



SPRING CITY PLANNING & ZONING PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
Wednesday October 1, 2025, 6:30PM
Spring City Council Chambers, Spring City Hall, 45 South 100 East

This meeting was held in-person at the Spring City Community Center Council Chamber, and via Zoom electronic meeting service. Public comments were heard in person or submitted in writing. All comments submitted in writing will be filed with these minutes.

Meeting Called to Order: 6:30 pm

Roll Call: Cami Christensen (Commission Chairperson), Craig Paulsen (Zoning Administrator), Michael Nelson, Sally Scott, Kristen Mortensen, Kay Van Buren, Andrew Skousen, City Treasurer Whit Allred (minutes).

Attending: Attendance sign in sheet attached.

Expression of Choice: Prayer

Craig Paulsen introduced the topic, changes to titles 10 & 11 of the Spring City code encompassed in proposed ordinance 2025-03 and 05 and gave a brief overview. Accompanying map and all public comments are preserved and available to review at the Utah State Public Meeting Notice website and linked at the Spring City website.

The floor was then opened to public comment:

(Please note, unless otherwise stipulated, the comments that were made live are paraphrased here in the interest of space but the spirit of the comment has been preserved as much as possible. If you were a live commenter and feel that the statement you made is not correctly conveyed here, please contact Whit Allred at the city office to have a note of correction added. Comments that were submitted in writing will be presented at the end of these minutes in the form that they were submitted. For a full audio recording of the meeting please consult the Utah State Public Meeting Notice website. If you need help, please contact the city office.)

Craig Paulsen (after his official comments), 76 percent of the answered surveys showed that 76 percent of the respondents said they were in favor of keeping the 1.06 acre lots. 1.06 acre lots is key to maintaining the historic nature of the city. Since 1980, as one of the founding members of the Friends of Historic Spring City, that has been my goal. I'm very concerned that the city allowing ½ acre lots inside the city will lead to the county starting to allow it in what is supposed to be our buffer zone which is presently zoned for 1 acre. Ordinance 2025-05 specifically created

a protected historic zone. I believe that the wording in the ordinance as it is written is misleading and confusing.

Cami Christensen said that Scott Newman would present his comments at this point. These were emailed to us so they will be included here as written by Scott: Last week, I emailed a compromise proposal drafted by the plaintiffs to Mayor Anderson, the City Council, and Planning and Zoning. Our intent was to provide a clear path for dismissing the lawsuit altogether, based on points of compromise with Ordinance 2025-05.

Unfortunately, the timetable was apparently not met for having this proposal formally considered in this meeting. So I'll cover its highlights now.

A compromise is when two sides come together and willingly give up some conditions in order to create a Win-Win outcome, not a Win-Lose. We applaud the City Council author of 2025-05 for putting on the table a much more fair and reasonable ordinance than Ordinance 2025-03, which is a big Lose for preserving the unique look and character of Spring City

O5 is not perfect, and as written, it leaves 55 historic homes and outbuildings outside the "protected zone," which is the area where the minimum lot size remains at 1.06. That's 19% of all historic dwellings in town. These dwellings will still be inside the National Historic District, but they will be subject over time to potentially being surrounded by half-acre lots with who knows what built on them.

Our compromise enlarges the O5 protected zone by half a block on the west to 200 West and a full block on the east to 500 East. What this does is reduce the amount of historic homes that are left out of the protected zone from 19% to 10%, or from 55 homes to 28.

The Friends of Historic Spring City Board voted 18 to 5 to join the lawsuit, in part to keep 2025-03 at bay. While we would prefer not to have a protected zone within the National Historic District, O5 does provide some protection for 1.06 lots.

On the other hand, 2025-03 offers zero protection by allowing half-acre lots throughout the entire city. O3 has been justified on grounds of universal property rights - that any property owner should be able to do whatever they want. But In reality O3 proposes not universal, but selective property rights, because it only gives owners of 1.06 lots the right to split, not anyone else.

We appeal to Planning & Zoning, the Mayor, and City Council to work toward a Win-Win in passing a revised Ordinance 2025-05, and not 2025-03. There is room in this city for the Win

of disciplined growth and increased tax and utility revenue, as well as the Win of preserving the treasure of the best intact example of an early Mormon community in the country. Thanks.

