

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Attendees: Planning Commission Chair Cody Harmer, Board Members: Claudia Jarrett, Gene Jacobson, Justin Atkinson, Jo-Anne Riley and Rick Allred. Also in attendance is Sanpete County Commissioner Mike Bennett, Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorenson, Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Heather Pyper, Sanpete County Recorder Talisha Johnson. Board Member Dallin Carter has 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.

Jo-Anne Riley seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed and the motion passes. Vote by voice: Gene Jacobson, yes; Claudia Jarrett, yes; Jo-Anne Riley, yes; Justin Atkinson, yes; Rick Allred, yes.

## **Welcoming and swearing in of Planning Commission member Rick Allred.**

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

**Public hearing to consider and potentially recommend for approval of ordinance changes to the Sanpete County Land Use Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance. The items are as followed: 14.76.365 Wildland Urban Interface Code (WUI) and Amendments, remove \$500.00 refund and add options of Class 2 and Class 3 clarification; Add definitions in Land Use Ordinance 14.12.020 for, Service Ranch, Private Landing Strip and Bunkhouse; Add Private Landing Strip in Land Use Ordinance 14.26.010 Land Use Classification Matrix; In Subdivision Ordinance 13.20.030 Supporting Documents, add supporting documents from 2019 ordinance 13.24.070, items J, K, M, N, O; and in Subdivision Ordinance 13.34.010 Dry Subdivisions, change 3.O. Skyline Mountain Resort Area 2 and 3 (as defined in 2026 SMSSD Water Plan).**

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Mr. Harmer introduced the next item on the agenda, noting that the commission would review several proposed ordinance changes. Mr. Harmer turned the floor over to Heidi to introduce the specific items. Ms. Sorenson stated that the first item for consideration was an update to the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Code, Section 14.76.365. She explained that the proposed amendments would remove the \$500 refund provision, which is currently applied to building permit fees for the Wildland Urban Interface. She noted that the \$500 refund option would be eliminated, and the county would introduce the option for Class 2 and Class 3 structural clarifications within the WUI building code. She informed the commission that the building official was present to provide further technical details regarding these specific classifications. Mr. Harmer requested that the building official state his name for the record and verified that the microphone was functioning correctly. Scott Olson, Sanpete County Building Official, addressed the commission. Mr. Olson explained that the Building Department frequently handles Wildland Urban Interface requirements for construction within the county's wildland overlay zone. He noted that the existing ordinance was originally introduced as an amendment around the 2015–2016 timeframe and required updates to clarify language and better reflect current needs regarding wildland assessments. Mr. Olson introduced an additional update not previously mentioned, noting that the current ordinance references the 2006 Wildland Urban Interface Code, which was previously adopted and recognized by the State of Utah. Because the Utah State Legislature has approved the 2024 Wildland Urban Interface Code, the Building Department proposes removing the specific year "2006" from the ordinance. Instead of substituting it with "2024", which would necessitate regular amendments each time a new code cycle is adopted the proposed language will reference the "current state-adopted code." Mr. Olson clarified that this administrative change does not alter the county's code recognition; rather, it allows Sanpete County to automatically retro-adopt and enforce the specific code cycles approved by the state. Mr. Harmer asked the commission if there were any questions regarding the proposed code updates or the elimination of the \$500 refund fee. Mr. Olson clarified regarding the initial purpose of the \$500 refund fee and the specific differences between the building classes. Mr. Olson explained that the \$500 refund was originally implemented to incentivize builders to complete their construction projects within a three-year timeframe

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

while the county navigated the initial rollout of the Wildland Code. Because the county has matured past that introductory phase and has not increased its base wildland fees, the department proposes removing the refund option and retaining the flat \$1,000 wildland fee. Furthermore, Mr. Olson noted that recent state legislation will place significantly higher assessment and administrative requirements on the Building Department moving forward. Mr. Jacobson asks for clarification on the difference between the proposed classes. Mr. Olson explained that under the current amendment, the county applies a single, uniform standard requiring a Class 1 designation, which mandates a one-hour fire-rated structure for all exterior outlines within the WUI zone. The proposed Class 2 and Class 3 designations offer less stringent options. Under a Class 2 designation, the county mandates a one-hour exterior structural rating but exempts soffits and facias from the rating requirement, though decks must still remain fire-rated identical to Class 1. A Class 3 designation removes all fire-construction rating requirements entirely for the primary dwelling or cabin. Mr. Olson noted that these new designations grant the building official or the county fire warden the authority to evaluate individual lots case-by-case to determine if a project can be downgraded from a Class 1 to a Class 2 or Class 3 standard. He explained that when the county overlay zone was adopted in 2007, the straight mapping lines inadvertently included lower-elevation properties surrounded by cultivated agricultural fields. This modification provides a mechanism to fairly evaluate those specific areas. Mr. Jacobson asked if a property owner with an existing Class 1 build could request a retroactive reassessment to a Class 3 standard to alleviate rising insurance costs, and whether a specific vehicle or fee existed for such a request. Mr. Olson clarified that the code change is not retroactive and cannot be used to reclassify existing structures downward for insurance purposes. He emphasized that insurance providers evaluate their own independent mapping metrics, which will remain unaffected by this local building code interpretation. Mr. Harmer asked for clarification on whether the building inspector or the county fire warden holds the final authority to designate these classifications. Mr. Olson confirmed that the ultimate authority rolls back to the building official, but acts as a joint option executed in cooperation with the county fire warden. Mr. Harmer verified that the language would explicitly account for assessments by both individuals, and Mr. Olson confirmed that was correct. Mr. Harmer requested clarification regarding the state code

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

adoption, asking if the county has any legal alternative other than to adopt what the state mandates. Mr. Olson confirmed that the county is legally required to enforce state-adopted building codes. Mr. Harmer noted for the record that the amendment does not alter what is being adopted, but simply removes the specific year text from the ordinance to streamline future state updates. Mr. Jacobson shared a personal experience regarding a previous WUI construction project he completed, noting that the assessment process was efficient. He stated that the representative who performed the site evaluation provided clear, practical recommendations regarding the removal of specific trees and shrubs according to the matrix, which was incredibly helpful for a first-time builder trying to balance safety with property aesthetics. Mr. Jacobson extended a compliment to the Building Department for their professionalism, clear communication, and thorough follow-up inspections. Mr. Olson thanked the Mr. Jacobson and added that when these local amendments were originally drafted, the county had moved away from certain standard options within the model WUI code. He informed the commission that he recently held a consultative meeting with Tom Peterson, a state official overseeing fire assessments across Utah, and Max Lewis, the Sanpete County Fire Warden. Mr. Olson reported that both officials highly complimented Sanpete County's existing wildland regulations relative to the rest of the state and expressed full support for the proposed amendments currently under review. Mr. Harmer opened the floor to a public hearing and invited members of the public to speak, requesting that comments be limited to approximately three minutes. Kevin Merrithew stepped forward and stated his name for the record. Mr. Merrithew shared that he had completed the WUI building process, paid the \$1,000 fee, and subsequently experienced a total loss when his building burned down in a wildfire. He expressed concern regarding the fire safety standards in the county, stating that despite paying the \$1,000 fee under the impression it supported fire department development and firefighting capabilities, local fire departments lacked the necessary certifications to combat the wildfire. He argued that removing the \$500 refund option felt unjustified if property owners were paying substantial fees without receiving guaranteed fire protection. Mr. Jacobson noted that when he built his own cabin and signed his building permit, the documentation required a signed acknowledgement stating that the property was outside of first-tier fire protection zones. He explained that for many

