

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Attendees: Planning Commission Chairman Cody Harmer, Board Members: Claudia Jarrett, Gene Jacobson, Jo-Ann Riley and Dallin Carter. Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorensen Sanpete County Building Official Scott Olsen and Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Heather Pyper. Also in attendance is Sanpete County Commissioner Mike Bennett. Board Members Justin Atkinson and Reed Hatch as well as Sanpete County Recorder Talisha Johnson have joined via ZOOM.

Planning Commission Chairman Cody Harmer calls meeting to order.

## **Approval of the Agenda**

A motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the agenda.

Jo-Anne Riley seconds the motion. All in favor, none opposed and the motion passes. Vote by voice: Cody Harmer aye; Gene Jacobson, aye; Claudia Jarrett, aye; Jo-Ann Riley aye; Dallin Carter, aye; Reed Hatch, yes.

## **Welcoming and swearing in of Planning Commission members Gene Jacobson and Dallin Carter.**

Mr. Harmer welcomes members Gene Jacobson and Dallin Carter. Ms. Pyper swears in both new members. They affirmed to support the U.S. Constitution, the Constitution of the State of Utah, and to faithfully discharge their duties.

## **Discussion and possible approval of a Petition filed by Jared Shelley to amend the plat of the Selena Subdivision. The affected property is located southeast of Fairview in the RA-1 Zone. The amendment would change the parcel size from 3.29 acres to 2.94 acres. Parcel # S-21959.**

Larry Seely is present. Ms. Sorensen introduced the item, noting that the amendment was necessary before the applicant could proceed with a proposed adjacent subdivision. Ms. Sorensen explained that the amendment would reduce the parcel size from 3.29 acres to 2.94 acres, effectively removing a strip of land that was planned for the new subdivision. She clarified that there was already a home on the existing lot, all utilities were in place, and the

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

amendment would simply adjust the lot boundaries without vacating or otherwise impacting existing infrastructure. Ms. Jarrett detailed that the change primarily involved a right-of-way area, which would go to the new subdivision that is going to be proposed. Mr. Seely further explained that a survey revealed slight discrepancies in property lines compared to the original 1979 survey by Ray Nielsen and prior records. This discrepancy affected water risers and infrastructure locations by about thirty feet, prompting a cost of \$3,750 to correct the subdivision plan accurately. Mr. Hatch clarifies that, the small strip being removed will remain part of the original subdivision until the new subdivision is submitted and approved. Also, the Parcel numbering will remain consistent with the original subdivision for the amended lot, while the new subdivision will receive a new parcel number. Ms. Sorensen states the new subdivision application has already been submitted and is expected to proceed. The board discussed whether approving this amendment before the adjacent subdivision constitutes putting the “cart before the horse.” Mr. Olsen states, the amendment does not vacate the land; it simply adjusts boundaries. He emphasized that the amendment was a straightforward adjustment to align property boundaries with modern surveying, title records, and irrigation infrastructure. Questions arose regarding the relationship between this amendment and the proposed adjacent subdivision. Ms. Sorensen and Mr. Olsen confirmed that the amendment must be completed first to allow the adjacent subdivision application to proceed correctly, including recording and public notification requirements. Mr. Hatch suggest the board could approve now and hold recording until the adjacent subdivision is approved.

The motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the petition file by Jared Shelley to amend the plat of the Selena Subdivision, located southeast of Fairview, in an RA-1 zone. The amendment would change the parcel size from 3.29 acres to 2.94 acres. ***Parcel # S-21959.***

Gene Jacobson seconds the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Ms. Jarrett amends her motion adding that this will not be recorded until such time as the additional subdivision is submitted and approved.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Gene Jacobson seconds the amended motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

**Discussion and possible approval of a Petition filed by Cameron White to amend the plat of the Golden Acres Subdivision. The affected property is located southeast of Fairview in the Agriculture zone. This amendment would add two additional lots to the subdivision. Lot 1 will be 5.50 acres, Lot 2 will be 5.50 acres, Lot 3 will be 5.50 acres and Lot 4 will be 5.72 acres. Parcel #'s S-64585, S-64586, S-22025X & S-22025X1**

This item is incomplete due to missing and unclear signatures .

The motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to table Cameron White to amend the plat of the Golden Acres Subdivision.

Reed Hatch seconds the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Mr. Harmer states to not add this item to the Agenda until it is fully complete.

**Discussion of preliminary subdivision and road requirement directives of the Rockwood Hollow Subdivision. Application by Michelle Miles and Jordan Harmon. Proposed Subdivision is located west of Mt. Pleasant in the Agriculture Zone. Parcel # S-22284 & S-22284X.**

Jordan Harmon and Michelle Miles are present. Ms. Sorensen presents the item. Ms. Sorensen states Michelle Miles submitted an application for a nine-lot subdivision out Summergrass road. Ms. Sorensen states the road to the subdivision is a very well engineered road. Ms. Sorensen states they have water and power. Mr. Olsen states, in the Ordinance it states the road would be improved from the end of County maintained road to the subdivision by the developer. Mr. Jacobson asks if the road is up to the County standards for that type of subdivision. Mr. Olsen states yes, Mr. Seely has okayed it. Ms. Riley asked the distance of the road that needs to be fixed. Mr. Olsen states he believes its three blocks. The applicants expressed significant frustration and emotional fatigue regarding the subdivision process. They explained that despite their best efforts to follow guidance from the former zoning administrator, there had been repeated changes and unclear instructions that led to confusion. The applicant emphasized that they had attempted to maintain communication and act in good faith, following advice as received, even though requirements shifted over time. They

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

noted that their engineer had identified procedural inconsistencies, specifically regarding the timing of preliminary meetings, and had documented these concerns in emails. The applicant stated that, under the former administrator's guidance, they were repeatedly told they could not meet to review preliminary plans before investing significant resources in the project.

Mr. Jacobson acknowledged the applicant's concerns, explaining that major subdivisions, such as the nine-lot development in question, require adherence to county ordinances. Mr. Jacobson reads from the Roadway Design and Construction Manual (revised April 2023). When new roads are proposed to be built by a developer, which serves more than five residences, when you have nine residences, the developer's proposal shall include an analysis of the projected traffic volumes, information on topography, surface drainage and extent of cuts and fields, along with construction plans and specifications. The road design and construction specification shall be reviewed and approved by the Sanpete County Road supervisor in conjunction with the final plat or if no plan is required prior to commencement of construction. Or if no plan is required prior to commencement of construction, if it is deemed necessary or appropriate by the road supervisor or the Board of County Commissioners to refer the review of the road design and construction specifications to an outside consultant. The cost of the review shall be borne by the developer. The total cost of roads required to serve new developments shall be borne by the developer. Mr. Jacobson explains that the last line in the section states that the County does not provide new roads for developers. Mr. Jacobson explains, Off-site improvements, defined as the road segment from the end of the county-maintained road to the subdivision, are separate from on-site improvements within the subdivision and must also meet county standards. Ms. Miles, clarifies that they had completed all on-site improvements within the subdivision, as required, but had not been instructed to engineer or design the off-site portion of the road.

Mr. Jacobson notes that prior staff guidance, while potentially inconsistent, could not override the requirements set forth in county ordinances. The Commission emphasized that the developer is responsible for off-site improvements to ensure compliance with the Roadway Design and Construction Manual, including projected traffic analysis, engineering specifications, and material selection. Discussion then focused on cul-de-sacs and well

