Cami:

I am a ten year resident of Spring City who is in favor of the 1.06 acre lots. The reason is because I want the pioneer settlement to stay traditional and historic. There aren't many more towns in Utah that still have the original pioneer layout. If someone wants to live in Sanpete but doesn't want the historic layout they can find the subdivisions and smaller lots in neighboring cities. Our towns are close enough that the next one down is a matter of being a few minutes away. Spring City is on the Historic National Registry and needs to be protected for the enjoyment and education of future generations.

That being said, I would be for some kind of "grandfather" type clause in our laws that says on the one acre lot a family may also build a small home for a child or grandchild to live in. Or a mother-in-law type home that is part of the property. This would all be owned and sold as part of the 1.06 acre lot. But I am not for splitting the 1.06 acre lot into two half acre lots where the other side is sold for profit and anyone can build and live there.

Sincerely,
Christi J. McGriff
287 South 100 East
Spring City, Utah

Greetings,

My family has owned the home located at 93 N 100 E ever since it was built in 1883. I support the proposal amending Title 10 Zoning Regulations and encourage elected officials to preserve the unique and historic character of Spring City that has been enjoyed for generations. Thanks for accepting these comments by email as I was unable to attend the public hearing.

Sincerely,

Brent W. Jensen

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing to voice our thoughts on the revision of the 2025-05 ordinance. Please vote in favor of the amendment, which would return the standard lot size to 1.06 acres. In our opinion the old one never should have been passed. The majority of our citizens have made it abundantly clear that we wish to keep our beautiful tiny town as it is. To see how much of the former council wished to literally trample under their feet our pioneer heritage for monetary gain was heartbreaking. What we have here must be cherished & PRESERVED.

Which also means that we fully support any measure which would prevent condensed living construction- except in designated multi-family zones.

Every bit of this is FOR THE RECORD.
Thank you for your attention in these matters.

Sincerely,
Barry & Wendy Bowthorpe
526 East 900 North
Spring City, Utah

From: Laurel Workman laurelworkman@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: 2/24/26 Public Hearing Statement.
Date: Feb 24, 2026 at 1:56:06 PM
To: ednapup2@aim.com

Thank you for your response concerning this important issue! I will also see that this gets to the planning and zoning committee before they vote tomorrow.

Laurel

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 24, 2026, at 10:10 AM, ednapup2@aim.com wrote:

February 24, 2026

I Pamela Dee Haring and For the Record, want to thank the city

council for this new ordinance to amend Title 10 Zoning Regulations that will restore the minimum lot size throughout Spring City back to 1.06 acres,

and put in place other codes that will once more protect Spring City from Over-development.

This ordinance will also help with the Historical achievement that has been a big part of what Spring City is.

As well as having a nicer place to live, instead of crowding as many people in as possible.

Also water, police, wear and tear of roads etc. will be eased up with people not having to be living on top of each other.

Thank you for reading my letter. I love living here, and would really like to see it grow slowly, and with dignity, and not lose it's Historical charm.

Sincerely Pamela Dee Haring

Bruce Spiegel
257 N Main and 265 N Main
POB 502
Spring City, UT 84662
FOR THE RECORD

I am in favor of Ordinance 2026-02. Ordinance 2026-02 corrects the failure of Ordinance 2025-05 which threatens the rich historic character and economic sustainability of Spring City. Ordinance 2025-05 addressed individual property rights but failed to address the community right.
Approve Ordinance 2026-02. After the public has had meaningful opportunity for public input, update the General Plan, and use the General plan to guide Planning and Zoning, and assist the Council in its administrative and legislative role.

Signed Bruce Spiegel 801 201 2712

Mayor and Council Members,

My name is James Baker, and I am contacting you in support of Ordinance 2026-02.

This ordinance is not about stopping progress. It is about making sure progress happens thoughtfully, transparently, and with the full voice of the community.

Ordinance 2025-05 was adopted in a rushed manner. Many of our citizens expressed that a new fully comprehensive General Plan for Spring City should be created prior to major zoning changes moving forward to have a clear, community-supported vision. Many residents felt there was insufficient public input and that concerns were not adequately addressed. When decisions shape the future of our town for generations, the process matters just as much as the outcome.