David Figgat: My time starts, this is something that should have been a long time ago. A simple cost benefit analysis to show the underlying reason they were doing this. To make benefits for the city, to which I say bull. Why do I say that? I'll let the number speak for themselves. (Submitted a simple cost benefit analysis). This exercise taught me three things. 1) That it doesn't take a genius to learn not to put this together. 2) The only people who benefit from this are outside the city. The city doesn't benefit. 3) Any attempt to do something that is the important for the city, do a cost benefit, and let the numbers speak for themselves.

Charles Shepherd: Gave name and address. I serve on the national registry review board. (Gave an out of town example of historic districts and how they relate to Spring City) the 50-50 rule is only rule of thumb. The historic buildings are also looked at qualitatively more than quantitatively. The impact of new construction and loss of open space does affect the towns standing on the national register of historic places. It is not an overnight thing obviously but the re-evaluation that happens periodically can change. There are tax credits available to eligible property owners and historic properties that can be affected by these types of ordinances and this one is not taking into account the negative affect it potentially has.

Ann Robinson: Stated her name and address. This city needs to carefully conserve the historic assets that it has and the planning commission needs to be mindful of that in their decisions. Any change to the historic plan needs to be carefully studied and that a professional master plan needs to be formulated and followed.

Kimberly Stewart: One of my concerns is that protecting the historic district means also our commercial district. One of the main ways the city can increase it's revenue is through a commercial district. Commercial property has higher property taxes and greater sales tax revenue. Originally the commercial district was allowed to build to the edge of the property and they could also build a building that could have both living quarters and a commercial section. We need a balance of tourism and commercial enterprise. Question, if my house is 1200 square feet, can I build two of my houses on my property? Also if someone has a commercial building on their property in the historic district, does that count as multifamily housing? I am also concerned with the setbacks. The current is 30 feet but less than 40 percent of homes currently have 30 feet or more.

David Potter: David stated his appreciation for the city council and we voted them in and we should support them. But if we don't like them we can vote them out. Any lawsuits we have

are being paid out of the taxpayer's pocket so I encourage that we come together and compromise. Not everyone is going to get everything but we should be more tolerant of each other. I also appreciate the young man who brought the cost benefit analysis to us. That gives us another option of thinking about the situation. I am glad to be part of Spring City.

Su Tullis: I live in the county. I would like to see a nice business area in town that would draw people in instead of having them bypass Spring City. We should be proud of what we have and it should be the people who decide that they want their town to be.

Tony Rudman: Stated his name. I have been here 5 years. We are part of the ongoing lawsuit. I have prepared for you an overview of 4 issues that are pending in the lawsuit. We have concerns that the general plan was not legally or statutorily adopted. As such no planning should be taking place without a proper plan adopted. Quoting the mayor from one of the city council meetings, the general plan is inconsistent with state statute and needs to be redone. One of the city councilmen, in a memo to Jones and Demille, stated that the general plan is weak but we are going to go ahead with it anyway. The Board of Adjustment can be used more than we are using it and for more types of issue. The ordinance says that spot zoning should not be done. It's clearly being done to benefit certain individuals. Councilmen have a duty to disclose any conflict of interest they may have.

Raelynn Ferguson: I don't have all the knowledge that you have. That was impressive, thank you. Stated her address. My main concern is water. We need to have a study to make sure that we are going to have enough for the people that are already here. We don't want a new road on 700 East. 1200 square feet is too big for an extra home on your lot. That just makes it more attractive to divide the property. My home is just as important as any of the historic homes in the city. We don't see any of the lots or new homes going to low income housing so that argument is flushed down the toilet.

Paul Penrod: I felt strong tonight on two different issues. The 1.06 acres and the historic district. I have had hundreds of people come through my historic home. The comments are interesting that people make. People say, "you don't know what you have here" with this property. We don't want to be Williamsburg VA, but we need to preserve what we have. I received a mailer in the mail and my picture and name are on it. I don't know who wrote it and I didn't give my permission for this at all. The five points that are in it are hearsay and wrong. I did not criticize the mayor or other council members.

Joe Bennion: I am Joe Bennion, I have been here 48 years. I was in on the foundation of Friends of Historic Spring City. I am absolutely against any of the proposed changes. I would

like to see no new half-acre lots created. I would like to see no new multifamily dwelling allowed. I would like to see the ADU's stay at 625 square feet. Guest houses should not be as big as a regular house. The historic district will be negatively affected by the proposed changes and that affects the grants that we get. This [Community Center] could not have been built or finished off like it is without these grants. The full acre size lots are what people like to come and see, and what we like to live in. Our water sources are diminishing. Some of the water wells that have been drilled North of town are going dry. This tells us the the water table is dropping. At a hydrology conference I attended last year, they said that the water is going down and we are looking at a new normal, not an extended drought. Our first obligation is to the people inside town and we should not be adding any new growth until we can find out if we are going to have enough water to go around. Public opinion should be the backbone of our decision making. 70 percent of the people who responded to the survey wanted to keep things the way they are.