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

locations. Mr. Jacobson observed what appeared to be a missing turnaround at one end of the subdivision. Ms. Miles clarified that a turnaround exists and is reflected on the preliminary plat. Mr. Jacobson asks if they are doing a Public Water System as they required if there are seven or more connections. Ms. Miles states the well locations were misaligned in the rendering but all nine wells have been drilled and approved by the Utah Division of Water Rights, providing a total of nine acre-feet of water. Ms. Jarrett addressed road ownership and maintenance. Mr. Hatch clarified that a D-class road is a privately owned public access road, not maintained by the county. Mr. Harmon confirmed that 66-foot easements for road and utility access had been obtained from adjoining property owners. Mr. Harmer recommended establishing an HOA or CCRs to manage ongoing maintenance and snow removal for the off-site road. Mr. Harmon raises concerns regarding the cost of off-site road improvements, estimated at over \$300,000, and a mechanism for future cost sharing was discussed. Mr. Jacobson suggests, future developments or homes using the improved road could pay a proportional share of the original construction costs within a seven-to-ten-year period, providing potential reimbursement for the developer. Mr. Jacobson reiterated that the county cannot provide funding for off-site road construction, and all ordinance requirements must be followed. Ms. Miles asks if they can do an appeal. Ms. Pyper clarifies that the Board of Appeals is for non-self-inflicted financial burdens. Ms. Riley acknowledges inconsistencies or mistakes by staff were noted as regrettable but cannot be used as justification for bypassing requirements. Ms. Jarrett suggests, the following process: the applicant's engineer must complete the off-site road design in accordance with the Roadway Design and Construction Manual and provide a detailed cost estimate. The applicant can then obtain a bond covering 110% of the estimated cost. Once the bond and engineering documentation are submitted, the Commission may approve the preliminary plat. Final approval will be granted once the road is constructed according to specifications and all other requirements are met. Mr. Jacobson emphasized that construction work is not required to obtain preliminary approval; only engineering documentation and specifications are needed at this stage. Mr. Harmon expressed concern regarding the potential for additional unforeseen requirements. Ms. Riley emphasized trust in current zoning staff, noting that the updated checklist provided by staff should accurately reflect all remaining obligations. Mr. Jacobson expressed

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

understanding of the applicant's frustration, acknowledging that prior guidance may have caused unnecessary delays. Mr. Harmon reiterated that the subdivision is intended for family relocation, not a profit-driven venture.

## **Discussion and potential approval of Skyline Mountain Special Service District Water Plan.**

Roy Fox, Ferris Taylor and Monique Robbins are present. Mr. Olsen presents the item. Mr. Olsen states, that issues surrounding the district have persisted since the subdivision's approval in 2014. One of the primary unresolved issues has been water allocation and water rights, particularly regarding building approvals and the district's capacity to service all lots within its boundaries. Mr. Olsen explained that the purpose of the current review was essentially a second attempt to revisit and clarify water-related matters that were not adequately addressed during the original approval process. A key element missing from the earlier documentation was a complete master water plan. Although it had been stated that such a plan existed, no one within the county had ever seen it in full. The district has now prepared a comprehensive master water plan intended to address these gaps. In addition to the new plan, Mr. Olsen stated that earlier directives governing how water within the district was to be allocated and managed had resurfaced. These directives were never fully reconciled with actual operations. The district has now attempted to incorporate those earlier directives into the updated plan in order to resolve longstanding confusion and ensure clarity moving forward. Mr. Olsen help distribute copies of the updated plan and noted that a final bullet point section had been added only the day prior. Mr. Jacobson asks an early clarifying question related to prior water allocations. He recalled that during the 2014 approval, water for all lots was accounted for in total, but not assigned to individual lots because it was unclear which lots would develop first. He further asked whether subsequent attempts by outside developers to buy water from the district had ever been approved, noting the concern that the district had long-term obligations to supply water to its own unbuilt lots before providing water to external developments. Mr. Olsen responded that the updated plan addresses those issues, but he invited Monique Robbins to clarify further. Ms. Robbins introduced herself, explaining that she is a civil engineer and a relatively new property owner