Spring City is not just another small town. It is one of the most intact examples of a 19th-century Mormon village in the American West. Our National Historic District designation is a tremendous asset. It reflects careful town planning, agricultural roots, craftsmanship in oolite stone, and a community identity that is increasingly rare.

Once historic character is compromised, it cannot be restored. Preservation is not anti-growth. It is smart growth. It protects property values, strengthens tourism, and maintains the very qualities that attract people here in the first place.

At the same time, we must serve the next generation. Many families are moving away from suburban bedroom communities. They are looking for space, self-sufficiency, and meaningful community connection. Spring City can model a balanced alternative — a place where preservation, small-scale agriculture, thoughtful development, and economic vitality coexist.

Ordinance 2026-02 gives us the opportunity to reset the process. It allows us to pause, engage the public fully, and develop an updated comprehensive General Plan that addresses:

- Water preservation and long-term resource management.
- Economic development and sustainable revenue sources.
- Transportation and future corridors.
- Zoning clarity, including multi-family considerations and buffer protections.
- Identification and preservation of historic structures.

This is not about division. It is about stewardship.

We are temporary caretakers of a legacy that began long before us and should continue long after us. Supporting Ordinance 2026-02 demonstrates that we value both our history and our future — and that we believe the citizens of Spring City deserve a meaningful voice in shaping both.

I respectfully ask you to support Ordinance 2026-02.

Thank you.

James Baker
12 w 200 n
Box 502
Spring City, UT 84662

Spring City Resident and Business Owner
Spring City Planning and Zoning Historic Preservation Sub-Committee Chairman
Friends of Historic Spring City Board Member
Spring City Main Street Executive Director
FOR THE RECORD

Dear Laurel,

I'm unable to attend tomorrow night's meeting, but I want to express my support for Ordinance 2026-03. I believe major zoning decisions in Spring City should follow a fully developed General Plan and meaningful public input and I believe this ordinance is a good step in the right direction.

Please consider my voice and the input of other community members as you move forward on this matter.

--

see you in the mud.

--

Preston Arnoldsen

Owner - General Contractor

P: 801-502-7992

O: 801-807-9155

rawhideconst.com

RAWHIDE

CONCRETE & CONSTRUCTION

Tuesday 2/24/2026

FOR THE RECORD

Dear Spring City Governing Officials,

I'm unable to attend the public hearing tonight, but I'd like to register my position. I very much support the idea of reversing the 2025 ordinance and replacing with the 2026 ordinance! Thank you for working hard to put this option on the table.

Here are some of my related thoughts.

1. I would love to slow things down enough to get genuine public input and problem-solving. I think we have enough ingenuity amongst us all to keep finding solutions that work better for most people.

2. The 1 acre lots, in my opinion, have facilitated a special community of interdependency, service, security, and a fuller exercise of personal rights compared to everywhere else I have lived. I champion preserving the layout as much as possible, as I believe the originators of the concept foresaw these advantages.

I know many other ideas are coming to the table. Thank you for considering them!

Sincerely,

Susan S. Tullis

RuthAnn McCain

From: ednapup2@aim.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 8:25 PM
To: RuthAnn McCain
Subject: 2/24/26 Public Hearing Statement.

February 24, 2026

I Pamela Dee Haring and For the Record, want to thank the city

council for this new ordinance to amend Title 10 Zoning Regulations that will restore the minimum lot size throughout Spring City back to 1.06 acres,

and put in place other codes that will once more protect Spring City from Over-development.

This ordinance will also help with the Historical achievement that has been a big part of what Spring City is.

As well as having a nicer place to live, instead of crowding as many people in as possible.

Also water, police, wear and tear of roads etc. will be eased up with people not having to be living on top of each other.

Thank you for reading my letter. I love living here, and would really like to see it grow slowly, and with dignity, and not lose it's Historical charm.

