

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

Attendees: Planning Commission Chairman Cody Harmer, Board Members: Claudia Jarrett and Gene Jacobson, Justin Atkinson and Dallin Carter. Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorensen. Also in attendance is Sanpete County Commissioner Mike Bennett. Board Member Sanpete County Recorder Talisha Johnson have joined via ZOOM. Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Heather Pyper and Board member Reed Hatch have been excused.

Planning Commission Chair Cody Harmer calls meeting to order.

## **Approval of the Agenda**

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

Cody Harmer seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed and the motion passes. Vote by voice: Cody Harmer aye; Gene Jacobson, aye; Claudia Jarrett, aye; Dallin Carter, aye; Justin Atkinson, aye.

## **Discussion and possible approval for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Dream Center at Hope Mountain Ranch) application by Kimberly Braud. The proposed subdivision is located north of Mount Pleasant in the Agriculture Zone. Lot- 1 of 18.828 acres. Parcel #S-22193**

Kimberly Braud is present. Ms. Sorensen presents the item and states that the applicant, has completed the subdivision process and submitted the required documents including a plat map, owner affidavit, City Buffer Zone Form, and site plan. She states that septic tank permits have been obtained and that there is an existing well on site that has been completed. Road access has been approved by the County Road Supervisor. Police, fire, and ambulance waivers have been signed and submitted. Power is available on site and will be serviced by Mount Pleasant City Power. A title search has been completed, all taxes are current, a floodplain elevation certificate and stormwater plan have been submitted, and all fees have been paid. The application has also been approved by the County Recorder and Address Coordinator. Ms. Jarrett states a concern that the required amount of water does not appear to be met, noting that only approximately .93 acre-feet had been identified. Ms. Braud states there is at least 1.5 acre-feet associated with the property and that additional water had been

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

obtained during the process. Further review of the submitted certificates indicates multiple water rights totaling approximately 2.68 acre-feet, with confirmation that the water rights are attached to the property. Ms. Jarrett raises a question regarding a reference in the title search to the Central Utah Water Conservancy District and suggests clarification may be needed, potentially with a legal review. Discussion follows regarding a historic easement and prior agreements related to the Conservancy District and the Narrows Project. It is clarified that the referenced easement applies broadly to property in the area and is not specific to the subject parcel. Ms. Braud states their attorney has reviewed the matter and found no conflict or issue affecting the proposed subdivision. Further discussion clarifies that the title search likely included multiple parcels under broader ownership, which created confusion regarding easements. The Commission discusses whether an updated title search limited to the specific parcel would be appropriate. It is generally agreed that clarification of the parcel-specific easements would be beneficial, though no major concerns remain. Ms. Jarrett asks about long-term plans for the property, noting multiple parcel numbers referenced in the title search. Ms. Braud explains that the current project is intended to develop a residential facility for women and children recovering from human trafficking, allowing families to remain together during recovery. She further explains a potential future plan for a small transitional housing development, such as a tiny home village, to support long-term stability, though the current focus is on completing the initial project. Discussion follows regarding whether a conditional use permit would be required for the proposed use, and Ms. Braud states she is working with staff on that process. Additional clarification is provided that the multiple parcel numbers referenced are part of larger land holdings and not indicative of an immediate large-scale subdivision plan.

The motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the application filed by Kimberly Braud for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Dream Center at Hope Mountain Ranch). The proposed subdivision is located north of Mount Pleasant in the Agriculture Zone. Lot- 1 of 18.828 acres. ***Parcel #S-22193.***

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

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

**Discussion and possible approval for a 4- lot Small Subdivision (Miller Meadows) application by Phillip Miller. The proposed subdivision is located north of Fairview (Indianola) in the Agriculture Zone. Lot- 1 of 10.08 acres, lot- 2 of 10.08 acres, lot-3 of 10.08 acres and lot-4 of 10.08 acres. Parcel #S-20164**