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

subdivisions and rural parcels, the county requires this signed disclosure because it is fiscally and logistically impossible for local municipal fire departments to guarantee protection across remote areas of the county. He noted that property owners must accept that inherent risk to secure a building permit. Mr. Merrithew responded that property owners face a forced choice to sign the disclosure or forfeit their right to build. He then asked the commission and the building official to clarify exactly what the \$1,000 fee funds. Mr. Olson addressed Mr. Merrithew's question, explaining that the \$1,000 fee covers the internal administrative costs, personnel time, specialized training, certifications, and required plan reviews and on-site field inspections performed by the Building Department throughout the construction process. He reiterated that the fee was established in 2008 and has not been increased, despite rising operational costs. Mr. Olson added that less than half of permit holders successfully complete their projects within the three-year window required to qualify for the old refund. He emphasized that incoming state regulations will demand significantly more training hours and rigorous certifications for building department staff to execute the mandated wildland assessments. Mr. Merrithew requested that the county ensure a greater emphasis is placed on actual training and certification moving forward, acknowledging humorously that he was among those guilty of not completing permits within the three-year timeframe. Mr. Olson clarified that the \$1,000 fee is retained entirely within the Building Department budget to fund the training of building officials who oversee and enforce WUI code compliance; the revenue does not get distributed to individual local fire districts. Ms. Jarrett pointed out that County Commissioner Mike Bennett was present in the audience and suggested that Mr. Merrithew address broader county-wide fire district training, equipment, and certification concerns directly with him, as the county commission coordinates directly with the various fire departments and districts across the county. Mr. Merrithew thanked the commission for the information. Mr. Harmer asked if there were any other members of the public who wished to speak on the matter. Seeing none, the public comment portion for this item was concluded.

Mr. Harmer called for the commission to move to the next agenda item regarding Land Use Ordinance 14.12.020. Ms. Sorenson introduced the first proposed change, which seeks to add

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

a formal definition for a "service ranch" to the county's Land Use Ordinance. Under the proposed text, a service ranch is defined as a privately owned site designed, designated, maintained, intended, or used for the purpose of providing temporary housing, recreation, and service opportunities. Ms. Sorensen noted that permissible facilities on these sites may include bunkhouses, as well as central dining and meeting facilities. Mr. Harmer opened the floor to public comment regarding the service ranch definition. Seeing no response from the public, Mr. Harmer directed the commission to proceed to the next item. Ms. Sorenson presented the next proposed item under Land Use Ordinance 14.12.020, which is the addition of a definition for a "private landing strip." The proposed definition states that a private landing strip is an area of land designed for the takeoff and landing of aircraft that is restricted strictly to the owner's exclusive use or to individuals with specific authorization from the owner. The proposed regulatory standards restrict the surface composition of the landing strip to simple dirt, turf, grass, or gravel. Additionally, establishing a private landing strip requires a conditional use permit, is limited to specific zones identified within the ordinance, and is restricted exclusively to twin-engine propeller aircraft, explicitly prohibiting jet propulsion aircraft. The ordinance further bars any commercial aircraft operations, commercial takeoff or landing uses, or commercial business activities. Infrastructure restrictions prohibit aircraft fueling facilities, control towers, and other related airport improvements. The landing strip may allow for a maximum of two wind directional flags or indicators, not to exceed a maximum height of 15 feet. One aircraft storage hangar for private use is permitted, subject to obtaining a standard building permit. Ms. Sorenson concluded by noting that this use would be added to the county land use matrix to be allowed within the agricultural zone and the sensitive land zone. Mr. Harmer requested public comment or concerns regarding the landing strip definition and its inclusion in the zoning matrix. Hearing no comments, Mr. Harmer closed the discussion on the item. Ms. Sorenson introduced the final definition update under Land Use Ordinance 14.12.020, which defines a "bunkhouse" as a simple building offering basic sleeping accommodations, which may be configured either with or without a bathroom. Mr. Harmer opened the floor to the public for any comments, concerns, or testimonies regarding this definition. No members of the public came forward, and the commission moved to the next agenda item. Subdivision Ordinance

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

13.20.030: Reinstatement of Supporting Documents The commission turned its attention to Subdivision Ordinance 13.20.030 regarding supporting documents. Ms. Sorenson explained that the Building and Zoning Department proposes reinstating specific supporting document requirements from the county's 2019 ordinance—specifically Section 13.24.070, items J, K, M, N, and O. Heidi noted that when the subdivision ordinance was comprehensively updated in the past, these critical informational items were inadvertently omitted, and the department determined that reinstating them would provide necessary clarity and utility for the county. At the request of Mr. Harmer to ensure the items were properly established in the official record, Ms. Sorenson read the specific sections into the transcript. Item J requires copies of protective covenants, deed restrictions, trust agreements, and homeowners association articles and bylaws, including those required by the Board of County Commissioners, to govern the future use of water and sewer systems, resubdivision, open space, and any potential changes that might significantly alter the subdivision as originally approved by the Board of County Commissioners relative to the criteria and standards of the regulations. Item K requires a completed monument record, which constitutes a standard part of a completed land survey. Item M mandates a change application for culinary water usage showing an approved status issued by the State Division of Water Rights, which verifies that adequate water volumes and quality exist for domestic use for each proposed lot when the development is not part of a central water system; it further notes that any central water systems must be approved by the State Division of Water Rights. Item N requires a formal letter from the Central Utah District Health Department approving the proposed system to be utilized as a sanitary sewer system. Item O mandates a letter from both the County Zoning Administrator and the County Road Department Supervisor verifying that all proposed subdivision roads comply fully with the road standards contained within the county code. Mr. Harmer called for public comment on the reinstatement of these supporting document sections. Seeing none, the commission advanced to the next item.