Sincerely Pamela Dee Haring

PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCE 2026-03

2/24/26 @ 6:30

I request that my statement be placed on the public record. My name is Ruth Bergener, and I am deeply grateful to our new Mayor Paul Penrod and our new City Council for serving at this challenging time and for proposing Ordinance 2026-03. I am in full support of it.

In attending City Council and Planning & Zoning Meetings, over time, I've learned a lot. It's clear, and was confirmed again in recent City Council meetings, that we are not prepared for the kind of growth that current Ordinance 2025-05 will bring.

Our City is struggling just to try to maintain the roads and infrastructure that it currently has. We don't *have enough funding to keep up.*

With denser growth comes increased traffic issues, other violations, and crime. At the 2/5/26, City Council Meeting when our already spread-thin-beyond-belief, Police Chief Huff presented his 2025 Annual Report, he stated that, "We need to keep the budget as high as we can to keep it up for what's to come. A one-man police department isn't going to work anymore. We need to get either a second officer or look at contracting, in the near future."

With the ongoing drought and new growth, the fire season also becomes more and more concerning.

At this time, secondary water is also a concern unless we get more snowpack in the mountains.

Growth may start slow, but would eventually lead to overgrowth, resulting in the loss of Spring City's National Historic District Designation.

One-time impact fees go back into infrastructure but can't help with the increasing service and liability costs. As our sister cities have shared in the past, opening the door to more dense development won't bring the revenue needed to cover those rising costs.

These are just a few areas of concern that have been brought up before, but these very valid issues have not gone away.

Growth is important. I support it---if it is carefully planned growth, and Ordinance 2026-03 will allow our City to be able to better prepare for it. It will allow them time to review, clarify and write more specific codes where needed, tighten up and update the General Plan with citizen input, create a Water Master Plan, allow time for more careful review of subdivision, multifamily, and annexation applications, study the code and ensure it is being followed, among other critical things.

This new ordinance will protect Spring City, our resources, our National Historic District designation, our open space, while benefiting our City, our buffer zone and county residents who are part of our Spring City community. It will also keep tourists coming. All of these are vital for our economic development.

Thank you—each one of you, for all that you do to serve Spring City. **FOR THE RECORD.**

Ruth Bergener

David V. McEwan public hearing response to Spring City Ordinance 2026-03

I wish to express my appreciation to Mayor Penrod, the new City Council and Planning and Zoning for this opportunity to express a few thoughts regarding this ordinance.

I've lived in Spring City for a little over 5 years and have been attending both City Council and Planning and Zoning meetings for the last 3 or so years of that time. During that time the City has had numerous debates and hearings over two basic issues, multi-family housing and changing the minimum lot size to half acre lots. In all cases, the majority of the citizens have expressed the desire to keep the minimum lot size to 1.06 acres in an effort to keep Spring City a small historic town that can be a haven to people who want a small town feel while having a large amount of property to use as they see fit. The majority also opposed increased multi-family buildings within City boundaries. In all cases, the previous administration passed ordinances that went against the will of the majority of the citizens, opening the door to eventual uncontrolled overgrowth.

This past election spoke volumes as to the will of the majority of the citizens, and that the new administration has the ability and the responsibility to listen to the deafening silence that the election made so definite.

Thank you for proposing Ordinance 2026-03 to restore the minimum lot size to 1.06 acres, limiting the density of multi-family housing allowed on 1.06 acre lots, maintaining controlled growth and give the City more time to prepare for future growth, while meeting the needs and desires of the majority of its current residents. I fully accept that growth is necessary and inevitable, but needs to be controlled in a responsible manner.

David V. McEwan

For The Record

10-1-3

APARTMENT: Any single-family dwelling or any apartment style single-family residence separate from or attached to a commercial building which is used as rental property.

SUBDIVISION: Any plot or parcel of land which is divided into two (2) or more plots or parcels of land having no less than 1.06 acres per parcel. in the case of land within the Protected Historic Zone and no less than 0.5 acres per parcel in the case of land outside the Protected Historic Zone Lots containing less than the required minimum acreage, unless grandfathered, are unbuildable.