Ms. Sorensen presents the item and states that the applicant has completed the subdivision process and submitted the required documents including a plat map, site plan, owner affidavit, septic tank permits, water rights for each parcel, road access approval, police/fire/ambulance waiver, power feasibility letter, and title search. Taxes are current. The County Recorder and Address Coordinator have also approved the application. Mr. Jacobson notes the subdivision is well laid out and in a good location but raise concerns that the plat does not show well locations or whether wells will be individual or shared. The applicant states that this has not been finalized, though most lots will likely have individual wells, with possible shared wells for family lots. It is discussed that if shared wells are used, easements or shared well agreements will be required. These items may be addressed during the building permit process if not included on the plat. Additional comments are made regarding road conditions and emergency access. While there is adequate space for turnaround, concerns are noted about road usability in poor weather conditions. Ms. Jarrett raises a question regarding a railroad easement referenced in the title report. It is clarified that the easement applies to the remaining parcel and not the subdivision. Mr. Harmer requests a copy of the updated title report or documentation for the record.

The motion is made by Gene Jacobson to approve the application filed by Phillip Miller for a four lot small subdivision (Miller Meadows). The proposed subdivision is located North of Fairview (Indianola) in the Agriculture Zone. Lot one of 10.08 acres, lot 2 of 10.08 acres, lot 3 of 10.08 acres and lot 4 of 10.08 acres. ***Parcel #S-20164***

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

Justin Atkinson seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Further discussion occurs regarding parcel number 20164 and whether it reflects a full 80-acre parcel or is divided into smaller portions. It is clarified the parcel is approximately 76.97 acres due to the railroad right-of-way. It is suggested that the title policy likely reflects the entire parcel, and that the applicant may either provide an updated title report specific to the subdivision parcel or have the surveyor depict the railroad easement on the final plat.

**Discussion and possible approval for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Hawks Hollow) application by Verlyn Hawks. The proposed subdivision is located south of Spring City in the Agriculture zone. Lot- 1 of 19.67 acres. Parcel #S-27338**

Ms. Sorensen presents the item and states the applicant has completed the subdivision application and submitted all required documents, including a plat map, owner affidavit, septic tank permit, and water right documentation. The well is existing on site and has been in place for several years. Power is available on site, road access has been reviewed and approved, and a power feasibility letter has been submitted. A title search has been completed, and all taxes are current. The property is not located within a floodplain. All fees have been paid, and the application has been approved by the County Recorder and Address Coordinator. The property is also located within the Wildland Urban Interface. Ms. Jarrett asks for clarification regarding the power line and whether it is installed underground. It is explained that the power line runs overhead to a certain point and then transitions underground from the split between neighboring properties. Discussion follows noting that the power infrastructure has been in place for approximately 10–15 years, with one member recalling installation around 2012. It is also noted that an easement exists for the placement of the power line and that the installation was coordinated with an adjacent property owner. Mr. Jacobson comments that he reviewed the application in detail and was unable to find any deficiencies, noting that the submission meets the County's ordinance requirements. Appreciation is expressed for the completeness and accuracy of the application, as it allows the Board to move forward efficiently.

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

The motion is made by Gene Jacobson to approve the application filed by Verlyn Hawks for a one lot major subdivision (Hawks Hollow). The proposed subdivision is located south of Spring City in the Agriculture zone. Lot 1 of 19.67 acres. *Parcel # S-27338*.

Claudia Jarrett seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

**Discussion and preliminary approval for a 2- lot Major Subdivision (Sterling Meadows Subdivision) application by Sam Maestas. The proposed subdivision is located north of Sterling in the RA-1 zone. Lot- 1 of 1.25 acres and lot- 2 of 1.25 acres. Parcel #S-7254**