13.30.100: Dry Subdivisions and Skyline Mountain Resort Water Plan Ms. Sorenson introduced a proposed change to Subdivision Ordinance 13.30.100, which governs dry subdivisions, specifically addressing Section 3.0 regarding Skyline Mountain Resort Areas 2 and 3. The amendment aligns the ordinance text with the definitions set forth in the recently

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

approved, updated Skyline Mountain Special Service District Water Plan. The updated text confirms and clarifies that Sports Havens International, doing business as Skyline Mountain Resort, was formally approved as a dry subdivision, unless modified by official action in the future. Section 3.0 of the water plan clarifies that Area 1 Valley full-time lots are required to hook up directly to the pressurized central water system, whereas part-time lots situated within the dry subdivision sectors, designated as Area 2 Upper Mountain and Area 3 Birch Creek, are served by hauling water from multiple year-round filling stations. Mr. Harmer opened the floor for public testimony regarding the Skyline Mountain Resort dry subdivision amendment. Ferris Taylor stepped forward and stated his name for the record, identifying himself as the Board Chair of the Skyline Mountain Special Service District and a property owner within the Skyline Mountain Resort. Mr. Taylor stated that his primary purpose in addressing the commission was to express his gratitude to Building Official Scott Olson, Heidi, and the Planning Commission members for the significant time and effort dedicated to developing and securing the final approval of the updated water plan. Mr. Taylor expressed full corporate and personal support for the proposed ordinance clarification, noting that the clarification was highly desired by departmental staff and members of the Board of County Commissioners. He concluded by reiterating his thanks for bringing the clarification to fruition. Mr. Harmer thanked Mr. Taylor for his comments and asked if there were any other individuals present who wished to speak on the amendment. Hearing no further comments, Mr. Harmer closed the public portion of the discussion.

Ms. Jarrett makes the motion to move out of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Atkinson seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. Motion passes.

Chairman Cody Harmer called the regular meeting to order to consider and potentially recommend for approval the items from the public hearing. Chairman Harmer asked the commission if they preferred to address the items individually or together. Chairman Harmer agreed, noting that because no significant objections or changes were raised during the public hearing, the commission could proceed with individual motions.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

The motion is made by Ms. Jarrett to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to amend Sanpete County Land Use Ordinance Section 14.76.365, Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Code, to remove the \$500 refund provision and add clarity and options regarding Class 2 and Class 3 structural classifications.

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

The motion is made by Ms. Jarrett to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to amend Land Use Ordinance Section 14.12.020 to add the definitions for a service ranch, a private landing strip, and a bunkhouse, and to update the land use zone matrix under Code Section 14.26.010 to incorporate the private landing strip.

Mr. Harmer seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

The motion is made by Ms. Jarrett to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to amend Subdivision Ordinance Section 13.24.070 to reinstate items J, K, M, N, and O, which had been inadvertently omitted during the 2019 ordinance updates.

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

The motion is made by Ms. Jarrett to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to amend Dry Subdivision Ordinance Section 13.34.010, confirming that Areas 2 and 3 of the Skyline Mountain Resort, as defined in their approved water plan, are designated as dry subdivisions.

Mr. Allred seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

**Discussion and possible approval for a 7-lot subdivision (West Haven Subdivision) application by Dale Lewis. The proposed subdivision is located East of Wales in the Agriculture Zone. Lot 1-9.63 acres, Lot-2 9.63 acres, Lot-3 9.20 acres, Lot-4 9.53 acres, Lot-5 9.86 acres, Lot-6 8.59 acres, Lot-7 8.96 acres. Parcel # S-25809 and S-25827.**

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Ms. Sorensen presents the item. Dale Lewis is present. She reported that the applicant, Dale Lewis, had completed the application process and submitted all required and approved documentation. This documentation includes a plat map, zoning map, owner affidavit, site plan, septic tank permit, water approval, road access verification, and service letters from law enforcement, fire, ambulance, and the power company, as well as a feasibility study and a completed title search. She noted that floodplain elevations and stormwater plans had been addressed by the applicant's engineer. Furthermore, all associated fees have been paid, and approvals have been granted by the Sanpete County Recorder and the address coordinator. Heidi stated that she had personally conducted a site visit, confirming that power and water infrastructure are on site, roads have been officially signed off, and the application is complete and ready for commission approval. Mr. Harmer asked the commission if there were any questions regarding the development. Mr. Jacobson requested clarification on whether the commission was reviewing a preliminary plat or a final plat. Heidi confirmed it was for final plat approval. Mr. Jacobson then inquired if water infrastructure had been extended to each individual lot, noting that while a well had been drilled, he wanted to verify if water lines were in place. Heidi confirmed that the water lines are stubbed to the lots. Mr. Jacobson mentioned that he had driven out to the site that afternoon and was able to locate one connection point but could not see the others. An individual from the audience began speaking from their seat. Mr. Harmer and Ms. Pyper requested that the speaker step forward to the microphone and state their name for the record. Dale Lewis stepped forward to the microphone. Mr. Lewis clarified that blue stakes were placed on-site to mark the water infrastructure and red stakes were used to identify the power connections. Mr. Harmer asked if there were any further questions from the commission regarding the West Haven Subdivision. Hearing none, Chairman Harmer noted that he had no additional questions or concerns.

The motion is made by Cody Harmer to approve the application filed by Dale Lewis for a 7-lot Major Subdivision (West Haven Subdivision) The proposed subdivision is located east of Wales in the Agriculture Zone. Lot -1 of 9.63 acres, Lot 2 of 9.63 acres, Lot - 3 of 9.20

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

acres, Lot - 4 of 9.53 acres, Lot - 5 of 9.86 acres, Lot - 6 of 8.59 acres, Lot - 7 of 8.96 acres. ***Parcel # S-25809 and S-25827.***