PROTECTED HISTORIC ZONE: That area within the city limits that is located within an area description as follows:

Starting at the corner of 600 North and 400 East, thence South along 400 East to the corner of 400 East and 500 South, thence West along 500 South to Main Street, thence North along Main Street to 400 South, thence West on 400 South to 150 West, thence North along 150 West to 400 North, thence East along 400 North to 50 West, thence North along 50 West to 600 North, thence East along 600 North to point of beginning.

No new R-3 or R-MF Zones are allowed in the Protected Historic Zone. The minimal buildable lot size will be 1.06 acres in this zone unless previously split and grandfathered.

VOID FOR VAGUENESS: Courts will invalidate a regulation that is so unclear or ambiguous that a person of normal intelligence will not be able to comprehend what the regulation forbids or permits.

Because zoning ordinances are in derogation of a property owner's common-law right to unrestricted use of his or her property, provision therein restricting property uses should be strictly construed and provisions permitting property use should be liberally construed in favor of the property owner. Patterson vs. Utah Co. Board of Adjustment, April 1995. (Ord. 2007-01, 2-1-2007, eff. 2-21-2007)

Clarifications/conformation

1. Is the RMF zone considered commercial
2. Three townhomes/guest houses on .75 of an acre 10-6D-2
3. No definition / clarification for Structure, Unit or townhomes
4. 10-6A-4 ADU /Guesthouse, Connection to city services provide revenue to city. No services questions the P&Z purpose and intent 10-1-2

Spring City Planning and Zoning Commission

Statement by Lowell C. Brown

February 24, 2026

There's another benefit to the City. Passing ordinance 2026-03 would help restore Spring City's confidence in this City Council. There is a widespread feeling among the public that in passing 2025-05, the former City Council was not listening to them.

With all due respect, this feeling is quite reasonable. Consider:

1. **Hostility**. In 2025 many citizens felt that they received a hostile response when they spoke to the Council during public comment. **Personal attacks** on individuals were allowed during public comment. This is simply wrong, and in once case was disgraceful. Such public discourse intimidates the public and violates First Amendment rights.

2. **Unresponsiveness.** In July 2025, a former City Council member and a current member of the Planning and Zoning Commission teamed up in a letter to the City Council suggesting that the Council simply put 2025-03 on the ballot in the November election. Their letter stated how Utah allowed the Council to do this. They said a public vote would give the townspeople a voice. As far as I know, there was never any response to that letter. This reinforced the impression that the Council did not care about the public's wishes.

3. **Legislative Maneuvers.** Just weeks before the November election, the City Council had already passed 2025-05. In October, on one day's notice, the Council made a minor amendment to 2025-05. Previously, that ordinance had passed with a four to one vote. This time the Council voted unanimously to pass the slightly amended statute. The new unanimous cancelled the public's right to bring a referendum. This result was based on a little-known seven-word amendment to Utah law that took effect just five months before the Council voted. The Council's tactic was deeply disappointing and frustrating to the public. It was widely seen as an effort to prevent the public from having a voice on the ordinance.

   This time, by listening, this City Council can restore the public's confidence in good, responsive government.

For the Record

To, Spring City Council and Planning and Zoning

I / We Kelly & Marjorie Anderson residing at

674 E 500 N Apartment # 7B

Are in favor of buildable lots within spring city of .5 (1/2) acer or less.

Date 2/24/2026

Date 2/24/2026

To, Spring City Council and Planning and Zoning

I / We JADE BUTTE / Jadree Butte residing at

674 E 500 N, SPRING CITY Apartment # 5B

Are in favor of buildable lots within spring city of .5 (1/2) acer or less.

Date 2/24/26

Date 2.24.26

To, Spring City Council and Planning and Zoning

I / We Megan Cochran Dustin Carter residing at 624 E 500 N Spring City Apartment # 1 A

Are in favor of buildable lots within spring city of .5 (1/2) acer or less.

Dustin Carter Date 2-24-26

Megan Cochran Date 2/24/26

To, Spring City Council and Planning and Zoning

I / We BROCK CHRISTENSEN Saylor Ford residing at

624 E 500 N Apartment # 4B

Are in favor of buildable lots within spring city of .5 (1/2) acer or less.