Sam Maestas is present. Ms. Sorensen presents the item and states Sam has begun the subdivision application process and is still working through portions of the review. He has submitted a plat map, owner's affidavit, city buffer zone form, and a site plan. A septic tank permit has been approved by the Health Department. A well has already been drilled on the property, and Sam explained he is seeking preliminary approval before moving forward with installing water lines to the additional lots. He indicated he does have water rights, consisting of approximately 0.45 acre-feet of well water, along with irrigation water, similar to other recent subdivisions discussed by the Commission. Road access has been signed off by police, fire, and ambulance services. A title search has been submitted, taxes have been paid to date, and a stormwater plan has been provided along with a letter from the project's engineer. Staff review has been completed, including feedback from planning and the address coordinator, and several revisions have been made following prior comments, including correcting document placement issues. Mr. Harmer starts the discussion regarding how the irrigation water will be tied to the property. It is explained that Sam is proposing to place the irrigation shares into a homeowners association (HOA), with the water being owned collectively by the HOA and assigned to the individual lots. The Commission discusses at length the challenges associated with irrigation shares, noting that they are considered real property and can legally be transferred, even if initially tied to a subdivision. Concerns are raised that methods such as tying water to a deed or relying on irrigation company agreements are not fully enforceable, as shares can still be sold or transferred after approval. It is discussed that without a stronger

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

mechanism, a future buyer could unknowingly purchase a lot without sufficient water, creating potential legal and development issues. Alternative approaches are discussed, including requiring a contract with the County to bind the water rights more securely. It is suggested that a County contract could provide stronger enforcement and legal recourse if the water were separated from the property. However, it is also acknowledged that this approach has not yet been fully implemented and would require further coordination with the County Attorney. The Commission notes that this topic has been an ongoing discussion and that similar subdivisions, including Golden Acres, have recently utilized the HOA structure as the most practical solution currently available. It is agreed that while the HOA method is not entirely foolproof, it provides the best level of protection under the current ordinance and practices. Additional discussion touches on the possibility of noting water rights on deeds to improve transparency during property transfers, though it is acknowledged this still does not fully prevent separation of water from the land. Ms. Jarrett notes the easements identified in the title report and that there are recorded easements, including irrigation-related easements, that are referenced in the title search but are not clearly depicted on the plat. Sam explains the general location of the irrigation lines and acknowledges that the easements can be more clearly identified. The Commission advises that all easements should either be shown directly on the plat with clear labeling or referenced in a dedicated note that corresponds with recorded documents. It is further clarified that if irrigation or utility lines fall within an existing public utility easement (PUE), that relationship should be clearly indicated. Concerns are raised that the current plat does not provide enough clarity to easily identify where these easements are located, which could create confusion for future development or property owners. Sam agrees to revise the plat to clearly show the location of the irrigation lines and include appropriate references. The Commission then discusses the location of the well and the requirement for a 100-foot protection radius. It is noted that the well location must meet setback requirements and remain within property boundaries to avoid conflicts with neighboring parcels. Concern is raised that the current placement may not fully meet the required separation distances, particularly in relation to adjacent properties. The potential issue of impacting future development on neighboring land is also discussed, especially if septic systems or other improvements are later installed nearby. Sam acknowledges the

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

concern and agrees to verify the well location and ensure that the required 100-foot protection radius is fully contained and compliant. A discrepancy is also identified between the lot labeling on the plat and the shared well agreement. The plat labels the lots numerically, while the shared well agreement references them alphabetically. The Commission notes that this inconsistency could lead to confusion or legal issues if not corrected. Sam acknowledges the error and agrees to revise the documents so that all lot designations are consistent across the plat and supporting agreements. Sam reiterates that he is requesting preliminary approval in order to secure financing for the project and proceed with infrastructure improvements, including water and power installation. He explains that he has already coordinated with the power company and that plans for electrical service have been prepared. The Commission acknowledges that this is a preliminary review and clarifies that the application will need to return for final approval once all required revisions and additional documentation have been completed. Overall, the Commission recognizes the effort that has gone into preparing the application and notes that several key items still need to be addressed prior to final approval. These include clearly defining how irrigation water will be legally tied to the property through the HOA structure, ensuring all easements are properly identified and labeled on the plat, verifying that the well location meets all setback and protection requirements, and correcting inconsistencies in lot labeling across documents. The Commission indicates that once these items are resolved, the application can move forward in the approval process.

The motion is made by Cody Harmer to approve the Preliminary Plat application filed by Sam Maestas for a 2-lot Major Subdivision (Sterling Meadows Subdivision). The proposed subdivision is located north of Sterling in the RA-1 zone. Lot- 1 of 1.25 acres and lot- 2 of 1.25 acres. **Parcel #S-7254** with corrections noted, easements, and verification of source protection.