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

## **Discussion of concept plan for Jacob Yamada**

Mr. Yamada is present and presents his items. Mr. Yamada provided printed copies of his concepts and utilized the digital display screen to demonstrate the layouts for the properties. Mr. Yamada introduced his first concept regarding properties his development company has owned for several years along Pine Creek Drive, which forms the northern boundary of the parcel. He noted that the project is potentially related to an upcoming moratorium item on the commission's agenda. Mr. Yamada reminded the commission that a minor subdivision was completed on the western edge of the tract along Meadow Road approximately four years prior. Due to building logistics and development constraints at that time, a major subdivision was not pursued for the remaining uphill lots, numbered 1 through 17. Instead, an agricultural split was completed, allowing for the sale of several lots to long-term recreational and camper-type owners. Mr. Yamada stated that his current objective, which aligns with previous discussions held with past zoning administrations, is to establish a major subdivision encompassing lots 1, 2, 3, 10, and 11, located on the northeast portion of the property closest to the main road. He explained that past exploratory discussions identified two primary regulatory roadblocks to a major subdivision, which he has spent the last one to two years attempting to resolve. The first roadblock was the requirement to establish a dedicated, 66-foot public utility and access easement from the current end of the county-maintained road, situated near the Mount Pleasant boundary where the existing asphalt transitions to a gravel Class D county road. Mr. Yamada reported that he successfully coordinated with all neighboring property owners who share that road frontage, and all parties have agreed to cooperate in recording a unified easement, which he viewed as a positive step forward. The second roadblock was the requirement to provide two distinct points of egress down the mountain for public safety. Historically, the secondary exit from this mountain area runs south through Spring City Canyon via the Pine Mountain Landowners Association, which utilizes private, locked gates. Mr. Yamada announced that

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

he successfully negotiated with the Pine Mountain Landowners Association, and they have provided a contractual emergency access easement, which he uploaded to the county planning portal for review. He requested feedback from the commission on whether the resolution of these two items would qualify the parcel for a major subdivision application. Mr. Harmer asked if the uploaded easement contract included a graphic plat map illustrating the exact alignment of the access. Mr. Yamada clarified that it is currently a text-based legal contract rather than a recorded plat map. He explained that he has held off on formally ratifying and recording the document because the association's language is highly specific regarding the location and naming of the grantee. He added that the association assured him that while they routinely open all physical gates during actual emergency events, they were comfortable providing this binding contract to give the future homeowners legal security. Mr. Yamada noted he was presenting the concept to ensure there were no further unexpected hurdles before proceeding. Mr. Jacobson spoke first, noting he had discussed this project with Mr. Yamada previously. He stated that public safety is his primary concern, particularly ensuring functional ingress and egress. He noted that he had personally driven the property that afternoon to inspect the site conditions. His initial concern focused on the logistics of operating a locked gate during an emergency and how residents or emergency services would secure access codes. However, his site visit revealed that multiple existing subdivisions in the immediate area already utilize private, locked entrance gates. Because a contractor and other local traffic were actively navigating the red gate without issue, he felt the proposed subdivision would not differ from existing neighborhood patterns, which resolved his primary concern regarding gate access during a fire event. He noted that a local contractor had offered to let him pass through the gate, but he declined as he did not possess formal permission to enter the private property. Mr. Jacobson raised a second concern regarding the physical construction quality of the road system stretching from the proposed subdivision down to the main, county-maintained road. Because he could not personally drive past the private gate, he requested that the commission look closely at the size, finishes, and safety of that connection. Mr. Yamada asked for clarification on whether Mr. Jacobson road quality concern applied to the internal road extending from the end of the asphalt to his property line under a major subdivision design, or the road segment beyond the private gate. Mr. Jacobson

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

clarified that her concern focused specifically on the road extending from the private gate downward to the public county road, ensuring that heavy emergency apparatus could safely travel the grade during adverse seasonal conditions. Mr. Harmer concurred with Mr. Jacobson, adding that a secondary access is not merely for incoming emergency equipment, but is primarily required to guarantee a safe evacuation route for the public if the primary canyon road becomes blocked by fire or debris. Without the full text of the contract visible, Mr. Harmer questioned what specific road dimensions and surfacing materials were being contemplated for the secondary access route. Mr. Yamada replied that he did not know the exact construction or maintenance standards of the existing internal roads managed by the Pine Mountain Landowners Association. For his company's proposed major subdivision roads, he planned to build a standard low-volume Class B road, featuring a 24-foot width with a 6-inch road base over 12-inch sub-base configuration, consistent with his other county development projects. However, he confirmed he did not intend to improve the roads situated on the other side of the association's gate. Mr. Harmer stated that if the secondary access relies on the existing road that connects back into Spring City Canyon, he has significant reservations about its current physical condition. While admitting he had not driven that exact section recently, Mr. Harmer described that particular road segment—where it exits the association property and heads toward Spring City Canyon, as being in poor, unimproved condition. He asked if Mr. Yamada had initiated any talks with the association regarding physical improvements to their side of the road. Mr. Yamada acknowledged he had not driven that section recently and had not discussed performing off-site road improvements, but noted the feedback was highly valuable. Mr. Harmer offered to personally visit the site with Mr. Yamada to inspect the road conditions together, reiterating that a secondary access must provide a guaranteed, practical route of escape. He noted that the urgency surrounding secondary access road standards has escalated dramatically within the county following multiple destructive wildfires over the past several years, which resulted in significant property losses due to poor access. Mr. Harmer continues, stating that if the gate logistics can be reliably managed and the road condition is upgraded to a reasonably passable standard, allowing standard vehicles to traverse it for at least nine months out of the year, the concept could be viable. Mr. Jacobson expanded on the broader contextual issues, noting that while

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

adding a handful of lots might not overtax local infrastructure on its own, the county faces a mounting cumulative impact. He expressed concern that the existing public road from the local high school up to the mountainside is becoming heavily congested and is structurally inadequate for the volume of traffic it currently sustains. He reported that during his drive to the property that afternoon, which took approximately 20 minutes, he counted 20 passing vehicles on the narrow road, forcing him to partially pull off the driving surface to allow an oncoming vehicle to pass safely. Mr. Jacobson stated that this systemic traffic capacity issue is a primary driver behind the pending county road moratorium. He cautioned that if this project is approved based on a private gate agreement, neighboring property owners will inevitably seek to pay the association for identical gate access to clear their own major subdivisions. He stressed that the commission must evaluate where to draw the line to protect county residents and future buyers who may purchase mountain lots under false assumptions. Ms. Jarrett turned to the legal text of the uploaded easement document. She expressed serious concerns regarding the limiting language drafted by the association, noting that while the introductory text mentions standard ingress and egress, the body of the document explicitly restricts usage to "emergency egress only." Furthermore, Ms. Jarrett highlighted a specific clause in the contract stating that the association does not guarantee the gates or roads will be accessible, passable, or usable during an emergency event. She argued that this disclaimer effectively absolves the association of any operational responsibility, meaning the document fails to secure a reliable evacuation route. Ms. Jarrett also emphasized that a secondary access must accommodate the ingress of arriving firefighting forces, not just evacuating residents. She concluded that the language in the easement contains critical flaws that must be thoroughly renegotiated before she would feel comfortable advancing the project. Sanpete County Building Official Scott Olson requested permission to comment on the access requirements. Mr. Olson stated that because this property sits entirely within the county's Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) overlay zone, it is bound by the mandates of the WUI Code. The code explicitly requires two separate, fully functional accesses for developments of this scale. Mr. Olson noted that he had also reviewed the submitted contract and confirmed that it limits use strictly to emergency evacuation. He clarified that under the WUI code, an "emergency-only" access does not satisfy the legal standard; the code demands two open,