David Deaton: I have been in Spring City since 2012. I love the town. We have a daughter in our home and we like to have our grandkids close. We want to see Spring City preserve its heritage without handicapping our future. I want the city council and others to work in an atmosphere of compromise and let's put this issue to bed.

Marla Deaton: Stated her name. I love the water idea, and I love what Dave Potter said. I hope that we can all get along and come to a compromise so we can act like one big family. We shouldn't have to involve lawyers. I appreciate what the council has done, they have done a great job and I can't wait to see what we can do with the city.

Michael Broadbent: On Monday, we had a training meeting with the Board of Adjustment, the Planning & Zoning Commission, and the City Council. The training agent for the state came and taught us that the state mandates that Utah cities must have a general plan. You may not have a perfect plan but if you have one, then that is what you work with. The changes that are being proposed in these ordinances and the planning decisions that are being made are not consistent with what is in the current General Plan.

Cynthia DeGrey: Stated her name. I really hate all these kinds of meetings. I feel very strongly about what is going on. I am in favor of what has been proposed by our mayor and council. I am supportive of their efforts. Life is always about compromise. With our families, friends, neighbors. I think this is an honest effort on the part of our mayor and council to compromise. I was encouraged by Scott Newman's comment tonight that we can come to some conclusion and make this work with some area of town that gives us both a historic zone and a growth zone. Some people do not want a whole acre of ground. I don't know what the big concern

is with people wanting to split their lot if they want. This won't lead to big development. She then shared a quote from President Russell M Nelson. Love your neighbor...

Laurel Workman: Stated her name. She is one of the people who is in the East side, the unprotected part of this proposal. My spouse and my neighbors and all my friends on the East side who have been fighting the high density housing for the last 18 months. Not everyone up here has a historic home but they have a rural home and they moved here because it was rural. They thought that the 1.06 acres and they were told the 1.06 acres were here to stay. So when we are being told we are in the area that isn't protected from half acre lots and multi family housing, we get mad and concerned. And a belt route that is going to be high traffic and commercial and industrial is not welcome. We need to protect the whole town, not just the inner core.

Dan Rasmussen: Stated his name. I live on 700 East 200 South. I know what you're talking about with the belt route going around the East side. There is really no way to do a belt route through that area, and I don't know why we would want [highway] 89 part 2. 89 Ruined Spring City by pushing everything out when they bypassed the town. We had businesses, we had industry but that was ruined. We live on a property that has been in the family for over 100 years, it's not been developed and not been spoiled. As I have been campaigning I have heard people say they want to preserve the town for historic buildings but we don't talk about saving it for our family. We need to preserve Spring City for our families. My kids want to live here. My neighbors kids want to live here.

Wendy Clark: Stated her name. We have been here for about 11 years. We built our home on the other side of town and we love it here. We have felt love and peace from people since coming here. We have a 1 acre lot and we are hoping to use it to build a home on for my mother to live in her own home. That's the kind of thing I like, the personal freedom to be able to do it if we want or need to. So I appreciate what the city council has done. We need to bring our city back to the love and peace that we felt 11 years ago.

Bruce Caldwell: We live on the Northeast side of town and we have been coming to these meetings for the last 2 years and we feel like we are losing life's lottery. We have spent a lot of money fixing up our historic rock home and we will be glad when this mess is over. We are in favor of the 1 acre lots. We don't feel like we are being listened to. It's not nonsense to want 1 acre lots and we feel like Laurel [Workman]. We have been told that we don't matter. We have been told that we are gray hairs and we just need to step aside. We have talked about the surveys that have been done over and over again that show people want to keep the 1 acre lots but we aren't being listened to. We should be listening to Craig Paulsen.

He has the standing in town, the experience to know the right way. We should pay attention to him.

Lowell Brown: Stated his name. We have lived here just outside city limits for a couple of years now. I would like to quote Isaiah. Come, let us reason together. We have seen very little of that the last couple of years. We have been lecturing each other, suing each other, fighting with each other. We see ADUs being put up next to a historic home. The home looks great but it doesn't belong next to a historic home. That doesn't look good. Also 1200 square feet for a guest home is pretty big! Our first home was 1200 square feet. That's too big for a guest home. To get back to the theme of we need to reason with each other. The city council has been doing a good job, working hard. The will of the people however was described as mob rule by one councilman however. This is not reasoning together. We still need a big change in the city. Our plea is take some time and do it right. Listen to the people.