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

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

Sam raises a question regarding the requirement for a 100-foot well protection radius, noting that in a previous meeting it had been stated that such a requirement may not be explicitly outlined in the ordinance. He clarifies that his question is not an objection, but rather an effort to better understand how the requirement is being applied. Sam explains that he is trying to reconcile how the County can advise or expect something that may not be clearly required within the ordinance, particularly as he works through planning and explaining the process. Sam expresses concern about the timing of approvals and the potential financial risk involved. He explains that, for example, an applicant may seek preliminary approval in order to secure financing, proceed with drilling a well and installing infrastructure, and then later be denied by the Health Department if the well placement does not meet required standards. He questions why the County would grant preliminary approval if there is still a possibility that another agency could deny a critical component of the project after significant money has already been spent. In response, it is clarified that because the 100-foot well protection radius is not explicitly stated within the subdivision ordinance, the County cannot formally require it as part of the subdivision approval process. Instead, it is being presented as a recommendation or advisory measure intended to help applicants avoid future complications. The intent is to prevent situations where a well is installed in a location that could conflict with neighboring properties or fail to meet Health Department requirements, which would ultimately delay or prevent final approval. It is further explained that this guidance is meant to protect applicants by identifying potential issues early in the process, even if it cannot be enforced at the preliminary stage. The County is attempting to avoid scenarios where applicants rely on preliminary approval, invest in infrastructure, and then encounter avoidable setbacks during final review. The discussion concludes with the understanding that the 100-foot well protection radius is not a formal requirement under the current ordinance, but rather a strong recommendation or warning provided to help ensure compliance and prevent future conflicts. The situation is compared to other advisory measures, such as fence line agreements, where guidance is offered to reduce the likelihood of disputes or complications later in the development process.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

**Discussion of concept review for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Sterling Lakeview Subdivision) application by Sam Maestas. The proposed subdivision is located north of Sterling in the RA-2 zone. Lot- 1 of 3.62 acres. Parcel #S-7256X5**

Ms. Sorensen presented the item as a continued concept review, noting that the application is currently under review and largely unchanged from the applicant's previous submission. Mr. Maestas explained that the only modification made was the addition of an extra hammerhead turnaround, including a hammerhead-style roundabout at the top of the development. While this addition was not required, the applicant included it due to having sufficient space. All other aspects of the proposal remain consistent with what had previously been reviewed, including existing power and infrastructure already in place. The applicant requested consideration for preliminary approval in order to proceed with securing financing through a lender. It was clarified that the primary outstanding item is the assignment of water rights to the property. While the water right is currently tied to the well, it has not yet been formally assigned for domestic use to the lots within the subdivision. The applicant explained that the well currently has three shares associated with it, and while two shares reflect domestic use tied to other landowners, the subject property's share has not yet been formally assigned. The applicant indicated that a change application will need to be submitted to convert irrigation use to domestic use, though the water rights are already physically tied to the well.

Discussion followed regarding the layout of the infrastructure shown on the plat. Mr. Jacobson questions how water would be delivered to individual lots, particularly given the existing 66-foot road and public utility easement. While the applicant stated that utilities would run through the existing easement, it was recommended that the plat more clearly illustrate the path of the water lines to avoid confusion for future property owners. Mr. Jacobson emphasized that clearly depicting utility connections on the plat would prevent misunderstandings and reduce the need for interpretation by engineers or future buyers. Ms. Jarrett raises concerns regarding inconsistencies in the shared well agreement, specifically the labeling of lots as both alphabetical and numerical (e.g., Lot A vs. Lot 1). Mr. Maestas acknowledged the discrepancy and agreed to correct the documentation to ensure consistency across all materials. The title report was also discussed, as it references multiple recorded easements, including irrigation easements associated with North Six Mile Creek and other

