



Mona City  
Planning & Zoning

20 W. Center St  
Mona, UT 84645  
435-623-4913  
[www.monautah.gov](http://www.monautah.gov)  
lori@monautah.gov

---

## February 4, 2026 Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes

**Members Present:** Chair Dennis Gardner  
Commissioner Nate Cieslak  
Commissioner Wayne Hellyer  
Commissioner Frank Riding  
Commissioner Kevin Young

**Members Absent:** Commissioner Jack Boyd

**Councilmember(s) Present:** Tony Openshaw

**Staff Present:** Secretary Lori Henrie, Chad Phillips

**Others Present:** Jobina Davis, Joshua Davis, Tiffinie McAffe, Jonathan Jones, Shawna Keyte, Tyler Keyte, Kayson Keyte, Joe Webb, Gordon Young, Rick Kay, Richard Hatfield, Kent Davis, Jeanette Southworth, Debra Barnes, Val Barnea, Jane Marlo, Arlene Bassett

### Public Hearing:

Planning and Zoning Chair Dennis Gardner made motion to open the Public Hearing at 7:30. Commissioner Young made motion to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Riding second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: Aye  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

The purpose of the Public Hearing is to receive public comment on the following:

- **Ordinance 2026-2:** Amendment to change wording in MCC 10-6-2, 10-6-3, 10-13-4, 8-1-1, 8-1-4, and 8-1-6. See attachment for more information.
- **East Hills Meadow Subdivision**
  - Opportunity for all interested parties to ask questions and receive information regarding a proposed 5-lot major subdivision, including an irrigation pond, located at approximately 750 East Center Street to 50

South. See Mona City website at [www.monautah.gov](http://www.monautah.gov) for more information on the subdivision.

**Ordinance 2026-2:**

Chair Gardner explained that Ordinance 2026-2 proposes adjusting the required culinary water allocation to .45 acre-feet. The ordinance also updates terminology by replacing “hogs” with “pigs” and revises the code to reflect that Nephi City now maintains the gas system in Mona City. Chair Gardner then opened the floor for public comment. No comments were made by the public.

**East Hills Meadows Subdivision:**

Chair Gardner opened discussion on the East Hills Meadow Subdivision and invited public comment.

Mona City resident Jeanette Southworth requested additional information regarding the nature and location of the subdivision and expressed concerns about irrigation water.

Chair Gardner explained that the proposal is for a 5-lot subdivision located east High Meadow Subdivision on 750 East.

Gordon Young, President of the Mona Irrigation Company, stated that the requirements for irrigation water are established by the City and are not determined by irrigation company. He explained that the company had specified the amount of water shares Mr. Davis would be entitled to supply for the subdivision, which would provide approximately five hours of stream flow once every two weeks, to be diverted into a pond. Mr. Young stated that while the engineer has probably calculated that, in theory, this would be sufficient to serve the homes, wasn't sure that realistically that would work. He expressed concerns about ditch losses, carrier water issues, and evaporation from the pond, and questioned what would occur if the pond were to run dry. He noted that either they turn the water on from the culinary system, which would be a big load on the system, or water could be taken through the headgate when not entitled to it, which he described as a very real scenario. He explained that the headgate is intended to stop their flow when it's not the user's scheduled turn to use the water. Mr. Young also asked who would be responsible for operating the system and stated that it creates difficulties for all parties involved.

Mona City resident Josh Davis asked about long-term maintenance responsibilities associated with the pond system and how the City would avoid assuming those obligations, especially as the original property owners sell and new residents move in who aren't aware of the requirements. He questioned how the city ensures they aren't stuck holding the bag after the developer moves on and noted that no one wants to pay for something that there is nothing to be gained from for the City.

There were no further comments.

