

1  
2  
3 MINUTES  
4 MONROE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
5 May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2026



6 **1. Meeting called to order- Prayer- Roll call.**

7 The regular meeting of the Monroe City Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Talon Gadd on  
8 May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2026, at 7:00 P.M. Opening prayer was offered by Commissioner Riddle

9 Present:

10 Commissioners:

11 Talon Gadd

12 David Riddle-excused

13 Riley Lindsay

14 Lance Roberts

15 Amy Moore

16  
17 Citizens:

18 Candice Barney

19 Michael Mathie

20 Cindy Kent

21 Kraig Nilsson

22 Perry Payne

23 Prescott McCarthy

24 Wendy Parsons

25 Scott Parsons

26 Steve Eyre

27 Lori Eyre

28 Jason Webb

29 Ralph Eyre

30 Rex Morrisson

31 Joy Lundgreen

32 Stephanie Elliott

33 Tyrell Bagley

34  
35 **2. Approval of previous meeting minutes April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2026.**

36 The minutes from the April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2026, meeting were presented for approval. No corrections or concerns were  
37 raised by any commissioner.

38 **Motion to approve the minutes from the April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2026, meeting was made by Commissioner Lindsay and**  
39 **seconded by Commissioner Roberts. The motion carried unanimously.**

40 **3. Citizens' comments.**

Planning Commission Minutes  
May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2026  
Public Hearing

41 No citizens who were present had comments.

42 **4. Welcome newest member of the Monroe City Planning Commission- Amy Moore.**

43 The Commission welcomed its newest member, Amy Moore. Commissioner Moore introduced herself, noting  
44 that she grew up in the valley, currently teaches at South Sevier Middle School, and previously served as the  
45 Elsinore Town Treasurer for approximately 15 years, during which time she also recorded minutes for the  
46 Elsinore Planning and Zoning Commission. The Chair expressed appreciation for her joining the board.

47 **5. Prescott McCarthy- Future Subdivision Discussion.**

48 Prescott McCarthy presented a conceptual plan for a future subdivision on an approximately 8-acre portion of  
49 the Hot Spring property, located near Red Hill on the east side of Monroe. The proposal, identified as Phase 1,  
50 contemplates 19 lots at approximately 0.3 acres each. The layout is designed to extend a road north-to-south  
51 to allow potential future phases connecting to adjacent parcels to the south, with a long-range vision of  
52 developing a broader neighborhood east and southeast of the Peterson property and the cemetery.

53 McCarthy indicated he was seeking early feedback from the Commission to determine whether any significant  
54 obstacles existed before pursuing acquisition of the land.

55 The Commission's discussion touched on several key considerations:

56 **Water Pressure:** Commissioner Moore raised a concern about water pressure, given the property's uphill  
57 location relative to the rest of the city. McCarthy indicated his understanding was that the city's water  
58 pressure reaches that area and noted that a proposed new water tank would add pressure to the system. It  
59 was acknowledged that this should be verified, and staff indicated the information may be available on the  
60 city website through an existing study. It was noted that anything above 300 East has historically had lower  
61 water pressure.

62 **Geological Hazard Disclosure:** Staff confirmed that any property above 300 East is required to sign a  
63 geological hazard disclosure. It was noted that Monroe City now requires this document to be notarized,  
64 signed, and recorded with the title so that it appears in future title searches for subsequent owners.

65 **Drainage Ditch:** McCarthy identified a drainage ditch crossing through the property and asked whether it  
66 could be paved over or would require a bridge. Staff recommended consulting with John Draper, noting that a  
67 waterway pass-through or bridge could be viable options.

68 **Road Surface:** McCarthy raised the possibility of using crushed granite or an alternative to asphalt, consistent  
69 with a more natural, foothills aesthetic he envisions for the development. The Commission acknowledged this  
70 desire but noted that current ordinances require asphalt. Commissioner Moore and staff noted that a variance  
71 would be difficult to justify on those grounds, but that the ordinance could potentially be amended, or the  
72 matter discussed with the City Council and Public Works. It was also noted that if the road is to be dedicated  
73 to the city, it must be maintainable by the city long-term, which is the primary rationale for the asphalt  
74 requirement.

75 **Infrastructure:** It was noted that water infrastructure and existing pavement appear to end near the  
76 subdivision at 540 East, meaning McCarthy would need to extend both to the development site. Sidewalk

77 requirements were discussed, with the understanding that curb, gutter, and sidewalk would be required  
78 within the platted parcels.

79 The Commission offered no objections in principle to the project moving forward, provided it complies with  
80 the subdivision application requirements. McCarthy was encouraged to review the subdivision guidelines and  
81 proceed accordingly.