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

entities. While the applicant noted that no physical irrigation lines currently exist on the upper portion of the property, it was clarified that recorded easements still apply regardless of current use. The Commission advised that all recorded easements be clearly identified either on the plat itself or within a title block or addendum, including references to recording information. It was further recommended that the applicant verify the exact location and extent of these easements, as some may apply to portions or potentially all of the property, which could impact buildable areas. Mr. Maestas agreed to work with his engineer to incorporate this information, either directly on the plat or as an attached addendum if space is limited. It was also suggested that the applicant consult the irrigation company to better define the location of any existing or future lines and ensure alignment with recorded easements. Mr. Jacobson recommends regarding geotechnical considerations. Based on observation of the site's soil conditions and terrain, concerns were raised about potential soil stability and compaction, particularly in elevated or bluff areas. It was suggested that the applicant consider obtaining a geotechnical report to evaluate soil conditions prior to development. While not currently required, the Commission noted that doing so could help prevent future structural issues and reduce liability for both the developer and the County. As the discussion concluded, Mr. Maestas reiterated his request for preliminary approval to assist with financing. However, it was determined that the item had been submitted and advertised as a concept review, not as a preliminary plat, and therefore could not be formally approved at this time. The Commission agreed that the application appears close to meeting preliminary requirements, with the primary outstanding items being the water rights assignment, clarification of easements, and minor document corrections. The Commission supported moving the item forward to the next meeting as a properly advertised preliminary plat. It was discussed that preliminary approval could potentially be granted at that time, possibly with conditions such as submission of a water rights change application. In the meantime, the applicant was encouraged to continue working on the required updates, including initiating the change application for water rights, revising the plat to clearly show utility locations, correcting documentation inconsistencies, and verifying easement details. No formal motion was made on the item. However, the Commission reached a general

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

consensus that the application, once updated and properly advertised, appears to be in a position to be considered for preliminary approval at the next meeting.

## **Discussion and possible approval of a Conditional Use Permit for Birch Creek Service Ranch application by Eric Peterson.**

Ms. Sorensen introduced the item for discussion and possible approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the Birch Creek Service Ranch application submitted by Eric Peterson. It was noted that Steve Peterson, Eric Peterson's father, was present as the applicant's representative. Ms. Sorensen explained that a previous Conditional Use Permit had been approved in 2015 (later referenced as 2018) for a single bunkhouse measuring approximately 470 square feet; however, that structure was never constructed. The current application proposes an expansion of that original concept, now requesting approval for four bunkhouses, each approximately 1,080 square feet. It was noted during discussion that "bunkhouse" is not currently defined within the County's ordinance, though updates to definitions are anticipated in a future ordinance amendment. Staff and Commission members reviewed the application materials, including the site plan showing existing structures and the proposed locations of the new bunkhouses. It was noted that the property includes an existing residence and additional outbuildings. Water availability was discussed, with the applicant indicating that a well is in place and that approximately 1.74 acre-feet of water is associated with the property. Concerns were raised regarding the property's location within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). Commissioners emphasized the importance of addressing fire safety requirements, particularly in relation to vegetation management and defensible space. While the site was described as visually ideal and well-suited for the proposed use, it was noted that some vegetation specifically cedar trees may need to be removed or managed to meet fire safety standards. The Commission recommended that the applicant coordinate with the appropriate officials, including the building department and fire authorities, to conduct a site inspection. This would help identify necessary mitigation measures, such as establishing defensible space, removing hazardous vegetation, and ensuring compliance with fire protection requirements. It was noted that these requirements may extend beyond standard building permit conditions and could significantly impact the layout and overall