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

standard public accesses to accommodate simultaneous evacuation and emergency response. Mr. Harmer thanked Mr. Olson for the clarification and asked if there were further comments. Hearing none, Mr. Harmer advised Mr. Yamada to work closely with Heidi in the planning office to see if the access and road condition issues could be resolved, noting that while it is not an outright denial, there are substantial regulatory elements that require revision. Mr. Yamada thanked the commission, stating he understood that the broader road capacity and mountain access issues were part of a larger county challenge. Ms. Riley informed Mr. Yamada that a separate development group had presented a concept plan for a neighboring mountain parcel a few months prior in November and faced identical secondary access hurdles. She offered to provide Mr. Yamada with their contact information so they could discuss potential joint infrastructure options, which Mr. Yamada welcomed. Mr. Harmer noted that Mr. Yamada's agenda item was listed broadly as a concept plan review, allowing the commission to seamlessly transition to his second submittal, titled "Crawford Ranches." Mr. Yamada explained that Crawford Ranches is an entirely separate project located on the south side of Spring City, off of 1100 South, also known locally as Crawford Loop Road. He pointed out that on the eastern portion of the parcel sits a cul-de-sac project called Crawford Circle, which his company successfully developed during the previous year. He stated that his takeaway from that prior project was the necessity of designing large-scale acreage with a long-term, comprehensive vision, as this new venture would likely take seven to ten years to fully build out across multiple distinct phases. Mr. Yamada described the layout, pointing out that the denser eastern section, encompassing lots 1 through 27, is situated within the RA2 one-acre residential buffer zone of Spring City. He noted that he incorporated lessons learned from Mr. Jacobson during his last application by pre-anticipating the county's maximum 550-foot distance requirement for dead-end streets by planning intermediate hammerhead turnarounds throughout the design. This dense eastern section would comprise the initial phase of development. The long-term plan involves expanding westward toward the hillside, creating large, five-acre lots over a period of years. Mr. Yamada highlighted an orange line on the map representing the proposed internal road network. He drew attention to a black line drawn across lots 29, 30, and 31, explaining it represents a restrictive building envelope designed to protect the natural aesthetics and

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

environment of the large pond located on lot 28. Mr. Yamada stated that Spring City Power had initial communications with him indicating they possess the capacity to provide electrical service to the development over time. He noted that while a main natural gas line exists in the fronting road, it remains undetermined whether the homes would connect to natural gas or utilize private propane systems. Mr. Yamada requested specific feedback regarding the overall scale of the master plan, potential design flaws, and county requirements regarding asphalt surfacing. He noted that the county road terminates at the bottom right corner of his property map. Because the complete build-out of these lots will eventually push the project's Average Daily Traffic (ADT) well past the county's 300-vehicle threshold for gravel surfaces, he requested that the county allow for a phased development agreement. This agreement would allow him to extend asphalt paving along 1100 South incrementally as specific lot thresholds are met over the lifespan of the development. Mr. Harmer asked for a detailed explanation of the proposed phasing sequence. He questioned if lots 1 through 5 and 16 through 14 would form the first phase, followed by a second northern phase encompassing lots 6 through 9 and 14 up through 10. Mr. Yamada confirmed that his example accurately mirrored his intent to progress sequentially down the road network. He explained that he designed the phases so that each sequential hammerhead turnaround would serve as a temporary cul-de-sac turnaround at the terminus of that specific phase, allowing the one-acre section to be chunked into two or three phases. An identical method would be applied to the western five-acre lots, building out five to seven lots at a time to prevent premature overdevelopment. Mr. Jacobson pointed out the property directly south of lots 29, 30, and 31, and asked if that land was owned by Mr. Yamada's company. Mr. Yamada explained that the black line separating those areas was simply the restrictive building envelope forcing the physical homes further north to preserve the pond views; the actual five-acre property boundaries do extend south toward the pond. He confirmed that the land directly south of the marked fence line (indicated by X-marks) belongs to a separate owner. Mr. Jacobson noted that a cul-de-sac terminates on lot 31 and asked if Mr. Yamada possessed the legal right-of-way to extend that road straight south approximately 640 feet to connect directly with the purple county road, which would provide an ideal secondary loop. Mr. Yamada explained that because the land south of the fence line is under separate ownership,

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

he cannot legally extend the road south. He pointed out that an old, unmaintained two-track farm road currently winds around the western side of the pond on lot 28, hugging the southern borders of lot 31 and lot 41. He stated that while he initially wanted to utilize that alignment for a secondary access road, the county's 66-foot right-of-way requirement made it impossible, as there is less than 24 feet of physical clearance between his property fence line and the edge of the water. Mr. Yamada noted on the map that he labeled this track "original road to be maintained," expressing a desire to preserve it as a private, internal association drive so residents could enjoy the scenic ponds. However, due to the tight 24-foot space constraint, he excluded it as a primary, standard subdivision road option. Mr. Atkinson asked if that track was currently a public right-of-way. Mr. Yamada clarified it is an unmaintained private farm road used primarily for agricultural trucks. Mr. Atkinson noted that the overriding issue for this development, identical to the first concept, remains the establishment of a functional secondary access. Ms. Jarrett asked if Mr. Yamada had entered into formal discussions with Spring City municipal officials regarding these large buffer-zone lots, and whether the city had expressed any interest in annexing the one-acre portion of the development. Mr. Yamada stated he had not spoken directly with Spring City officials within the past few months. He explained that based on his last communication, the city had been evaluating a separate annexation petition on the north end of town. A comprehensive infrastructure and water supply study concluded that Spring City lacks the current utility infrastructure to support the large volume of undeveloped lots already sitting within existing city limits. Consequently, the city placed all annexation discussions on indefinite hold, meaning annexation for his southern parcel is not a viable option at this time. Ms. Jarrett then asked where the development would secure its domestic water supply. Mr. Yamada replied that his company owns a significant and sufficient amount of water shares within the local irrigation company, as the entire project field is currently under active irrigation. He stated that between these irrigation water rights and their documented water rights tied directly to the pond on lot 28, the development possesses ample water volume. Ms. Jarrett asked if he planned to construct a public water system or drill individual wells. Mr. Yamada stated that while he personally favors a shared-well approach restricted to seven lots, he understands that a public system is highly complex. He reported that he consulted with the State Division