82  
83 **6. Public Hearing. The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments regarding proposed amendments**  
84 **to the Monroe City Land Use Zoning Ordinance Proposed amendments to Title 13.6.4- Zoning District uses**  
85 **to include additional uses such as liquor store, etc.**

86 **The regular Monroe City Planning Commission meeting was closed at 7:15 and the public hearing was**  
87 **opened.**

88 The Chair opened the public hearing to receive comments regarding proposed amendments to the Monroe  
89 City Land Use Zoning Ordinance, Title 13.6.4, to include a liquor store as a permitted use.

90 The owners of the Monroe City gas station presented their proposal to utilize the east side apartment portion  
91 of the gas station as a retail package liquor agency. They clarified emphatically that the proposed business  
92 would be a retail liquor sales establishment — not a bar — with its own separate entrance on the east side of  
93 the building. Plans were described to potentially expand the square footage to approximately 2,200 square  
94 feet by squaring off the building. The owners expressed that this addition is intended to help sustain the  
95 viability of the gas station business.

96 Several public comments and questions were raised:

97 A nearby resident noted concerns about increased traffic on what is already a busy residential street,  
98 referencing the traffic increase that accompanied the development of the hot pots. The owners acknowledged  
99 some traffic increase would be expected but pointed out that customers currently purchasing alcohol are  
100 already traveling to Salina to do so, meaning much of the traffic would be redirected rather than newly  
101 generated.

102 A question was raised regarding the viability of the venture given the closure of similar stores in the region.  
103 The owners clarified that those stores were not closed voluntarily — they were shut down — and that all were  
104 reportedly under the same ownership. The owners indicated they have gauged community interest through  
105 social media and received a strong, positive response of hundreds of comments.

106 It was noted that a package agency is already under construction in Richfield, and that the next closest liquor  
107 store to the south is in Panguitch. The owners noted they serve tourists from multiple surrounding  
108 communities including Elsinore, Marysvale, Joseph, and others.

109 Staff clarified that Monroe City currently has no ordinance whatsoever addressing liquor sales — beer is  
110 addressed separately — and that this public hearing is specifically to consider whether liquor sales should be  
111 added to the land use code. It was further clarified that this action would not grant the applicants permission  
112 to open; they would still be required to meet all state licensing requirements administered by the Department

113 of Alcoholic Beverage Control (DABC), including distance requirements from schools and population-based  
114 licensing thresholds.

115 A question was raised as to whether the Commercial Residential zone — where the gas station is located — is  
116 the most appropriate zone for such a use, or whether another zone might be more suitable. Staff noted there  
117 is no zone in Monroe City designated as purely commercial; the Commercial Residential zone is the city's  
118 primary retail zone. It was also noted that any business seeking to open a liquor store in the future would still  
119 need to come before the Commission for approval.

120 **No other comments were made.**

121 **The public hearing was closed at 7:29 PM and the regular Monroe City Planning Commission Meeting was**  
122 **opened at 7:29 PM.**

123 **7. Consider proposed amendments to Title 13.6.4- Zoning District uses to include additional uses to as**  
124 **liquor store, etc.**

125 The Commission deliberated on whether to recommend adding a liquor store as a use within the Monroe City  
126 Land Use Ordinance.

127 Commissioner Lindsay noted that because there is no purely commercial zone in Monroe City, the Commercial  
128 Residential zone is effectively the only viable location for such a use, and that it would be appropriate for any  
129 liquor retail to fit within the same commercial framework as other retail establishments already operating in  
130 town.

131 Commissioner Roberts acknowledged the difficulty in balancing business, growth, and moral perspectives but  
132 noted that prior research — including a conversation with the Sheriff — found no data suggesting that a  
133 package agency would increase DUIs or public safety incidents. He noted that the Commission's role is to  
134 weigh what is best for the community as a whole.

135 Staff clarified that the action before the Commission was not to grant approval for a specific location or  
136 business, but simply to determine whether to add liquor store retail as a use category within the city's land  
137 use ordinance, and if so, under what classification. A member of the public with planning knowledge  
138 recommended designating it as a conditional use rather than a permitted use, so that the city retains the  
139 ability to impose conditions or deny individual applications based on project-specific merits.

140 The Commission agreed that conditional use designation within the Commercial Residential zone was the  
141 appropriate path forward, and that the detailed ordinance language could be developed subsequently with  
142 reference to examples from comparable cities such as Centerfield and Monticello. The recommendation  
143 would then proceed to the City Council for final action.

