Town of Spring Lake

Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

Meeting to be Held

March 18, 2026 – 7:00 P.M.

3744 West 12240 South

Spring Lake, Utah 84651

NOTICE IS HEREIN GIVEN THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF SPRING LAKE WILL HOLD A COMMISSION MEETING ON WEDNESDAY MARCH 18, 2026, AT 7:00 PM. JOIN US DIGITALLY AT https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85335878612?pwd=UquEaaIBbNfs2KLxNrbeXBaH9sQyUb.1

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: JASON KNAPP

Commissioners Present: Jason Knapp, Layne Batty, Ryan Moore, and Joy Benson.
Commissioners Absent: Richard Behling.
Alternates Present: Von Menlove and Greg McDavitt.
Staff Present: LAA, Spencer Foster, Town Recorder, Becca Batty, Deputy Town Recorder, Brenda Warner.
Chair Knapp: Conducted a roll call to start the meeting. Commissioner Behling was not present. As a result, Alternate Von Menlove sat in as a voting commission member. Explained that they will be keeping the main part of the meeting very short so they can get to the General Plan survey results. Provided an explanation to the public regarding voting members and alternates and how that works.

PUBLIC COMMENT

THIS IS THE TIME SET ASIDE FOR THE PUBLIC TO BRING FORWARD TO THE COMMISSION ANY ITEM THAT THEY WISH TO DISCUSS. PLEASE KEEP YOUR COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES MAXIMUM.

Chair Knapp: Explained how this first public comment session will work and requested that citizens hold their comments on the presentation until after the survey results have been presented.
Spencer Foster: Explained that any comments related to the survey should wait until after the survey results have been provided.
Jeri Carter: Talked about the Easter Egg hunt and that she really appreciates everyone in the Town's help and goodness for this event.
Chair Knapp: Asked Jeri to give the town a deadline for when she needs things for the Easter Egg Hunt.
Jeri Carter: March 27th for donations.
Brenda Warner: Asked if they still need eggs.
Jeri Carter: Thinks they will be ok, but they are not sure.
Mayor Menlove: Payson City has given the town the go ahead for the event and that they will clean up before.

AGENDA ACTION ITEMS

TOWN PLANNING COMMISSION MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS

2. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 18, 2026, AND MARCH 4, 2026, MEETINGS

Commissioner Moore: Made a motion to adopt the minutes from February 18, 2026, and March 4, 2026.
Commissioner Batty: Seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor say I. Unanimous. Richard Behling absent. Motion passed and minutes approved.

3. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – GENERAL PLAN SURVEY RESULTS AND PRESENTATION

Chair Knapp: Began the presentation of the survey results. Explained how administration and mailing of the surveys worked. Explained the purpose of the survey. Explained that confidentiality was important in this survey and how this worked, including numbering of the surveys. 158 surveys went out to residents and 35 went out to non-resident landowners, for a total of 193 surveys. He went through the questions in the survey one by one and explained the results and data for these results. Also explained how the data for residents and non-residents differed due to the number of respondents. **The complete audio recording is available on the Utah Public Notice Website while the complete survey results can be found on the Springlakeutah.gov website.** Explained the appendix and open-ended responses to questions. He also pointed out that rather than have names in some of the responses, he took out or redacted those names to retain confidentiality and maintain professionalism in the survey.