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

of Water Quality, and officials indicated that if he isolated a shared well system on the far western five-acre parcels, well removed from the Crawford Circle area, the state might be amenable. However, for the dense one-acre lots, his current master plan contemplates drilling individual domestic wells for each lot. He argued that individual wells represent a major selling point for high-end rural buyers and are far more economically viable than installing and maintaining a regulated public water system across a project of this geographic scale. Mr. Harmer remarked that shared wells generally face operational challenges when spread across large, low-density lots. Mr. Jacobson returned to the secondary exit issue, pointing to lot 48 on the western edge. He suggested that Mr. Yamada look into extending the cul-de-sac from lot 48 straight east across the parcel to tie back into the primary internal road network, effectively creating a large internal loop. He noted that further south, the county road bends, transitioning into marshland. Mr. Harmer and Mr. Jacobson reviewed the map coordinates, identifying a visible "T" intersection at the bottom center of the page, which marks the western boundary of the Crawford Loop Road. Mr. Harmer verified that the road extending west from that intersection travels up into the White Hills area near several existing farmsteads. Mr. Yamada confirmed that alignment was correct. Mr. Harmer noted his personal familiarity with that specific area through his work with the irrigation company, confirming it aligns with the two-track farm road discussed previously. He commended Mr. Yamada for presenting a complete, long-term master plan up front, rather than applying for piecemeal lot approvals over time. Mr. Jacobson stated that the secondary exit requirement is the critical item Mr. Yamada must resolve. Regarding the asphalt paving request, he noted that the commission is fully capable of calculating a fair development matrix to trigger paving requirements as lot counts grow. He expressed support for a phased asphalt plan, viewing it as a sound business approach. Mr. Jacobson asked if the commission envisioned him paving 1100 south all the way out to the main state highway, or just along his property frontage. Mr. Yamada clarified that in his view, the paving requirement should only extend from the town entrance west to the main access intersection at lot 19, since the subdivision traffic would not travel on the unpaved county road further west of that point. He noted that implementing a phased development agreement to pave an existing county road to handle subdivision traffic represents brand new territory for the Sanpete County Planning

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Commission, as they have not previously encountered a project that triggered this specific asphalt threshold. Mr. Jacobson asked County Building Official Scott Olson if the Crawford Ranches property sits within the WUI overlay zone, which would mandate a secondary public access. Mr. Olson reviewed the county zoning maps and confirmed that the Crawford Ranches property is located on the west side of old Highway 89 and sits outside of the WUI boundary. Mr. Jacobson noted that since the property is outside the WUI zone, the strict dual public access mandate does not apply. The project must simply comply with the county's standard 550-foot maximum cul-de-sac length ordinance. He questioned whether the commission could legally approve the narrow, 24-foot farm road passing by the ponds to serve as a secondary emergency-only exit under standard subdivision rules, or if the road must be fully dedicated. Mr. Harmer noted that because this is outside the WUI zone, the commission would need to carefully research the standard subdivision ordinances to see if a narrower private drive or gated right-of-way could legally satisfy the secondary access standard. He pointed out that if the road runs directly along Mr. Yamada's property boundary, the county would only require him to dedicate a half-easement of 33 feet, rather than the full 66 feet. He expressed support for connecting the cul-de-sacs on lots 48, 49, 31, and 41 into that existing two-track farm road to form a secondary exit path past the ponds, noting that a secondary way out is highly desirable given the long dead-end travel distances within the development. Mr. Jacobson recommended that Mr. Yamada perform additional research on county road classes and present a formal proposal to Heidi. He commended Mr. Yamada for his thorough preparation, noting that if he brings the specific ordinance sections and road class data to the planning office, it would streamline the administrative review. Regarding the phased asphalt, Mr. Jacobson suggested that Mr. Yamada work with Mr. Harmer, himself, and Heidi to draft a formal development agreement that can be presented to the County Commissioners. He emphasized that the county would require strict engineering oversight to ensure the road's sub-base is constructed properly so that future maintenance costs do not fall onto county taxpayers. Overall, he viewed the plan as entirely feasible. Mr. Atkinson raised a final conceptual concern regarding the individual well proposal. He stated that drilling a single domestic well for every individual one-acre lot felt inefficient and counter-intuitive when alternative water configurations exist, though she acknowledged that

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

final water approvals fall under the jurisdiction of the State Division of Water Rights and the Central Utah District Health Department. Mr. Harmer noted that the property sits less than a mile from the Spring City corporate boundary, though it does not directly touch the city line. Mr. Atkinson asked if Spring City had a history of providing municipal water service to properties located outside city limits. Mr. Harmer clarified that current city policy strictly prohibits serving water outside municipal boundaries. However, Mr. Harmer noted that Spring City recently completed a new water storage tank and made major system upgrades, meaning their external service or annexation policies could potentially evolve. He suggested it might be worth exploring a wholesale water agreement with the city, noting that a city fire hydrant is already located very close to the property near the existing Crawford Circle development. Mr. Atkinson repeated that while the commission cannot legally mandate a public water system over individual wells if the applicant meets state criteria, his concern was largely an emotional and subjective reaction to seeing dozens of individual wells drilled in close proximity. Mr. Jacobson shared his concern and recalled that John Chartier from the local DEQ district office previously addressed the commission on this subject. Mr. Jacobson stated that he followed up with Mr. Chartier downstream to ask if the state genuinely preferred individual wells over small, shared seven-lot networks for dense subdivisions. According to Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Chartier confirmed that the state's current stance heavily favors drilling one well per individual lot for contiguous subdivisions, describing the approval of shared wells in dense configurations as a regulatory "gray area." Mr. Jacobson added that from a developer's business perspective, a five-acre lot buyer generally demands exclusive control over their own well and water destiny rather than entering into a shared water agreement with multiple neighbors. On the alternative side, Mr. Atkinson noted that small, shared public water systems are frequently neglected by homeowners associations who fail to maintain infrastructure or manage rate structures properly, eventually creating critical failures. He concluded that both water approaches possess clear pros and cons. Mr. Harmer asked if the commission had any further comments. Hearing none, he thanked Mr. Yamada for presenting his comprehensive concepts. Mr. Yamada apologized for the length of the discussion and thanked the commission for their time and guidance.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

