 “Conditions”, and Title 16 “Subdivision Regulations”, Chapter 16.04 “General Provisions”, Section 16.04.050 “General Responsibilities”.

Mr. Boudrero provided an outline of the following proposed changes:

**§16.04.050 General Responsibilities**

Information is added to paragraph K, detailing the expectation that any utility line required by a water model or capital improvement project be upsized to a minimum of 8” diameter.

**§17.92.020 Conditions**

Detached accessory units are currently allowed to be a maximum of 50% of the size of the original dwelling unit or fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet. There are many smaller homes that occupy larger lots that could utilize this code. This ordinance would increase the allowable size to 75% of the original dwelling unit.

Mr. Boudrero said this is a slight change to ADUs. The current Code says a detached unit is allowed if it can fit within the current setbacks, but must be 50% of the size of the original floor plan or 1,500 SF. There are quite a few homes that are smaller, but have large lots – they can do a detached ADU; however, meeting the 50% of the small home makes it impossible. This proposal will increase the allowable size to 75% of the original dwelling unit, allowing more people to have this option.

**7:18 p.m. Public Hearing Opened**

There were not any comments or questions.

**7:19 p.m. Public Hearing Closed**

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-11
---

Commissioner Holbrook said this seems like a good idea. Commissioner Olsen agreed and said it is straightforward and supports the change.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Marshall to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2025-11, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.92 “Accessory Dwelling Unit”, Section 17.92.020 “Conditions”, and Title 16 “Subdivision Regulations”, Chapter 16.04 “General Provisions”, Section 16.04.050 “General Responsibilities”. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

**Vote:**

**Yes:** Anderson, Henderson, Holbrook, Marshall, Olsen, Price, Thatcher

**No:** None

Mr. Boudrero reminded the members that there is an upcoming training opportunity that he emailed out earlier this week. Anyone interested should let him know.

Chairman Anderson recommends reviewing a section of the Land Use book at each meeting. Mr. Boudrero said that could be an option; he also tries incorporating information in his monthly emails.

**MEETING ADJOURNED** at 7:23 p.m.

---

Jamie Anderson, Chairman



**SMITHFIELD CITY  
CORPORATION  
96 South Main  
Smithfield, UT 84335**

**AGENDA**

Public notice is given that the Smithfield Planning Commission will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, on Wednesday, April 16, 2025. The meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m.

Welcome/Pledge of Allegiance and/or thought/prayer by Chris Olsen

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 19, 2024.
2. Resident Input
3. Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-07, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 "Zoning Regulations", Chapter 17.12 "Supplementary And Qualifying Regulations", adding Section 17.12.235 "Keeping Pigs", amending Chapter 17.04 "General Provisions", Section 17.04.070 "Definitions", Chapter 17.14 "Animal Rights Regulations For R-1 Zones", Sections 17.14.030 "Number Of Animals Permitted", 17.14.080 "Prohibited Animals", and Chapter 17.48 "Agricultural Zone", Section 17.48.050 "Farm Animals".
4. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-07.
5. Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-12, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Construction & Design Standards, Part I "Design Standards", Chapter 5.0 "Culinary Water System Design", Section 5.1 "General".
6. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-12
7. Introduction and Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-11, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 "Zoning Regulations", Chapter 17.92 "Accessory Dwelling Unit", Section 17.92.020 "Conditions", and Title 16 "Subdivision Regulations", Chapter 16.04 "General Provisions", Section 16.04.050 "General Responsibilities".
8. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-11.

Adjournment

**\*\*\*Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda\*\*\***

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing unique accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7997 at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.