Public Comment

Mayor Menlove: Asked about lot sizes and how that will be decided for the General Plan process. How do they plan to think about this for the plan.
Chair Knapp: Reminded the Mayor that he is just one person and that there may be many other opinions from other members of the commission. It needs to be a very open process. They may start at a very high level with 5 acre lots while they decide whether they are going to have different lot sizes in different areas. As he has investigated how other communities have done, this one common thing is to meet with specific landowners and see what they want the land around them to look like. Having a series of meetings and open houses will be a good start to figuring this out.
Von Menlove: Brought up the challenges of building new homes on empty lots and the difficulty of connecting to existing systems.
Ryan Moore: Explained the difference between deep trench lots versus the type of lot Von Menlove has.
Von Menlove: Pointed out that the Health Department will need to be involved in some of this as well.
Chair Knapp: These are good points and they will need to be considered.
Kelly Warner: Wondering about how the town is going to deal with water. This is a very hard challenge. Where is the town going to get any water for any new development.
Chair Knapp: Pointed out that water rights will probably need to be purchased and emphasized the County's process. This will need to be a consideration for the future in how the Town grows.
Councilmember Marsh: Seems like this will limit the growth.
Chair Knapp: Brought up the CUP and the plans to build a pipe by their Town and that they will need to be aware of this when it happens.
Councilmember Marsh: Will the town be able to get updates about this and when it happens.
Chair Knapp: That's not something that they've discussed as a commission, but this seems like it needs to be something they pay attention to and keep track of.
Greg McDavitt: Developers will figure out how to deal with the water issue and get this resolved when they need to.
Kelly Warner: Brought up the fact that businesses would help with tax base.
Chair Knapp: That's something that towns look for with tax funding. Brought up the feasibility study and they projected that revenues in the town would be adequate how it is. If the town wanted more services, they would need to provide it in some way and be able to fund it somehow.
Robert Bascom: Are they going to be putting on an onramp near Spring Lake?
Mayor Menlove: That's in the RTP for the region. It's not in the immediate future.
Robert Bascom: That is an option for some sort of revenue eventually.
Mayor Menlove: Talked about different locations that this onramp would potentially go. The town of Spring Lake is sort of divided into four quadrants. Emphasized that the town needs to include an annexation plan as part of the General Plan so that they can talk about having future annexations for the town. The northwest corner of the freeway quadrant would be in Spring Lake.
Councilmember Judd: Brought up the Olympics and that the State wants some projects done before the Olympics in 2034.
Mayor Menlove: Pointed out that the project for Santaquin and widening of I-15 are the ones they want to finish before 2034, not necessarily the onramp near Spring Lake.
Citizen Comment: Pointed out that Santaquin's traffic is a challenge.

Mayor Menlove: While they widen I-15 they will also be working on fixing the Santaquin interchange to make that situation better. He wanted to thank the commission, especially Jason, for doing the survey and for helping get this taken care of. The response rate was pretty good. Thanked Jason for presenting this to the community tonight.
Brenda Warner: Asked what the definition of residents was (renters or property owners only?)
Chair Knapp: There were a few that requested a response, but if they don't show up on the records of the County then he didn't go out and canvas to see who the renter is and who is the owner. Unless someone reached out to him, the survey would have been sent to the landowner or property owner.
Becca Batty: So, the survey would have gone to the owner of the property and not the renter.
Chair Knapp: Yes. The owner of the property would have received it.
Mayor Menlove: Asked for a clarification question on the data presentation. Asked if Jason could provide clarification of those questions that may have said, "Choose up to five of the answers" for specific questions.
Chair Knapp: Explained how this worked and clarified which questions applied to this situation.
Mayor Menlove: Maybe just make a note on the presentation slides?
Chair Knapp: On the survey itself, it said to just choose five, but in the presentation, he wanted to save space on the slide deck. When he puts the information on the website, he will include the survey itself, the survey results, and the presentation. That should give a complete view of the results.
Mayor Menlove: Were there any other comments that were made that should have been included in the survey as a question?
Chair Knapp: Pointed to question #2 and said that people pointed out that they were, "Born and Raised" here in Spring Lake. Said that it wouldn't really have changed the meaning or results of the survey. There were a fair number of responses in the free response question (16) that called out junk cars on Spring Lake Road and that need to be cleaned up. That was the only other thing with a high response rate. Pointed out that high response for the Town needing to look the same as it does now in 20 years down the road.

CLOSED MEETING (IF NECESSARY)

POSSIBLE MOTION TO ENTER INTO CLOSED MEETING FOR THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF PROPERTY; PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION; THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETANCE, OR THE PHYSCIAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL; OR THE DEPLOYMENT OF SECURITY PERSONNEL, DEVICES, OR SYSTEMS.

REPORTS

4. CHAIR
5. VICE CHAIR
6. COMMISSION MEMBERS
7. STAFF MEMBERS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Benson: Made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Commissioner Batty: Seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor say I. Vote was unanimous. Commissioner Behling absent. Motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.

Spencer Foster

_____

Spencer Foster, Temporary Town Recorder

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing special accommodations, including auxiliary communicative aids and services, for this meeting should notify the Town at 801-310-9632 or by email at sfoster@magutah.gov at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The Town does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda has been posted at the designated meeting place, the springlakeutah.gov website, and the Utah Public Notice Website.