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

aesthetic of the property. Ms. Sorensen asked for clarification regarding the submitted floor plan, noting that it includes a kitchenette, bathroom, sleeping area, and dining space, and questioned whether that layout reflects what the applicant intends to construct. Mr. Harmer responded by stating that the County does not currently require 1.74 acre-feet of water for part-time use. Ms. Sorensen pointed out that the application indicates an intent to operate year-round, to which Mr. Harmer clarified that the use would not be continuous. He further noted that the permit should clearly define the number of days of operation if it is to be considered part-time. Mr. Jacobson stated that part-time approvals are no longer being granted and raised questions about whether the water system could be improved, specifically asking if the storage tank could be elevated to increase pressure. Mr. Day explained that water pressure increases by approximately 43 pounds per 100 feet of elevation, and discussion continued regarding the adequacy and distribution of water on the site. Ms. Jarrett raised concerns about the definition of “bunkhouse,” stating that it should be limited to sleeping purposes only and should not include additional facilities such as kitchens or bathrooms. She noted that if those types of amenities are included, the structures would more appropriately be classified as lodging rather than bunkhouses. Mr. Harmer asked what definitions currently exist within the ordinance, and Ms. Sorensen responded that “sleeping unit” and “boarding house” are defined, but “bunkhouse” is not. Ms. Jarrett clarified that the applicant’s intent is to operate a “Service Ranch,” while Mr. Harmer noted that although the applicant had previously been advised to update their Conditional Use Permit under that classification, the current ordinance no longer includes “Service Ranch” as a defined use. As a result, the Conditional Use Permit would need to be updated to reflect a use that aligns with current ordinance definitions. Further clarification was made by Ms. Jarrett that the Commission is effectively considering the originally approved bunkhouse from the 2018 Conditional Use Permit, which was never constructed. Mr. Peterson explained that although approval was granted at that time, the project was not completed, and when the applicant returned with a revised proposal, the ordinance and definitions had since changed. He added that his son had previously presented the updated proposal to the Commission, but it could not move forward due to the need for updated definitions. Mr. Jacobson asked whether the next step would require a public hearing, and Ms. Sorensen confirmed that it would, noting

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

that the earliest it could be scheduled would be July. Ms. Jarrett recommended that the County Attorney review the matter to ensure the County is proceeding appropriately given the ordinance changes. Additional discussion revisited a prior agreement with a neighboring property owner referenced in earlier approvals, though it remained unclear whether that agreement is still valid or applicable. Commissioners also emphasized the need for further review of water shares and supporting documentation to ensure compliance. Mr. Jacobson suggested consulting with the Central Utah Health Department to determine requirements related to occupancy levels for the proposed use. Mr. Harmer reiterated that a key issue to resolve is whether the units will be limited to sleeping only or include kitchenettes and bathrooms, as that distinction affects how the use is classified. Mr. Jacobson expressed that if the County intends to support business development, it should consider allowing the expanded use. However, Ms. Sorensen pointed out that Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are not permitted within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), and again questioned whether the inclusion of kitchenettes would conflict with that limitation. Mr. Day noted that recent legislative changes affecting Conditional Use Permits will take effect on May 7, which may impact how this application is processed moving forward. Mr. Harmer suggested that the County consider formally adding a definition for “bunkhouse” to the ordinance to provide clarity for future applications. The discussion concluded with ongoing consideration of how to properly define both “Service Ranch” and “bunkhouse,” and how those definitions will guide the review and potential approval of the application. Overall, the discussion focused on ensuring that the expanded proposal aligns with safety standards, ordinance requirements, and site-specific constraints. Further coordination with staff and applicable agencies was encouraged before final consideration of approval.

## **Approval of March Minutes**

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission minutes from March 03, 2026, with no corrections.