Date 2-24-26

Date 2-24-26

To, Spring City Council and Planning and Zoning

I/We Krista Jenkins and Tyrell Hammon residing at 500N 624E Apartment # 2B

Are in favor of buildable lots within spring city of .5 (1/2) acer or less.

Krista Jenkins Date 2/24/2026

Tyrell Hammon Date 2/24/2026

My name is HANS, I am a property owner in spring city and I am expressing my support for protecting property owner rights, including the ability to subdivide lots down to one-half acre.

At its core, property ownership is about having reasonable freedom to use your land in a way that benefits your family, while still respecting your neighbors and the community. Allowing lot splits down to half an acre strikes a fair balance. It preserves neighborhood character while giving landowners flexibility.

Half-acre lots are not high-density development. They still provide open space, privacy, room for septic where needed, and a rural or semi-rural feel. At the same time, they create opportunities for families to build homes, for aging parents to live nearby, or for property owners to responsibly increase the value and usability of their land.

We often talk about housing availability and affordability. Sensible lot size flexibility is one practical way to increase housing options without dramatically changing the look or feel of a community.

I respectfully ask the planing and zoning commission and the city council to consider policies that trust property owners and allows reasonable lot splits with half-acre lots as the minimum for Spring City. With appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards in place, this can be done responsibly and thoughtfully.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Hans Rasmussen

My name is Neil Sorensen, I am a property owner in spring city and I am expressing my support for protecting property owner rights, including the ability to subdivide lots down to one-half acre.

At its core, property ownership is about having reasonable freedom to use your land in a way that benefits your family, while still respecting your neighbors and the community. Allowing lot splits down to half an acre strikes a fair balance. It preserves neighborhood character while giving landowners flexibility.

Half-acre lots are not high-density development. They still provide open space, privacy, room for septic where needed, and a rural or semi-rural feel. At the same time, they create opportunities for families to build homes, for aging parents to live nearby, or for property owners to responsibly increase the value and usability of their land.

We often talk about housing availability and affordability. Sensible lot size flexibility is one practical way to increase housing options without dramatically changing the look or feel of a community.

I respectfully ask the planing and zoning commission and the city council to consider policies that trust property owners and allows reasonable lot splits with half-acre lots as the minimum for Spring City. With appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards in place, this can be done responsibly and thoughtfully.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Neil Sorensen

My name is Anton Sorensen, I am a property owner in spring city and I am expressing my support for protecting property owner rights, including the ability to subdivide lots down to one-half acre.

At its core, property ownership is about having reasonable freedom to use your land in a way that benefits your family, while still respecting your neighbors and the community. Allowing lot splits down to half an acre strikes a fair balance. It preserves neighborhood character while giving landowners flexibility.

Half-acre lots are not high-density development. They still provide open space, privacy, room for septic where needed, and a rural or semi-rural feel. At the same time, they create opportunities for families to build homes, for aging parents to live nearby, or for property owners to responsibly increase the value and usability of their land.

We often talk about housing availability and affordability. Sensible lot size flexibility is one practical way to increase housing options without dramatically changing the look or feel of a community.

I respectfully ask the planing and zoning commission and the city council to consider policies that trust property owners and allows reasonable lot splits with half-acre lots as the minimum for Spring City. With appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards in place, this can be done responsibly and thoughtfully.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

2/24/26

My name is MARK Sorensen, I am a property owner in spring city and I am expressing my support for protecting property owner rights, including the ability to subdivide lots down to one-half acre.

At its core, property ownership is about having reasonable freedom to use your land in a way that benefits your family, while still respecting your neighbors and the community. Allowing lot splits down to half an acre strikes a fair balance. It preserves neighborhood character while giving landowners flexibility.

Half-acre lots are not high-density development. They still provide open space, privacy, room for septic where needed, and a rural or semi-rural feel. At the same time, they create opportunities for families to build homes, for aging parents to live nearby, or for property owners to responsibly increase the value and usability of their land.