**Close Public Hearing:**

Chair Gardner called for vote to close the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m. Commissioner Riding made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Young second the motion. The roll call vote to adjourn the meeting at 7:40p.m. The roll call vote to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye

Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

**Planning & Zoning Meeting:**

The Planning & Zoning meeting resumed at 7:40 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Chair Gardner requested feedback on the minutes from January 7, 2026. No additional changes were suggested. Chair Gardner called for vote to accept the meeting minutes. Commissioner Hellyer made motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 7, 2026. Commissioner Young second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

Chair Gardner requested feedback on the minutes from January 27, 2026. No additional changes were suggested. Chair Gardner called for vote to accept the meeting minutes. Commissioner Cieslak made motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 27, 2026. Commissioner Riding second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

**Approval of Ordinance 2026-2:**

Chair Gardner called for vote to approve Ordinance 2026-2. Commissioner Riding made motion to approve Ordinance 2026-2. Commissioner Hellyer second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

**Kelsey Quarnberg – Property Inquiry – approx. 700 S and Old Hwy 91**

Kelsey Quarnberg is inquiring about putting a business on the north east corner property at 700 S and Old Hwy 91. Mrs. Quarnberg was not in attendance at the meeting. Secretary Henrie recommended the agenda item be tabled until Mrs. Quarnberg was present to discuss with the commissioners.

Chair Gardner called for a motion to table the property inquiry for Mrs. Quarnberg. Commissioner Hellyer made motion to table the property inquiry. Commissioner Cieslak second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

### **East Hills Meadows Subdivision Preliminary Approval**

Chair Gardner informed Mr. Hatfield and Mr. Davis that the City had drafted a letter in response to Mr. Hatfield's earlier inquiry regarding whether culinary water shares could be used in place of the proposed irrigation pond system. Secretary Henrie noted that the letter had not yet been shared with them and asked the Commission to discuss the possibility of pursuing that option. She also invited Mona's water expert, Jonathan Jones to join the conversation.

Chair Gardner stated if the developer wanted to use culinary water for the houses in lieu of the irrigation pond system previously proposed that the required culinary water shares for the subdivision for outdoor use would be 12.56 acre-feet of water. They would need additional shares for indoor use. He noted that this option would need the approval from the City Council.

Mr. Jones explained that the city has been opposed to this option since the development of the High Meadows Subdivision, particularly because the culinary water system is chlorinated.

Mr. Hatfield spoke up explaining that "every option that they approach seems to get shot down. The first option that was explored with the irrigation company was to use a 6" pipe to hook on at the junction box and leave it charged all the time and then put a booster station at every home. It wouldn't need an HOA with this option. It could be metered. That way if all the allocated water doesn't get used, it would just go down the pipe and be used elsewhere."

Mr. Hatfield mentioned discrepancies in comments made during the Public Hearing by Mr. Young regarding a letter written to the developer in June 2024 regarding the specifics of the water usage. Mr. Hatfield also noted that a high-pressure line passes by the property but they are unable to connect to it because the shares are not from that system. He added that drilling a well had been considered; however, City ordinance prohibits wells being drilled within city limits.

Mr. Jones stated that further discussions needed to explore other possible options. Secretary Henrie mentioned that in the letter to be shared with Mr. Davis and Mr. Hatfield, the City is not interested in exchanging irrigation shares for culinary shares because the system is outside the Mona Town system and does not meet code requirements for water 24/7. She stated that if the developer chooses to pursue the culinary water option, the City would recommend providing the 12.56 acre-feet of water. She emphasized that the decision would be theirs and would require City Council approval.

Chair Gardner asked if there were any further questions. Secretary Henrie questioned the HOA documents, stating they appeared to protect only the developer from liability and did not protect the City's interests. Mr. Hatfield replied that they could make adjustments to the declaration sheets. Secretary Henrie stated she had a draft approved by the City Attorney and would provide it to them. Mr. Hatfield replied that their submitted version was not meant to be final and that they can add an addendum to it.

Mr. Young questioned that by opening up the city culinary system as a means for the property owner to irrigate their property, does the city have the means to allow this going forward for all future developments in the city? Mr. Jones responded that the City would need to carefully evaluate that option. Mr. Young replied that the city is setting a precedence. Chair Gardner replied that the irrigation company is also setting a precedence when allowing the developer to have an irrigation pond. There are two other developers waiting for the city's decision on this

development whether they are allowed to also put irrigation ponds in.