## **Discussion and recommendation to County Commissioners in regards to Moratorium**

### **Development up Pine Creek Ranch Road, Whispering Pines.**

Mr. Harmer presents the item and opened the floor for board discussion. Mr. Jacobson expressed concern regarding the structural limitations of a land-use moratorium. He noted that county code restricts a temporary moratorium to a maximum timeframe of 180 days, and the county cannot legally enact a consecutive moratorium for the identical issue. He questioned whether the county could realistically formulate and execute a permanent infrastructure or zoning solution within that six-month window, or if the commission should perform preliminary administrative groundwork first to maximize the efficacy of the time. Mr. Jacobson shared his concerns regarding the legal limitations. Mr. Atkinson sought clarification on how other municipal entities manage extended development freezes, pointing to Mount Pleasant City's ongoing moratorium on secondary utility connections driven by municipal water shortages. He questioned whether enacting a development freeze legally obligates the governing body to provide a public utility solution, particularly when alternative domestic systems are involved. Mr. Harmer noted he shared that question and cited the unincorporated community of Axtell as a precedent where a county-imposed development moratorium has successfully remained in place for several years to address specific localized issues. Mrs. Jarrett suggested that a prior presentation by Building Official Scott Olson regarding the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) code partially resolved the immediate question. Because the WUI overlay zone strictly mandates two functional public access points rather than simple emergency paths, that existing regulatory requirement provides immediate enforcement capability. She then deferred to County Commissioner Mike Bennett to clarify the county's broader authority. Mr. Harmer requested that Commissioner Bennett step forward to the microphone and state his name for the record. County Commissioner Mike Bennett addressed the commission. Commissioner Bennett clarified that a governing body can legally extend or follow up a temporary moratorium, provided that the county is actively and demonstrably working toward a final resolution to remedy the underlying health, safety, or infrastructure deficiencies that prompted the initial freeze. He confirmed that an initial six-month moratorium can be extended for an additional six months as long as the county's efforts do not remain stagnant. Mr. Harmer asked if the

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

county is genuinely prepared to initiate the formal process required to rectify the access issues. Ms. Sorenson noted that while it is difficult to turn away prospective developers looking at the Pine Creek area, the reality is that the region possesses only one standard point of ingress and egress. She reported that she consulted with County Attorney Kevin Daniels on the matter, and Mr. Daniels recommended that the Planning Commission establish an official administrative stance to provide a firm legal footing. Mr. Harmer clarified the precise scope of the proposed restriction, stating that the moratorium would apply strictly to the creation of new subdivisions and the adding of additional building lots. It would explicitly exempt any currently platted and approved vacant lots; property owners holding valid, existing lots would retain their right to apply for building permits and construct homes. Mrs. Jarrett questioned what legal authority the county possesses to compel separate private property owners to establish a secondary public access corridor. She questioned whether the Board of County Commissioners would be willing to execute high-level legal mechanisms, such as eminent domain or public takings, to resolve an access deadlock across private holdings. Mr. Olson acknowledged that the legal remedy remains complex but emphasized that the moratorium is driven by a twofold crisis. Beyond the WUI access mandate, a formal transportation study performed on Pine Creek Road documented that the physical width, grade, and safety layout of the road are dangerously inadequate for existing traffic volumes, irrespective of the massive volume of undeveloped, platted lots already sitting up the canyon. Mr. Harmer asked if the commission possessed an accurate estimate of the total volume of vacant, approved building lots that retain the right to build along Pine Creek Road. Mr. Olson detailed that multiple large-scale recreational and full-time residential subdivisions are already platted and approved. In the Twin Oaks development, approximately 50 percent of the original 104 lots remain vacant and undeveloped. Further up the road, the multi-phase Pine Creek development contains four or five phases with roughly 50 lots per phase, where approximately two-thirds to three-fourths of the total lots remain vacant. The Pine Ridge Estates subdivision contains 30 lots, with roughly half remaining unbuilt. Additionally, the Whispering Pines development retains a vacancy rate of nearly two-thirds, and the extensive Pine Mountain and Spring City Rancheros tracts encompass hundreds of approved, platted vacant lots. Mr. Olson concluded that based on those figures, there are easily between 500

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

and 1,000 legally approved vacant lots capable of adding cabins or full-time residences along that single road corridor. Commission Member Jo-Anne Riley noted that local Community Wildfire Coalition (CWC) chapters across the various mountain developments have been working diligently in response to recent legislative changes governing WUI guidelines. She noted that under the new state framework, if an area successfully secures a functional secondary access route that can be utilized by emergency forces, the state allows for greater leniency in local structural assessments. She added that incoming state-mandated fees and evaluation guidelines will assist the county in governing these dense mountain developments moving forward. Mr. Bennett raised an additional compounding factor, noting that if local property owners successfully proceed with their pending petition for their incorporation, that specific geographic sector would be removed from Sanpete County's planning and zoning jurisdiction. He warned that a new incorporation would likely permit smaller minimum lot sizes, which could instantly compound the infrastructure crisis by potentially adding another 100 to 400 building lots into the canyon corridor. Mr. Harmer returned to his original point, stating that continuing to approve further major subdivisions or adding new lots on top of the massive volume of unbuilt inventory would be irresponsible and negligent from a public safety and board liability standpoint. He argued that if a disaster occurs and the board continues to compound a known, documented evacuation hazard, the county faces immense liability. Backed by Commissioner Bennett's confirmation that a moratorium allows the county room to actively work on a solution, Mr. Atkinson advocated for an immediate freeze on new lot approvals, stating that the county must establish a starting point to halt the expansion of the problem. Mr. Atkinson agreed, noting that an official moratorium gives the necessary enforcement "teeth" to the zoning office. Currently, Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorenson is placed in a difficult position when developers request new lot approvals, as she must rely on general departmental understandings regarding safety gaps rather than an official, codified restriction. An official moratorium provides clear notice to the public regarding the county's position. Mr. Harmer asked if the commission had a defined geographic boundary in mind to establish the perimeter of the moratorium. Mr. Harmer specified that the boundary should encompass all unincorporated lands extending east from the official Mount Pleasant City limits that utilize Pine Creek Road for primary access.

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Chairman Harmer asked if there were any active subdivision applications pending within that boundary. Ms. Sorensen confirmed that no formal development applications are currently in process, noting that while preliminary discussions have occurred with separate parties, there are no open files. Mr. Harmer noted that this absence of active applications makes it the cleanest administrative window to enact the restriction. He reiterated that any future developer would still be legally required to independently satisfy the WUI dual-access mandates and standard road specifications.

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to implement a temporary land use moratorium on all new lot creation and subdivision development extending east from the Mount Pleasant City boundary along Pine Creek Road, including the Pine Creek Ranch and Whispering Pines areas. She specified that the request is grounded in critical public health and safety protections, extreme fire danger within the WUI zone, the high volume of unbuilt inventory within existing subdivisions, escalating traffic volumes, and the severe obstruction of fire and rescue evacuation efforts. She mandated that the text explicitly include the complete lack of a secondary public access corridor as a core justification and direct the county to formally review the findings of the completed transportation studies during the moratorium period to establish long-term planning guidelines.