We often talk about housing availability and affordability. Sensible lot size flexibility is one practical way to increase housing options without dramatically changing the look or feel of a community.

I respectfully ask the planing and zoning commission and the city council to consider policies that trust property owners and allows reasonable lot splits with half-acre lots as the minimum for Spring City. With appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards in place, this can be done responsibly and thoughtfully.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Mark Sorensen

My name is _____, I am a property owner in spring city and I am expressing my support for protecting property owner rights, including the ability to subdivide lots down to one-half acre.

At its core, property ownership is about having reasonable freedom to use your land in a way that benefits your family, while still respecting your neighbors and the community. Allowing lot splits down to half an acre strikes a fair balance. It preserves neighborhood character while giving landowners flexibility.

Half-acre lots are not high-density development. They still provide open space, privacy, room for septic where needed, and a rural or semi-rural feel. At the same time, they create opportunities for families to build homes, for aging parents to live nearby, or for property owners to responsibly increase the value and usability of their land.

We often talk about housing availability and affordability. Sensible lot size flexibility is one practical way to increase housing options without dramatically changing the look or feel of a community.

I respectfully ask the planing and zoning commission and the city council to consider policies that trust property owners and allows reasonable lot splits with half-acre lots as the minimum for Spring City. With appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards in place, this can be done responsibly and thoughtfully.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Warren J. Stehman

Public Comments Letter to the Planning and Zoning Committee

My name is Tony Rudman. I am a resident of Spring City. I spoke in front of the Planning and Zoning Committee last year in opposition to the passing of Ordinance 2025-05. The arguments I presented at that time are mostly the same that I am stating tonight in writing, since I cannot attend in person.

Spring City is a special place. My wife and I moved here with the knowledge that the entire town is on the National Historic Registry, and that the minimum lot size within the Spring City boundaries was 1.06 acres. We presented our arguments then to Planning and Zoning, and following that the Committee voted four to one to not change the zoning to allow more half-acre lots in the city.

Unfortunately, despite that recommendation, the then City Council voted to adopt Ordinance 2025-05 last October, which has now allowed half-acre subdivisions to be created. Not only does this ordinance potentially cause harm to the National Historic District designation, but there has never been a thorough study regarding the potential infrastructure cost to Spring City of allowing more half-acre lots. We repeatedly asked for these projected hard cost data from those City Councilmen pushing this ordinance, but none was ever offered.

In fact, the only cost analysis which was ever provided was done by the citizenry opposing the ordinance. This analysis demonstrated that it could cost as much as $4 million to develop the infrastructure necessary for the half acre lots which would be allowed under the ordinance. Moreover, there's never been an official study regarding the current infrastructure for water, power, sewer or electrical for the development of additional half-acre home sites.

Elections have consequences. Certainly the one held last November did. All of the candidates who were elected were the ones who vowed that they would work to keep the 1.06 acre lot requirement. The candidates who came out in support of changing the minimum lot size to half acres were defeated in the election. It turned out that 75% of the voters voted for candidates who favored 1.06 acre lots. Again, elections have consequences and the consequences for our recent one should be the reinstatement of 1.06-acre lots.

We love Spring City. We love the people of Spring City. We love the atmosphere that is so much different than any other city. We strongly encourage the Planning and Zoning Committee to again vote as it has done every time it has faced this issue — to maintain 1.06 acre lots within the city boundaries.

I thank you for your time.