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

in the district who became involved after noticing ongoing confusion in the water records. She explained that Scott had provided her with a 2014 document from the original subdivision approval. That document confirmed that adequate water had been allocated at the time: 222 acre-feet had been deeded directly to the district, and the remainder of the water required for the approval existed as water shares held in the Birch Creek Irrigation Company under the subdivision's name. However, no one had ever established when or how those shares were supposed to be converted or transferred into the culinary system. Ms. Robbins also clarified a major misunderstanding. Several years ago, an outside developer had proposed purchasing additional water in order to bring their own water into the system. This was inaccurately interpreted by some as the district selling water assigned to residents of the subdivision. Ms. Robbins continues, the developer's proposal had always been to acquire their own water and contribute it to the system; the district was not reallocating or selling subdivision water. She emphasized the importance of correcting this misconception, which has circulated for years. Mr. Taylor, added that a single sentence in the developer's agreement had caused confusion. The agreement required the developer to provide water rights "according to current county standards," which was interpreted by some as implying that the district was selling its own water. In reality, the developer was to provide their own water, and the district never sold nor intended to sell any of the water allocated to the subdivision. Mr. Taylor continued by explaining that the district received the 2014 water requirements document from the county only in October of this year, despite the document having been circulated to others previously. The document clarified that the subdivision had been allocated 55.5 water shares in Birch Creek Irrigation District and an additional 222.85 acre-feet in water rights. The new master plan attempts to formally reconcile how both categories of water are to be applied. He also noted that both the district and its property holders have purchased additional water shares in recent years. Mr. Jacobson asked how many acre-feet each water share represented. Mr. Taylor confirmed that each share represented approximately three acre-feet of water. Mr. Taylor further explained that the district has a well available for purchase that meets state standards for converting water shares into groundwater rights, though such conversions have recently become complicated by Birch Creek Irrigation Company's resistance to transferring surface shares into the

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

culinary system. Mr. Taylor states, the district completed an audit of all 946 lots, reviewing building history dating back to the 1960s and 1970s. The audit identified 170 full-time residences and 162 seasonal or part-time cabins. Based on the District's standards—0.45 acre-feet per year-round residence and 0.25 acre-feet per seasonal cabin—the district has allocated 116 acre-feet of its 222.85 available acre-feet. This places the district at approximately the halfway mark in its total water allocation. Based on growth projections, the district estimates that full build-out demand may exceed current allocations sometime between 2038 and 2043, assuming an approximate pace of nine to ten full-time building permits per year, along with sixteen to twenty mountain cabin permits annually. Mr. Fox, the district's water superintendent, explained that under current state law water rights may be protected for up to forty years if assigned to a subdivision, even if not immediately used. The district therefore remains in compliance with state requirements so long as it documents its allocation of water to subdivision lots. These projections will be reassessed every two years under the new plan. If future growth accelerates and projections indicate that the district may run short of water within a five-year window, the district will need to secure additional water in advance. Mr. Taylor emphasized that it has recently invested, with regional partners, in new water infrastructure including a year-round fill station at the top of the mountain and an option on a well capable of meeting state culinary standards. He expressed confidence that it possesses the water necessary for the subdivision's build-out, but acknowledged that misunderstandings, missing documentation, and inconsistent past interpretations had created uncertainty. The new master water plan is intended to resolve those issues by clearly documenting the district's water holdings, establishing two-year reporting updates with the county and formalizing procedures for future water conversion, allocation, and infrastructure planning. During the discussion, it was noted that current projections indicate the district could face a water shortfall by 2042 if growth continues at its present pace. The board reviewed the annual permit activity, which includes approximately nine to ten full-time building permits and an additional sixteen to twenty mountain permits each year. This represents a minimum of twenty-six new building permits issued annually. The board agreed that when they look back two years from now, the cumulative total—likely around fifty-two permits—will further confirm the growth trend and the corresponding need for additional

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

water resources. It was emphasized that a five-year outlook makes the future demand even more apparent, underscoring the importance of beginning preparations now. In practical terms, the district effectively has a two-year window before the next review period to ensure that they can confidently assure the county that the necessary water supply will be secured in advance of development needs. Mr. Olsen states that Skyline Mountain Resort is currently identified as a dry subdivision in the County's ordinance. He explains that the water report and documentation provided show that the full-time water system area, identified as Area 1, should be removed from dry-subdivision status because all lots in that area are now connected to the water system. Areas 2 and 3 will remain classified as dry subdivisions for construction and water-supply requirements. Mr. Jacobson asks whether the correction will be reflected in the ordinance, and Mr. Olsen confirms that it will be updated. Mr. Taylor adds that the system services the entire full-time area and that every lot has a stub-out, noting that while not every lot has a meter installed, the majority of lots with existing structures do. Mr. Olsen states that he is very comfortable with the current status of the water system and its capacity.

The motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve Skyline Mountain Special Service District Water Plan to go forward to the County Commissioners and to recommend to go forward with the possible adoption.

Dallin Carter seconds the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Mr. Hatch asks if the document is going to be recorded in the recorder's office since there is legal descriptions in the document. The suggestion was made by Ms. Jarrett to keep it the Zoning Administrator's office. Ms. Pyper states if its approved in the County Commission meeting it'll be filed in the County Clerk's office too. Discussion ensues about where the document will be in the County as permanent document. Mr. Atkinson asks if it would be recorded with the Division of Drinking Water. Mr. Fox states its not a master plan it's a water plan

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Claudia Jarrett amends her motion stating, after the county commission meeting that the document be filed in the County Clerk's office and Zoning Administrator's office.

Dallin Carter seconds the amendment. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

## **Discussion of addition to Final Plat 13.20, supporting documents 13.20.030 in the Subdivision Ordinance.**

Ms. Sorensen noted that the information she presented would be useful to include in the subdivision ordinance under the Final Plat Supporting Documents, as it had been part of the previous ordinance. She reviewed the materials previously required: copies of protective covenants, deed restrictions, trust agreements, and homeowners' association articles and bylaws—including those required by the Board of County Commissioners—governing the future use of water or sewer systems, resubdivision, open space, and other potential changes that could significantly alter the subdivision as approved. She also referenced the monument record; all information required by FHA when a subdivision is submitted for feasibility and approval under a federal program; a change application for culinary water usage with approved status from the State Division of Water Rights verifying adequate water volume and quality for each proposed lot when not connected to a central water system; a letter from the Central Utah District Health Department approving the sanitary sewer system; and a letter from the County Zoning Administrator or County Road Department Supervisor confirming compliance with county road standards. Ms. Jarrett clarified that the intent is to add this material to the current subdivision ordinance.

Mr. Harmer asked for clarification on the definition of a monument record, and Ms. Sorensen explained that it functions similarly to documentation used by an HOA.

Mr. Harmer then asked whether the letter would accompany the septic permit, and she confirmed that it would. Ms. Jarrett stated that the Planning Commission agrees with the supporting documents presented. Mr. Jacobson asked whether Mr. Seely fully understands the requirements he is signing off on regarding off-site improvements. Mr. Olsen responded that he believes he does. Mr. Hatch added that Tom had not signed off on access to the county road.

## **Discussion of Private Landing Strip definition.**

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Mr. Merrithew is present. Ms. Sorensen presents the following definition to the Planning Commission for a Private Landing Strip: an area of land designed for the takeoff and landing of aircraft that is restricted to the owner's exclusive use or to those with specific authorization. The landing strip would be limited to simple dirt, turf (grass), or gravel surfaces. It would require a conditional use permit and would only be allowed in zones specified within the ordinance. Use would be limited to twin-engine propeller aircraft, and jet-propulsion aircraft would not be permitted. Commercial aircraft or commercial operations for landing or takeoff would not be allowed. No aircraft fueling facilities, control towers, or other airport improvements would be permitted. Up to two wind-direction flags or indicators may be allowed, with a maximum height of fifteen feet. One aircraft storage hangar for private use would be allowed with a building permit. Mr. Harmer states that he would like to see a time limit placed on conditional use permits. Ms. Sorensen asks how such the conditional use permits would be monitored. Mr. Harmer responds that it should be a two-year conditional use permit. Mr. Merrithew states that his intention is for this definition to be usable by others, not solely himself, and explains that a two-year conditional use permit would be ineffective for anyone who intends to build a landing strip. Mr. Harmer then states that he is comfortable with a conditional use permit as long as it is reviewed if and when a complaint is submitted. Ms. Riley asks about the requirement for a flight plan. Mr. Merrithew states that flight plans are handled through the FAA. Mr. Jacobson asks whether a flight plan must be filed with the FAA, and Mr. Merrithew responds that it does not. Mr. Jacobson also asks why pavement is not included as an allowable surface. Mr. Merrithew explains that limiting the surface to grass, dirt, or gravel helps restrict the size of aircraft that can use the landing strip. Ms. Sorensen states that private airstrips should be verified with the FAA. Mr. Harmer states that the definition will be added to the public hearing. Ms. Sorensen adds that it will also be included in the Matrix.