Ruth Bergener: Stated her name and address. I have been coming to these meeting for 2 years now and I have learned a lot. I am not in support of Phil Wood's development. I know he has a right to use the property how he wants but that kind of development takes over. I have seen that over and over again and the local residents are left to pick up the pieces. They breed higher crime and other problems. I think we need to come together and reason together to decide what's best for the town. I have just seen too much of the rapid growth. We should keep the 1.06 acre lots.

That is the end of the list of people that signed up to speak. The floor was opened to anyone who had last minute comments.

Kristen Mortensen (Planning & Zoning Member): We will need to reconvene at a later date so that we can prepare a recommendation for the City Council.

Cami Christensen stated that we will advertise a new meeting to approve a recommendation to give to the council. She stated that she has been threatened and bullied in this issue and she doesn't appreciate it. She stated that she had been flipped off more in town than in her high school job. She wants to bring the town back. She stated that we would get the minutes and comments published for review. She thanked everyone for their patience and comments.

Meeting adjourned at 6:35pm



October 1, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT SIGN UP SHEET

If you would like to make comments in the public hearing, please fill out the information below.

Print Your Name	Your Physical Address
DAVID FIBLAT	383 SD 100 E
Charles shephard	415 S. Main
ANN ROBINSON	56 NO MAIN ST.
Kimberly Stewart	95W 300N
DAVID Potter	545 So MAIN
Sc Tullis	COUNTY
Tony Rasmussen	90 EAST 100 South
Kaelynn C. Ferguson	591 E. 300 S.
Paul Penrod	92 S 100 W
CRUIE PAULSEN	119 W 200 N
Joe Bennin	310 E 200 S
Dave [unclear]	520 S. 300 E.
Marta Deaton	520 S. 300 E.
MICHAEL BROADBENT	100 E. 500 S.
Cynthia De Grey	89 W. 200 S.
Renee Workman	604 N. 500 E.
SCOTT NEWMAN	355 S. 100 W



October 1, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT SIGN UP SHEET

If you would like to make comments in the public hearing, please fill out the information below.

Print Your Name	Your Physical Address



October 1, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT SIGN UP SHEET

If you would like to make comments in the public hearing, please fill out the information below.

Print Your Name	Your Physical Address

Topics for planning and zoning

Here are 4 legal issues the Planning and Zoning Committee may want consider when reviewing this ordinance.....

General Plan

1. There should be no major zoning decisions at this time because there is not a statutorily compliant legally adopted General Plan in Spring City.

The primary Utah general plan statutes are found in the Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 9a (for municipalities) and Title 17, Chapter 27a (for counties), which mandate that local governments must create a general plan with specific elements like land use, housing, and transportation to guide long-term growth and development. These laws outline the required components of the plan, how it should be prepared and adopted, and its legal effect as an advisory guide (though ordinances can mandate compliance) and a requirement for public projects.

The failure to have a legally adopted compliant general plan refers to a local jurisdiction not having a formally legally adopted document outlining its vision for future growth and development, which is a legal requirement in states like Utah. Consequences can include losing local control over development, facing court-ordered compliance within strict deadlines, or being subject to fees and increased scrutiny from state agencies. Such a failure can also lead to a lack of guidance for community growth, making it harder to achieve goals related to housing, transportation, and economic development.

Mayor Andersen admitted in a recent city counsel that the current Spring City General Plan has inconsistencies with the state requirements and he ordered work to begin on a professionally prepared new general plan.

In an internal Jones and DeMille text Councilman Krogue is quoted as saying:

"As for new work on the GP, Ken says that he's tried to find funds to do a project multiple times, but they have nothing (partly because of lawsuits). He knows that the plan is weak, but they are sticking with it for now."

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

2. Variances for one or two individuals asking for relief from specific zoning requirements are best left to the Board of Adjustments.