Chair Gardner asked Mr. Young and Mr. Kay about the irrigation line that runs from the high-pressure system near the property and how the property had previously been irrigated. Mr. Kay explained that the property was previously flood irrigated using field water from a ditch running from the headgate and that it was unrelated to the line serving his former residence. Mr. Kay disapproved of the city considering using the culinary system and the demands that it would put on the culinary system. Secretary Henrie also pointed out the great expense that the homeowner would also be responsible for with all the overages on their water bill for using the culinary system in this manner.

Chair Gardner then asked Mr. Kay why couldn't the 2" line that runs to Mr. Kay's former residence could not be upgraded to serve the subdivision. Mr. Kay explained that when the high-pressure line was installed past the property, a right-of-way was given in exchange for one connection to that system. Chair Gardner asked whether the cost of upgrading the line could be passed on to the developer.

Mr. Young replied that "there has been enough experience to know that when they mix the irrigation system with people watering lawns that it's been endless problems, so it's been their policy not to do that. They are also not going to compromise the integrity of the main line that comes down that feeds the secondary system with additional connections. He continued, that when that line came down to feed the secondary line, when it was tapped in, it was put in with private money, Mr. Young, Mr. Kay, everyone who irrigates on that line. No one else has rights on that line."

Mr. Kay mentioned that when the secondary system was installed, it was sized specifically for acreage within Mona City limits. He noted that annexation does not increase the volume of water available and expressed concern that allowing additional connections would create shortages.

Mr. Young stated that the system was designed for the area historically served by Mona Town shares in the Mona Town ditch and that it was built with finite financial and water resources. Expanding the system, he stated, would compromise its integrity and manageability.

Commissioner Kevin Young restated Chair Gardner's earlier question regarding whether development costs could be passed on to those wishing to expand or improve the system. Chair Gardner added that because the City does not own the irrigation system, it cannot directly charge fees but questioned how upgrades could be required in lieu of pond systems. Mr. Kay suggested that the developer could enlarge the City system.

Mr. Young stated that expanding the system would require substantial engineering. He questioned whether millions of dollars should be spent to benefit a few developers when the existing system was designed and funded years ago to serve current residents economically.

Mr. Hatfield stated that they had offered to allocate funds intended for the pond system toward expanding the existing pond system so the town system could be utilized. Chair Gardner stated that it all comes from the same source so to speak. Mr. Young clarified that the water is divided and directed into the pond serving the town system.

Mr. Young explained that boundaries were established for the secondary system to prevent spreading resources too thin and leaving irrigated areas dry. Chair Gardner asked why field shares can't be transferred into the different lines. Mr. Young explained that the irrigation company consists of four streams established in the 1800s, including town shares and field shares, each operating on different schedules and historically segregated. Although they represent equivalent amounts of water, their schedules and management differ. He stated that

past attempts to mix the systems have not been successful and that expanding the town system beyond its capacity would require quadrupling its size, primarily benefiting developers while placing financial burden on the town.

Mr. Hatfield inquired about the approval process for tonight. Secretary Henrie stated that the city does have 4 preliminary review cycles, we could send it back to the developer to improve on. She continued that we don't have to give a preliminary approval tonight. We could ask that the HOA documents be improved on, the city can provide what the attorney recommended. Mr. Hatfield interjected that going back to the letter from the irrigation company, the developer's intent wasn't to run the water in the ditch, that it was always to pull the water from the High Line System, and to find a way to get it from that system to their pond. They were told no. After which, they worked with the Ingrams to come up with an agreement to use their line to fill the pond. They know the water is in the pipe. Mr. Young responded that the water doesn't have rights to be in that pipe, it was an oversight that it was in there. He continued that Mr. Kay, Mr. Stanley, other members of the Kay family, the Walls, and himself put the pipe line in for High Line in 1999. Those shares have not contributed to that pipeline. They are old field shares. They were bundled with other shares but they have no real rights there. It's a private pipe line.

Mr. Hatfield stated that the developer's original intent was not to run water through the ditch but to obtain water from the High Line System and deliver it to their pond. He stated they were denied that option and subsequently worked with the Ingrams to arrange use of their line to fill the pond. He stated they knew the water was in the pipe.