## **Discussion of Development restrictions related to Pine Creek Road secondary access (Seth Wright Easement).**

Ms. Sorensen presents the item and explains that an applicant recently submitted a plat for a development up Pine Creek Road. She notes that the County had previously discussed

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

limiting additional development in that area until two separate points of egress were available. Mr. Olsen states that the minutes show a different item previously brought before the Planning Commission that was denied due to the lack of a full public secondary access for the area. Mr. Jacobson adds that the earlier proposal was a fifty-two lot subdivision, and it was denied specifically due to the absence of secondary access. He explains that the applicants at that time claimed to have two possible routes—one extending down the back side and another going into Spring City—but those routes would require securing a public right-of-way and upgrading and maintaining the road. He also notes there are several farms that could potentially provide access. Ms. Jarrett states that the issue may relate to the area that has expressed interest in becoming its own incorporation. Mr. Hatch notes that the traffic study conducted in the area by Jones & DeMille Engineering had just been completed, and a fire had recently occurred in the same area, requiring residents to evacuate using only a single road. Ms. Sorensen states that the current applicant claims they have a recorded easement with the parcel. Mr. Olsen explains that the document describes it as an emergency exit tied to the Spring City Ranchero road leading into Spring City Canyon. He asks whether a development restriction should be considered. Mr. Jacobson states that an addendum should require any new road to be properly engineered, built to appropriate standards, and adequate for projected traffic, emphasizing that ingress and egress must be equivalent in reliability. Mr. Hatch asks whether the road through Spring City Rancheros has ever been opened. Mr. Harmer states that it is only a two-track road with two locked gates. Mr. Olsen notes that the County Commissioners recently addressed a separate applicant who was limited to four lots until a traffic study on the highway access could be completed due to safety concerns. He adds that the County needs a clear directive for handling these types of development requirements. Mr. Jacobson cautions that the County must be careful when drafting such a document so that it does not become overly restrictive. Mr. Harmer states that the road should be traffic counted. Ms. Sorensen notes that the WUI code requires a secondary access, and Mr. Olsen clarifies that the requirement applies specifically to emergency access.

## **Discussion of adding legal action directives to the ordinance.**

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Ms. Sorensen states that there is nothing in the current ordinance outlining the process to follow when an individual seeks legal action against the Planning Commission. Mr. Harmer responds that, in his view, if anyone threatens legal action, all communication should immediately be directed through the County Attorney until the matter is resolved. Mr. Jacobson agrees with this approach. Ms. Jarrett adds that, as a legal entity of the County, the Planning Commission should already be covered. Mr. Olsen states that the issue lies in the legal process itself and that a clear directive is needed to address such situations.