When the zoning code causes an undue hardship on one or two property owners the Zoning Board of adjustment is authorized to issue a variance. The zoning board of adjustment is authorized to issue a variance when a zoning code causes undue hardship on a property owner. A variance is a legal mechanism that provides relief to property owners from the strict application of zoning

“Significant hardship” refers to a substantial and difficult level of suffering, adversity, or deprivation that is hard to endure, often leading to significant challenges in a person's life, such as financial struggles, loss of basic necessities, or severe stress. It is a serious deprivation or a difficult condition to bear, beyond mere inconvenience or minor discomfort, and its presence or absence often has legal and personal implications

SPOT ZONING

3. This ordinance is unacceptable Spot Zoning

This is the unjustifiable singling out of a piece of property for preferential treatment. It is a judicial term signifying legal invalidity. It is zoning a relatively small area differently from the surrounding area, usually for an incompatible use and often to favor the owner of a particular piece or pieces of property. According to this very ordinance “Spot zoning is not allowed in Spring City as it smacks of favoritism and usually annoys neighbors.”

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

4. There is a complete failure to disclose Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest is defined by state law (Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 16a) and prohibits public officials from engaging in business with or being involved in transactions where their private interests could create a conflict, unless those interests are fully disclosed. Public officials must file a sworn statement with the county clerk, which is then posted to the county's website, to detail the nature and extent of any private business interest that might create a conflict.

Officials are barred from engaging with private businesses that are regulated

Officials cannot be involved in any transaction where their private business interests could conflict with their official duties

Any actual or potential conflict of interest must be fully disclosed.

Elected officers are required to file a sworn statement detailing their conflict of interest.

The disclosure statements must be entered into the meeting minutes and remain posted for public access.

Total Cost Benefit Analysis - Spring City, Utah: Moving from 1.06 Acres to 0.50 Acres

Metric	Value
Total one-time benefits (\$)	\$2,125,000
Total one-time costs (\$)	-\$9,340,000
Net one-time impact (benefits - costs) (\$)	-\$7,215,000

Total annual costs (\$/yr)	-\$607,500
Total annual benefits (\$/yr)	\$128,340
Net annual impact (benefits - costs) (\$/yr)	-\$479,160

Potential Annual Historic Designation Loss Impact -\$48,750

Lot Size Premium (1 acre vs. 1/2 acre Estimated Premium) 25% to 30% Estimate provided by National Real Estate Association

Included in analysis but not on Summary Sheet:

Benefit and Cost Assumptions
 Calculations
 One-time Costs
 Annual Costs
 Potential Historic Impact
 One-time Benefits
 Annual Benefits

500 EAST

950 NORTH

700 NORTH

200 NORTH

CENTER

300 SOUTH

50050574

SEC. 29 T103 R4E
SEC. 32 T103 R4E

SEC. 28 T15S R4E
SEC. 33 T15S R4E

[illegible]

NOTES

U.S.T.C.
approval
Date:

PLAT DEPARTMENT

SANPETE COUNTY, UTAH

CRAIG PAULSEN'S PROPOSED COMPROMISE
PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE TO PROTECT
THE 1 ACRE BUFFER ZONE
PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE AS PER 2025-05 DRAFT

Craig Paulsen's (Zoning Administrator) comments on proposed Spring City Ordinance
2025-3 and 2025-05 changes for the public hearing October 1, 2025

GENERAL PLAN COMMENTS--It is required by State Code 10-9a-401(1) that Spring City adopt a comprehensive General Plan. The town survey in the 2024 General Plan that was legally adopted by the City Council showed that 76% of the answered surveys were in favor of 1.06 acre lots and open space as important to Spring City. This shows a simple fact that we want to keep Spring City as a great place in which to live. 1.06 ACRE LOTS ARE KEY TO MAINTAINING THE PIONEER VILLAGE CHARACTER OF SPRING CITY. As one of the founders of the Friends of Historic Spring City in 1980, that has been my goal. I'm in favor of keeping 1.06 acre lots with some possible consideration for limited zoning to be ½ acre. I am very concerned that ½ acre zone around the entire town will lead to the County allowing ½ acre lots in the buffer zone which are presently zoned 1 acre. Changing to a ½ acre buffer zone may allow for large developments which will undoubtedly put a strain on our ability to provide services.

ORDINANCE 2025-05--PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE—Title 10-1-3 Definitions establishes a Protected Historic Zone that I disagree with as stated above but also does not agree with the 2021 National Register of Historic Places boundary update. Attached is my suggested boundary update for the Protected Historic District. This protects a 1 acre buffer zone. Under the same definitions section, I think that Subdivisions should remain 1.06 acre.

LOT SIZE REQUIREMENTS—10-6A-4—I believe that ½ acre lots need to be 23,080 s.f. not 21,780 s.f.