Mr. Young responded that the shares in question do not have rights to that pipeline and that its use was an oversight. He explained that the High Line pipeline was installed in 1999 with private funds from specific shareholders and that the shares associated with the proposed development did not contribute to or hold rights in that pipeline.

Mr. Hatfield expressed frustration with the difficulty of obtaining preliminary approval for a five-lot subdivision and questioned the need for another 30-day review cycle. Secretary Henrie responded that the State of Utah mandates the review cycle timelines and that the City is entitled to use the full 30-business-day review period. Chair Gardner added that recent state legislation allows up to four review cycles prior to a vote.

Chair Gardner stated that the Commission's goal is to act in the best interest of the City. He suggested taking additional time to evaluate options, organize documentation, consult with the City Council, and review financial considerations. He stated that the irrigation company appears unwilling to approve the proposal at this time and that the City is in a difficult position. He indicated he could not approve the subdivision that evening and suggested tabling the decision. Secretary Henrie noted that tabling would return the application to the developer for up to 180 days, allowing time for resubmittal and then would start another 30-business-day review cycle. Mr. Hatfield cautioned the commissioners in tabling due to missing documents that could be finalized later. Secretary Henrie replied that the City is allowed only one final review and must either approve or deny the application at that stage. She emphasized the importance of resolving issues during preliminary review. Chair Gardner stated that perhaps a special meeting could be held should they re-submit timely.

Chair Gardner called for a motion to table the East Hills Meadows Subdivision for another review cycle. Commissioner Riding made motion to table the preliminary approval for the East Hills Meadows Subdivision. Commissioner Hellyer second the motion. The roll call vote was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent  
Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye

Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

## **Secretary Business**

Secretary Henrie reported on the previous meeting's discussion regarding the electrical box that had been installed in the wrong location. She stated that the homeowner plans to continue the project and will pay for the inspections once it is completed. She also clarified that the city does not require Planning & Zoning approval for an electrical upgrade.

She reminded the Commission about the R6 Growth Summit originally scheduled for May 6, which conflicts with the regular first-Wednesday meeting. After discussion, the Commission agreed to reschedule it for May 13, 2026, and Secretary Henrie will ensure it is properly noticed on the state website.

Secretary Henrie noted that the completed file for the Mona Commercial development has been received. She reminded the Commission of the 30-day review period and encouraged members to review the materials. Councilmember Ingram has already reviewed the file and has suggestions for consideration. A meeting with the developer is scheduled for March 4.

She also reported inquiries regarding the property at 200 W and 200 S, which is currently for sale. She confirmed that a future builder would be responsible for providing water, installing a sewer booster if necessary, and meeting driveway width requirements, including a turnaround for emergency services (33 or 66 feet). The proposal is for one home. Commissioners Young and Riding agreed that a cul-de-sac or turnaround would be required unless it is designated as a private drive.

Secretary Henrie distributed a document on ethical behavior, noting that state law requires it to be reviewed and signed annually.

Finally, she informed the Commission about proposed state legislation, House Bill 184, related to land use. The bill is in its early stages, and she will continue to monitor its progress.

## **Public Comment**

Mona City resident Jane Marlow addressed the Commission. She stated that she is neither for nor against development but wanted to acknowledge how thoughtfully the Commission listens to developers. She expressed hope that future proposals could be presented more clearly to residents, suggesting that the City and the water company provide maps to improve communication and help citizens better understand development plans.

Ms. Marlow also raised concerns about the size of accessory buildings permitted in residential areas. She said she does not like the "warehouse-sized buildings" that have been appearing, describing them as looking more industrial than residential. She urged the Planning & Zoning Commission to consider maintaining the residential character of neighborhoods and preventing them from taking on an industrial appearance.

## **Adjournment**

Chair Gardner called for vote to adjourn the planning and zoning meeting at 8:40 p.m. Commissioner Cieslak made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Riding second the motion. The roll call vote to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. was as follows:

Commissioner Boyd: absent

Commissioner Cieslak: Aye  
Commissioner Hellyer: Aye  
Commissioner Riding: Aye  
Commissioner Young: Aye

---

Dennis Gardner  
Planning & Zoning Chair

---

Lori Henrie  
Planning & Zoning Secretary