Tony Rudman

Mayor and Council Members,
My name is James Baker, and I am contacting you in support of Ordinance 2026-02.
This ordinance is not about stopping progress. It is about making sure progress happens thoughtfully, transparently, and with the full voice of the community.
Ordinance 2025-05 was adopted in a rushed manner. Many of our citizens expressed that a new fully comprehensive General Plan for Spring City should be created prior to major zoning changes moving forward to have a clear, community-supported vision. Many residents felt there was insufficient public input and that concerns were not adequately addressed. When decisions shape the future of our town for generations, the process matters just as much as the outcome.
Spring City is not just another small town. It is one of the most intact examples of a 19th-century Mormon village in the American West. Our National Historic District designation is a tremendous asset. It reflects careful town planning, agricultural roots, craftsmanship in oolite stone, and a community identity that is increasingly rare.
Once historic character is compromised, it cannot be restored. Preservation is not anti-growth. It is smart growth. It protects property values, strengthens tourism, and maintains the very qualities that attract people here in the first place.
At the same time, we must serve the next generation. Many families are moving away from suburban bedroom communities. They are looking for space, self-sufficiency, and meaningful community connection. Spring City can model a balanced alternative — a place where preservation, small-scale agriculture, thoughtful development, and economic vitality coexist.
Ordinance 2026-02 gives us the opportunity to reset the process. It allows us to pause, engage the public fully, and develop an updated comprehensive General Plan that addresses:

- Water preservation and long-term resource management.
- Economic development and sustainable revenue sources.
- Transportation and future corridors.
- Zoning clarity, including multi-family considerations and buffer protections.
- Identification and preservation of historic structures.

This is not about division. It is about stewardship.
We are temporary caretakers of a legacy that began long before us and should continue long after us. Supporting Ordinance 2026-02 demonstrates that we value both our history and our future — and that we believe the citizens of Spring City deserve a meaningful voice in shaping both.
I respectfully ask you to support Ordinance 2026-02.
Thank you.
James Baker
12 w 200 n
Box 502
Spring City, UT 84662

Spring City Resident and Business Owner
Spring City Planning and Zoning Historic Preservation Sub-Committee Chairman
Friends of Historic Spring City Board Member
Spring City Main Street Executive Director
FOR THE RECORD

Greetings,
My family has owned the home located at 93 N 100 E ever since it was built in 1883. I support the proposal amending Title 10 Zoning Regulations and encourage elected officials to preserve the unique and historic character of Spring City that has been enjoyed for generations. Thanks for accepting these comments by email as I was unable to attend the public hearing.
Sincerely,
Brent W. Jensen

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing to voice our thoughts on the revision of the 2025-05 ordinance. **Please vote in favor of the amendment, which would return the standard lot size to 1.06 acres.** In our opinion the old one never should have been passed. The majority of our citizens have made it abundantly clear that we wish to keep our beautiful tiny town as it is. To see how much of the former council wished to literally trample under their feet our pioneer heritage for monetary gain was heartbreaking. What we have here must be cherished & PRESERVED.

Which also means that we fully support any measure which would prevent condensed living construction- except in designated multi-family zones.

Every bit of this is FOR THE RECORD.
Thank you for your attention in these matters.

Sincerely,
Barry & Wendy Bowthorpe
526 East 900 North
Spring City, Utah

Talking Points Related to Lot Size

Lot size historical points

1. In 1980 when the Spring City historic district designation was initiated, there were 261 homes.
   A. 135 (52%) of them were built on less than 1.06 acre lots. The average size of these lots is .51acre in size. (Sanpete County Records)
2. In 1994 when the 1.06-acre minimum buildable lot size ordinance was enacted there were 293 homes.
   A. 153 (52%) of them were built on less than 1.06 acre lots. The average size of these lots was still .51acre in size. (Sanpete County Records)
3. The main street historical district (half block either side of main street) has:
   A. 42 lots which are less than 1.06 acres with average size of .48 acres.
   B. 15 lots at 1.06 acre
   *These numbers do not include city, church, business lots on main street.
4. All blocks on either side of main have 97 smaller lots and 32 1.06 acre lots.
5. All blocks between 100 E and 300 E have 63 smaller lots and 53 1.06 acre lots.
6. Items 1-5 above illustrate that as the city grew many lots were split to meet lot owners desired lot size with no adverse effect to the city.
7. The Spring City National Historical District 2022 amended nomination asserts that the majority of the 110 city blocks remain undivided and remain intact with 4 lots per block, this assertion is incorrect per Sanpete County Records, as:
   A. Only 38 residential blocks remain with 4 lots per block.
   B. 57 blocks have had one or more lot splits, with the majority of these with multiple splits.
8. Spring City's published historical sites tour includes mostly buildings on small lots. Tour summary:
   A. 18 homes, average lot size of .48 acres.
   B. 10 homes lot size of 1.06 acres.
   C. 12 other buildings (government, church, businesses).
9. ½ acre as the minimum buildable lot size would still be the largest minimum buildable lot size within cities in Sanpete County.
10. Minimum buildable lot size history:
    A. Prior to 1979 no restriction on lot size
    B. 1979-1986 1/3 acre minimum
    C. 1987-1993 1/2 acre minimum
    D. 1994-2025 1.06 acre minimum