PERMITTED USES- 10-6D-2-- No Multi Family dwellings should be permitted in the Protected Historic Zone. Also eliminate the last sentence in paragraph 4 that states that dwellings within a R-3 or R-MF zone will not be counted as single family homes for this calculation. I believe they should be counted as part of the calculation.

LOT & DWELLING SIZE REQUIREMENTS--10-6D-4—1/2 acre lot sizes should be 23,080 s.f. by definition.

I'm opposed to Ordinance draft 2025-03

I appreciate the opportunity to have my thoughts included in the decision for this major ordinance change for Spring City.



Craig Paulsen
Zoning Administrator

Proposed: Protected Historic Zone



CRAIG PAULSEN'S PROPOSED COMPROMISE
PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE TO PROTECT
THE 1 ACRE BUFFER ZONE

THE 1 ACRE BUFFER ZONE
PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE TO PROTECT
CIVIL RIGHTS: PROTECTED COMMUNITIES



October 1, 2025

Dear Spring City Council Members,

I am writing in objection to the proposed "Protected Historic Zone" on most or part of Spring City. This proposal is packaged as a compromise because it would allow a few people on the outskirts of Spring City to subdivide to 0.5 acre lots while restricting that freedom to the rest. Please don't compromise by giving only increased freedom to some. Our city needs to allow homeowners to revitalize all the poorly kept up back lots in the city. Even worse, the proposed Protected Historic Zone will use the "historic" designation to impose permanent new limitations on homeowners and landowners in this area.

Every year homeowners in Spring City get older and have a harder time keeping up with all the land imposed by the 1.06 acre minimum lot size. Land that is well taken care of is what makes a place beautiful, not open spaces filled with weeds and/or old vehicles. The historic district of Spring City has some of the smallest lot sizes, but their look and feel defines the town despite their small size. Some people in town would like the same freedom by subdividing and selling their land to others or giving children and grandchildren the chance to build. Don't compromise that away. I think a new minimum lot size of 0.5 acres would revitalize the poorly cared for areas of the town and allow more family-friendly lots in town.

The Protected Historic Zone is much more concerning. This year my dad submitted plans to tear down and rebuild a small house in Spring City. Although of old age, the house was not fit to preserve due to a sagging foundation, stick-framed walls insulated with adobe, termite problems and a host of other issues. It was best torn down and rebuilt. Some homes have real historic value, but not everything from the past is worth keeping and restoring. Our project was delayed and almost stymied by restrictions against new construction. I can only imagine how much more difficult it would have been to get approval to tear down an old building within a "Protected Historic Zone."

The title of this new zone can only mean new rules about changing existing properties and on the look and feel of new homes. More regulations always result in fewer new homes and buildings. I fear that is precisely what many in and around town want and are using the Historical designation to conceal their real intent. Let's not naively assume that there will be no more future restrictions from this new zoning framework. There surely will be, and it will only tread further on the property rights of home and land owners who are the real ones working and living to make Spring City beautiful and attractive. Let's encourage these qualities with equally applied rules for small acre lots and keep the city growing in a stable, healthy way.

Sincerely,

Andrew Skousen, Resident of Spring City

TO: Comments for Mayor and City Council re October 1st meeting 2025

Although I do not feel that comments will be read and absorbed I feel I should make the following comments anyway. They are somewhat general regarding the status of the town.

1. Any changes to the Historic District will eventually lead to the loss of this District!
2. Poorly managed growth is worse than no growth at all!
3. Many currently needed actions are not always completed – cemetery maintenance, tree trimming, road maintenance, snow removal. Are we so involved in controversy that we stop doing what needs to be done on a daily basis?
4. Owners of historic properties not in your proposed Historic District are being discriminated against.
5. As far as the .5 ac. Change I can see many problems with that size because of the places in town that are already smaller – how about no parking area to speak of, increased people problems, fire protection, barking dogs, noise pollution, lost animal rights, set back issues, etc etc etc. And then there are issues with Speeding downtown that will be more dangerous by adding old and young bikers to the mix. This issue needs current action!! Also we need instructions on who can do what and where along the bike path!

In short, why do you want to create more problems instead of dealing with what you can't do ^{now}?
~~now by~~ Complicated requirements, ~~and so on?~~ will just make your lives harder, not
To mention everyone elses!

I hope somebody reads this at some point so I don't feel like my time was wasted!



A long time resident of the town

P.S. Leave the 1.06 Acreage
as it is!

Listen to the voice of the
citizens!!