## **Discussion of combining small and major subdivision ordinances.**

Ms. Sorensen states that she is trying to make the subdivision review process easier for both applicants and the Planning Commission. Mr. Olsen asks for suggestions regarding one- or two-lot subdivisions and the requirements for installing power—specifically, when it must be in place—as well as the timing for water installation, such as when a well must be drilled. He notes that road requirements are already addressed through the ADT standards and the Roadway and Construction Manual. Ms. Jarrett asks whether a Preliminary Plat is required for a small subdivision. Mr. Olsen states that it is, although it does not necessarily need to come before the Planning Commission. Ms. Sorensen comments that the most confusing part of the process for applicants is determining when water and power are required. Mr. Olsen suggests that the number of lots may change the requirements and proposes limiting the simplified process to two lots and no more. Mr. Jacobson adds that another issue arises when someone completes an agricultural split creating four lots, where the lots already have water because the owner is a farmer. Under current rules, anything within 1,000 feet of that split becomes a Major Subdivision and must complete all associated infrastructure, allowing the next applicant to benefit without bearing the initial costs. Ms. Jarrett asks whether the ordinance could include language stating that if the intent of the split is to build within two to five years, certain improvements must already be in place. Mr. Harmer responds that no applicant will openly admit such intent. Ms. Sorensen asks for any additional suggestions the members may have. Ms. Jarrett then asks whether power and water could be required prior to the issuance of a building permit rather than at the time the plat is recorded. Mr. Jacobson states that he does not support agricultural splits. He explains that if the County had a clear Major Subdivision ordinance, the applicant would already be responsible for installing roads,

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

providing water to the lots or drilling a well, and ensuring power is extended to the property. Ms. Jarrett concludes that the County could continue its existing process but simply add the term “Major Subdivision,” since it is currently absent from the ordinance.

## **Approval of December Minutes**

Mr. Jacobson states, he typically looks through the minutes and sees where his name is mentioned and if he believes a change needs to be made he’ll call Ms. Pyper if not then he won’t and typically she does a good job Mr. Harmer states, Ms. Pyper does a phenomenal job with our minutes and everything she does for us.

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission minutes from January 06, 2026, with no corrections.

Jo-Anne Riley seconds the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

## **Other Business (if necessary)**

Ms. Riley states there is document she wants to send to the Planning Commission on the HB48 WUI. Mr. Olsen brings forward the topic of the noise and nuisance ordinance as it relates to the Buffer Zone. Ms. Pyper asks whether municipalities would be able to extend their ordinances into the Buffer Zone. Mr. Bennett states that legally they cannot. Mr. Olsen adds that the County Commissioners are working on an arrangement that would allow the County to use municipal dog impound facilities. He explains that a decision must be made on whether the ordinance will apply countywide or only within the Buffer Zone. Mr. Harmer states that it should apply only to the Buffer Zone. He then asks whether the County could contract with the city governing that zone, paying the city to handle related calls and impound services, with the County then billing the responsible individual. Mr. Hatch questions where the budget for such an arrangement would come from and raises the concern that an owner might refuse to reclaim the animal. Mr. Harmer responds that administrative citations could be used and tied to property taxes with compounding interest. Mr. Hatch asks how situations involving renters would be handled, and Mr. Harmer states that landlords would have to address the issue with their tenants. Ms. Riley asks whether the ordinance would apply only to the Buffer Zone or also to those cities or towns located in unincorporated areas. Mr. Olsen states that it can apply to those areas as well. Mr. Bennett

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

February 03, 2026 6:00 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

notes that most nuisance complaints originate from the Buffer Zone. Mr. Harmer comments that the issue is largely driven by density. Mr. Jacobson asks for the opinion of Mr. Carter, given his work with the Sheriff's Department. Mr. Carter expresses doubt that the Sheriff will want deputies responding to noise complaints. Mr. Harmer asks what happens when residents dial 911. Mr. Carter replies that deputies will respond. Mr. Harmer states that the County wants a framework in place so deputies have authority to act when they do respond. Mr. Carter emphasizes that deputies already cover extensive areas and handle numerous calls, and that barking dog complaints should not consume excessive law-enforcement resources. Mr. Bennett concludes that the nuisance ordinance must be aligned with municipal ordinances, given the proximity of these areas to city boundaries.

## **Adjournment**

With no further business before the Planning Commission, a motion to adjourn is made by Claudia Jarrett.

Gene Jacobson seconds the motion. All in favor, none opposed, and the motion passes. The meeting is adjourned at 9:05 PM.