Other relevant points related to lot size

1. Common law property rights should allow property owners to choose the size of lots they wish to build a home on, ½ acre is a reasonable minimum ordinance restriction for Spring City.
2. Smaller lots in general are easier and cheaper to maintain; this enhances well maintained neighborhoods.
3. The majority of the 1.06 lots with homes already on them could not be split, and still buildable, due to current home and other building would not accommodate set-back rule requirements for split lots.
4. Common law property rights are a principal right that should be honored in allowing individuals to choose what lot size best fits their needs. Land use ordinances should only be instituted to promote health, safety and wellbeing (per Utah Municipal Code). Forcing 1.06 lots on everyone is an unreasonable restriction to be mandated by city ordinance.
5. Most of the homes built in the last 40 years do not conform to the "morman plat" layout that the historic district asserts as prevalent in the city, therefore this is not a relevant assertion to justify forcing 1.06 lots on everyone.
6. Judicial cases have made it clear that "zoning ordinances are in derogation of a property owner's common-law right to unrestricted use of his or her property, provisions within ordinances restricting property uses

should be strictly construed, and provisions permitting property uses should be liberally construed in favor of the property owner".

7. The rights of individuals to have larger lots that align with their needs and desires should be honored and respected, however individuals who desire smaller lots to meet their desires and needs should be respected as well.

Financial considerations talking points

1. For 1.06 acre lots that could potentially be split into 2 lots has the potential financial benefits in the following ways:
    A. In situations where lots could be split gives individuals the option of realizing the financial benefit in the equity of their property.
    B. City tax revenue generated from property taxes is most significantly influenced by a home on the property, so 2 homes versus 1 home would be added tax revenue to the city.
    C. The cost of utility connections is borne by the owner/developer requesting a new connection, so no financial burden is incurred to the city by allowing more lots.
    D. More connections allows the city additional utility income that then spreads its operation and maintenance cost out. This would help in keeping utility rates from needing to be increased by rising costs.
    E. Impact fees paid for utility connections help pay down the city's expansion project bonds which will lower the financial burden of current residents.

Infrastructure facts

1. Wastewater impact fee analysis completed by sunrise engineering shows that post current expansion project there will be an estimated 1039 additional available connections.
2. Culinary impact fee analysis completed by sunrise engineering shows that post current expansion project there will be an estimated 580 additional available connections as result of infrastructure capacity.
    A. There is not an endless availability of water, however there is availability of additional water resources that can be developed by the city as growth warrants the additional needs.
    B. Additional water resources are available to the city if and when needed. The city does have the option, and authorized by Utah Municipal Code title 10-20-911, to enter into a water exaction process with Horseshoe Irrigation Company to acquire additional water rights for city culinary expansion needs.
3. Water available and delivered by Spring City for culinary use can in no way be compared to the secondary water available and delivered by Horseshoe Irrigation Company. The city's culinary water availability, distribution, infrastructure and use is not subject to, nor contingent upon, Horseshoe Irrigation Company's water. Examples of usage:
    A. City's Culinary water peak usage in July 2024 was approximately 220,000 gallons per day.
    B. Horseshoe Irrigation peak usage in June 2024 was approximately 76,600,000 gallons per day.
    C. City's Culinary water low usage in January 2024 was approximately 137,000 gallons per day.
    D. Horseshoe Irrigation low usage in September 2024 was approximately 3,240,000 gallons per day.
    E. The City's 5 spring and 3 wells have a combined nominal flow of approximately 568,800 gallons per day (city on average is using about half of its available water sources).