General Plan – Requirements and Preparation Process

As a town with fewer than 1,000 residents, our general plan process is governed by the newly reorganized Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 20.

I. General Plan Sections

Under Section 10-20-404, the plan is divided into mandatory elements and optional sections.

1. **Required Elements**

- *Land Use Element*: Must designate long-term goals and proposed locations for housing (all income levels), business, agriculture, and public uses. The land use element should also include a future land use map and written goals/policies that guide zoning decisions and future development.
    - *Note:* We must specifically identify and consider any Agriculture Protection Areas to ensure proposed land uses do not conflict with them.
- *Transportation & Traffic Circulation Element*: Outlines the general location and extent of existing and proposed streets and transit.
    - *Requirement:* Because we are withing the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) boundaries, our Transportation Element must be coordinated with the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)'s regional plan, known as TransPlan50. Coordination with MAG ensures consistency with regional transportation planning and eligibility for funding opportunities.

2. **Optional Elements (Town-Specific Decisions)**

- *Moderate Income Housing Element*: For a town of our size (under 1,000 residents), this section is optional. We are not a "specified municipality" required to adopt a formal 5-year housing strategy unless we grow to over 1,000 residents. While the Town is not currently classified as a "specified municipality," it should continue to monitor population thresholds, as additional requirements may apply if the Town exceeds 1,000 residents.
- *Water Use & Preservation Element*: Towns and fifth-class cities are currently exempt from the mandatory water use and preservation element that larger cities must adopt by December 31, 2025. Water planning considerations are still considered a best practice, particularly for long-term infrastructure planning.

- *Other Optional Elements*: We may choose to include sections on public services (sewage, waste), environmental protection (natural resources, geologic hazards), historic preservation, or recreation.

II. **Preparation Process (10-20-404 and 10-20-405, with notices being prepared as provided in Section 10-20-203)**

Per Utah State code, the Planning Commission leads the creation of the plan through the following legal steps:

1. *Preliminary Drafting and Public Input*: The Planning Commission may gather public input, review survey results, hold working sessions, and prepare draft elements of the General Plan prior to issuing the Notice of Intent.
2. *Notice of Intent*: Before preparing the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Town Council, the commission must provide notice of its intent to all affected entities (neighboring towns, the county, the Utah Geospatial Resource Center, and MAG).
3. *Public Hearing*: The Planning Commission must hold at least one public hearing on the completed draft plan. Notice for this hearing must be posted at least 10 days in advance. Additional hearings may be held if needed.
4. *Recommendation*: Following the hearing and any revisions, the commission forwards a formal recommendation to the Town Council.
5. *Town Council Action*: The Council may adopt the plan as-is, make revisions, or reject it. If rejected, they may send it back to the Planning Commission with suggestions.
6. *Filing*: Once adopted, the Town must send a copy of the plan to our regional Association of Governments within 45 days.

Resources Available in Preparing a General Plan:

- Mountainland Association of Governments – Our primary partner for technical and financial planning support
- Utah State Planning Resources
    - Land Use Academy of Utah (LUAU). Provides training, including a General Plan Writing Guide and templates specifically for Utah municipalities.
    - Utah League of Towns/Local Administrative Advisor (Spencer Foster)
    - Utah Geospatial Resource Center. Access to free GIS data and mapping layers to create mandatory land use and transportation maps.

- Recent General Plans prepared by other small towns
- Paid professional companies (Fairfield recently paid $70,000 to a professional company to help prepare their General Plan) (Not recommended at this point due to budget constraints)

Next Steps:

- Complete initial drafting of General Plan elements based on survey results and Planning Commission input.
- Hold Planning Commission work sessions to refine goals, maps, and policies.
- Prepare a near-final draft of the General Plan

III. Implementation and Use of the General Plan

The General Plan is a policy document that guides decision-making but does not itself regulate land use. Implementation occurs through zoning ordinances, subdivision regulation, capital improvement planning, and budgeting decisions.

1. **Plan Maintenance/Updates:**
   The Town should review and update the General Plan at least every five years to reflect changing conditions, growth patterns, and community priorities.

2. **Public Engagement:**
   Public participation is a critical component of the General Plan process and should continue throughout drafting, review and adoption, as well as throughout any subsequent reviews and updates.