144 **Motion to recommend that liquor store retail be added to the Monroe City Land Use Ordinance as a**  
145 **conditional use within the Commercial Residential zone to the Monroe City Council was made by**  
146 **Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Moore. The motion carried unanimously.**

147 **8. Consider recommendation of WUI map.**

148 Tyler Timmons of Sevier County Regional Council presented background on the Wildland-Urban Interface  
149 (WUI) matter. He explained that House Bill 48, passed by the Utah Legislature in 2025, created new  
150 requirements for municipalities, and that a separate annual cooperative wildfire suppression agreement  
151 between Monroe City and the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands requires the city to adopt a WUI map  
152 and corresponding building code.

153 Timmons explained that two maps were presented: (1) a state-generated map identifying areas the state has  
154 designated as high wildfire risk within Monroe City's boundaries, and (2) a broader risk-scored map based on  
155 data from wildfirerisktool.gov, from which a threshold of risk score 5 and above was suggested as a reasonable  
156 minimum standard by the state's forestry contact.

157 Key points discussed included:

158 The adoption of a WUI map designates where new construction must comply with either the 2006 or 2024  
159 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code. This applies only to new construction; existing homes are  
160 grandfathered and unaffected. General contractors consulted indicated that most new construction already  
161 substantially complies with the code's requirements. The code focuses on items such as defensible space,  
162 wood pile placement, and open cable protection, and does not include requirements such as rooftop sprinkler  
163 systems.

164 Timmons clarified that a state-assessed fee is being levied on property owners within the state-designated  
165 high-risk zone regardless of any action Monroe City takes — that fee is entirely outside the city's control. The  
166 city's WUI ordinance designation only affects which areas will be subject to the additional building code  
167 requirements, enforced through the county building inspection process via Jason Mackelprang.

168 The primary benefit of signing the cooperative agreement is protection from wildfire suppression cost liability.  
169 Timmons cited the example of Marysville, which was spared over \$200,000 in suppression costs from the  
170 Silver King Fire due to their participation in such an agreement.

171 The Commission agreed that adopting the minimum designation — the state-identified high-risk map — was  
172 the prudent starting point, noting that the ordinance could be expanded in the future if circumstances or  
173 legislation warrant. It was noted that the cooperative agreement itself should be signed by June 1st, with the  
174 formal map adoption and public hearing process to follow. The Commission recommended proceeding with  
175 the state-designated map as the city's WUI zone.

176 **Motion to recommend adopting the state-designated map as Monroe City's WUI area to the Monroe City**  
177 **Council was made by Commissioner Roberts and seconded by Commissioner Lindsay. The motion carried**  
178 **unanimously.**

179 **9. Discuss and set public hearing to Amend Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance.**

180 The Commission reviewed proposed amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance. Staff noted that  
181 the amendments — particularly those on pages 39–42 of the draft document — more clearly spell out  
182 requirements that the city may already impose under existing ordinance language, but which are not currently  
183 enumerated in detail. Notable additions include requirements for hydraulic modeling reports to assess  
184 impacts on the culinary water system from new subdivisions.

185 Commissioner Roberts highlighted the importance of the hydraulic modeling provision given ongoing concerns  
186 about water supply and pressure, particularly relevant to proposals like the McCarthy subdivision which would  
187 not have irrigation water and would place a higher demand on the culinary system.

188 Commissioner Moore raised the concern that without the updated ordinance in place, requirements such as a  
189 hydrological study could potentially be overlooked in the checklist process. Staff and Tyler Timmons both  
190 clarified that the city can already request such studies under existing "may require" language; the  
191 amendments simply make these requirements explicit and systematic.

192 The Commission determined it would benefit from a work session prior to the public hearing to review the  
193 proposed changes in depth. After discussion regarding scheduling in light of potential City Council meeting  
194 cancellations in June, the Commission agreed to hold a work session at 6:00 PM on June 16th, immediately  
195 preceding the regularly scheduled planning commission meeting, and to hold the public hearing that same  
196 evening.

197 **Motion to hold a work session at 6:00 PM on June 16th, 2026, and to hold a public hearing on the proposed**  
198 **Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance amendments that same evening was made by Commissioner Roberts**  
199 **and seconded by Commissioner Lindsay. The motion carried unanimously.**

200 **10. Other Business.**

201 A member of the public provided an additional comment relating to Item 6, noting that state law permits one  
202 package agency per every 18,000 persons of the state population, and that the DABC administers this  
203 threshold. Staff confirmed this is set by the DABC. It was noted that existing agencies in Salina, Centerfield,  
204 and Ephraim are in the vicinity, with a proposed agency in Richfield also under consideration. The Commission  
205 acknowledged this as a relevant factor for the DABC licensing process.

206 **No other business was discussed.**

207 **11. Adjournment.**

208 **Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Roberts. The motion**  
209 **carried unanimously.**

210 **The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.**