Justin Atkinson seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

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

This item began with Ms. Sorensen reporting on a recent Zoom meeting she had with FEMA's Water Plan Management Program regarding Sanpete County's current floodplain management practices and permitting status. During that discussion, it was identified that while some municipalities, such as Manti City, have made updates to their floodplain ordinances and mapping, Sanpete County itself does not currently have an adopted floodplain permit system in place at the county level. Ms. Sorensen explained that FEMA initiated a new floodplain study in 2022, which is expected to continue through approximately 2028. In the interim, the County is required to rely on both the existing Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) and preliminary or evolving study data. Because of this, there may be areas not currently designated within the floodplain that could be identified as such in the future. She emphasized that the County should begin incorporating disclosures or documentation into development review processes indicating that certain properties may be subject to future floodplain designation based on ongoing FEMA studies. Mr. Jacobson noted that in areas such as Fountain Green, some property owners have individually worked with FEMA to pursue floodplain exemptions. However, this approach is inconsistent and does not replace the need for a formalized countywide framework. Ms. Jarrett stated that after reviewing FEMA-provided materials, she identified that only a portion of the recommended ordinance language directly applies to Planning Commission responsibilities—specifically, standards related to subdivision proposals. She outlined that FEMA guidance requires subdivision applications to meet development permit standards intended to minimize flood damage. This includes incorporating mapped flood hazard zones from the effective FIRM into preliminary plats, generating Base Flood Elevation (BFE) data for larger developments (those exceeding 50 lots or 5 acres, whichever is less), ensuring adequate drainage systems to reduce flood risk, and designing public utilities and infrastructure—such as sewer, gas, electrical, and water systems—in a way that minimizes or eliminates potential flood damage. She further stated that FEMA is recommending the County designate a Floodplain Administrator to oversee compliance and implementation of these requirements. Mr. Atkinson questioned whether establishing such a role is mandatory, noting the potential administrative burden. Ms. Sorensen responded that the County's last comprehensive floodplain-related effort was

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

completed in 2012, and updating these processes would likely be necessary to remain aligned with FEMA expectations and future eligibility requirements. Ms. Jarrett suggested that the Floodplain Administrator role could logically be housed within the Building Department, given its involvement in permitting and inspections. However, Mr. Harmer expressed concern about adding additional layers of regulation, noting the potential impact on both residents and the Planning Commission in terms of increased requirements and oversight. To move the discussion forward, Ms. Jarrett recommended that the County Attorney review the FEMA-provided ordinance language in detail to determine what elements are required, what is optional, and what is appropriate for Sanpete County specifically. The Commission generally agreed with this approach. The outlined next steps include having the County Attorney evaluate and propose ordinance language, followed by Planning Commission review and discussion of those recommendations. Any proposed ordinance amendments would then proceed through the required public hearing process before the Planning Commission, and subsequently to the County Commission for final consideration and adoption.

Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification regarding when a secondary access (egress) is required for subdivisions, noting that some subdivisions have been approved without a secondary exit while others have been required to include one. His question centered on whether the requirement is universally applied or determined on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Harmer responded that the requirement is not automatic for every subdivision but is instead governed by the County's Roadway and Construction Manual, specifically tied to projected traffic volumes, or Average Daily Traffic (ADT). He indicated that roadway design standards, including the need for additional access points, should be based on those thresholds rather than applied inconsistently. Mr. Atkinson added that the manual also outlines requirements related to road length and when turnarounds are necessary. He emphasized that the primary concern is public safety—particularly in subdivisions with a higher concentration of homes where relying on a single point of ingress and egress could create access issues for emergency services. Mr. Harmer agreed, stating that there needs to be a clearly defined and consistently applied standard, and reiterated that tying requirements such as secondary access

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

April 07, 2026 6:30 P.M.

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

to ADT is the most objective way to do so. To provide context, Mr. Atkinson read directly from the Roadway and Construction Manual regarding cul-de-sac streets and turnaround requirements. The manual states that cul-de-sacs should generally be avoided, but when they are the only feasible option, a turnaround must be provided. For bulb-type turnarounds, the minimum road surface diameter is eighty (80) feet, with a minimum right-of-way diameter of one hundred (100) feet. As an alternative, hammerhead turnarounds may be used, with three acceptable configurations outlined in Figure 7 of the manual. He further noted that roads extending more than six hundred (600) feet and terminating in a turnaround must incorporate wildfire mitigation measures. These may include fire cistern storage, fuel breaks, and tree thinning, as determined by the Sanpete County Fire Authority or the applicable Fire Protection District. Additionally, adequate snow storage must be provided to ensure that turnarounds remain accessible year-round. The manual also clearly states that dead-end roads without a turnaround are not permitted under any circumstances. Mr. Atkinson concluded by emphasizing that these standards are fundamentally tied to fire safety and emergency access, reinforcing the importance of proper roadway design in subdivision planning.

### **Adjournment**

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

Cody Harmer seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed, and the motion passes. The meeting is adjourned at 9:21PM.