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

## **Discussion and recommendation to County Commissioners of Solar Farm Moratorium.**

Mr. Harmer introduced the next item on the agenda regarding a discussion and potential recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to implement a temporary land development moratorium on solar farms within Sanpete County. Addressing the members of the public in attendance, Mr. Harmer noted that the commission had previously discussed their concerns during a work meeting held a couple of weeks prior, specifically highlighting the county's current lack of regulatory framework to govern or oversee the building,

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

operation, and placement of solar infrastructure. He stated that the intent of the moratorium is to grant the commission necessary time to research and compile a robust, comprehensive set of local zoning regulations. Mr. Harmer opened the floor for board discussion, asking if members had any additional points to incorporate. Mr. Olson suggested that it would be highly beneficial to establish a clear, technical baseline for what constitutes a "solar farm" under the moratorium to ensure the public text remains unambiguous. Chairman Harmer agreed with the recommendation. Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorensen reviewed example solar ordinances analyzed during their recent work meeting. Mr. Jacobson read an overarching baseline definition into the record, noting that a "solar energy facility" or "solar farm" generally means one or more ground-mounted or building-mounted systems primarily used to capture solar radiation and convert it into electricity for on-site use, off-site sale, or the transmission to a utility grid. This term encompasses solar panels, mounting structures, inverters, transformers, battery storage where permitted, electrical interconnection equipment, access roads, fencing, and other necessary accessory improvements. He further noted that model codes typically break these systems down into distinct subcategories, including accessory, commercial, utility-scale, community, solar-plus-storage, agrivoltaic, and temporary solar facilities. Ms. Pyper located the specific working model text analyzed during the prior work meeting, which contained the preferred structural size thresholds. Mr. Harmer directed that the commission utilize that specific text to form the legal parameters of the moratorium motion. Ms. Jarrett initially moved to forward a recommendation to the County Commissioners to place a moratorium on solar farms, incorporating definitions for accessory solar energy systems, utility-scale systems, solar panel modules, inverters, and formal decommissioning restoration requirements. She emphasized that enacting this protective measure is vital to supporting the county's Master General Plan, which places a significant mandate on preserving active agricultural land. She noted that the moratorium window would allow the county to properly analyze the long-term impacts of large-scale solar arrays on local irrigation systems, grazing rights, and related agricultural mechanisms. Mr. Harmer seconded the initial motion. Mr. Atkinson requested a point of clarification regarding the precise scope of the restriction. He noted that he was unfamiliar with high-level solar logistics and wanted to verify whether the text would inadvertently prohibit private

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

property owners from installing standard solar panels on their own residential or agricultural structures. Mr. Harmer clarified that the moratorium is designed strictly to halt large-scale commercial utility developments and is not intended to impact personal, residential use. Mr. Atkinson added that while the preliminary text defined an "accessory solar energy system" as a configuration designed to serve on-site consumption, the core emphasis of the freeze should be placed tightly on commercial utility-scale projects. Mr. Jacobson recommended amending the motion to explicitly state that individual domestic, residential, and personal-use solar configurations are entirely exempt from the moratorium, ensuring absolute clarity for county residents. Ms. Jarrett and Chairman Harmer agreed that incorporating this clear exemption was an excellent safeguard. Mr. Harmer noted that focusing the definition strictly on utility-scale systems would also prevent a scenario where a developer constructs a massive commercial building and installs a large system just under a broader definition to bypass the freeze. The commission agreed to strike the accessory language and consolidate the motion around the single, primary utility definition.

Ms. Jarrett presented the finalized, amended motion. She moved to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to place an immediate temporary land use moratorium on all new applications for utility-scale solar energy systems within Sanpete County. She mandated that for the purpose of this moratorium, a "utility-scale solar energy system" is defined exclusively as a ground-mounted solar facility that generates electricity primarily for off-site use, typically exceeding a capacity of one megawatt (1 MW). She explicitly stated for the record that this moratorium strictly exempts all personal, residential, and individual domestic-use solar systems designed to serve private, on-site consumption.

Cody Harmer seconded the amended motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

## **Land Use Matrix and Definition review.**

Mr. Harmer moved the commission to the next item on the agenda, a comprehensive review of the county land use matrix and definitions, and requested that Zoning Administrator Heidi

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Sorensen distribute the working materials. Ms. Sorensen noted that the documentation under review comprised the administrative tracking sheets compiled by Mr. Jacobson. Commission Member Jacobson addressed the board to explain the structural layout of the documents. He noted that the definitions were derived directly from a baseline priority list provided by county administrators, which highlighted several commercial and operational categories currently missing from the county's regulatory framework. Commission Member Jacobson explained that he drafted the definitions multiple times using artificial intelligence to refine the wording. Through this iterative process, he learned that initial drafts were overly dense by attempting to regulate every potential contingency within the definition text itself. He emphasized that municipal best practices dictate that land use definitions remain brief, generalized statements of identity. To illustrate this structural approach, Mr. Jacobson cited the example of a "daycare center," which is defined simply as a facility licensed by the state to provide care for children for less than 24 hours a day. He explained that the actual operational restrictions, such as requiring a six-foot solid perimeter fence around outdoor play areas, dedicating off-street loading zones, or establishing hour limitations, belong strictly within the "Supplemental Use Standards" chapter of the land use ordinance. By keeping definitions generalized, the Zoning Administrator retains necessary administrative flexibility to interpret diverse applications without being blocked by overly restrictive definitions, which would otherwise force the county to continually pass formal ordinance amendments to catch up with shifting market variations. Mr. Jacobson noted that his compiled list begins with agricultural uses and focuses tightly on the complex operational categories requested by staff. He drew the commission's attention to items highlighted in yellow on his worksheet, explaining that while these specific categories appeared on the administrators' priority checklist, his research revealed they are already comprehensively codified within current county ordinances. He documented the corresponding page and paragraph numbers next to each yellow item for cross-reference and stated that because the existing text is in excellent order, the commission does not need to add or modify any text for those categories. Turning to the sections highlighted in green, Mr. Jacobson used an "alcohol production facility" to explain his data formatting. The worksheet lists the basic definition, followed by green-highlighted text stating that the use may be allowed as a conditional or

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

special use where impacts on nearby properties, utilities, and access are a concern, and that an overlay district may be deployed in sensitive airport or transition sectors. He explained that he originally embedded these operational clauses directly into the primary definitions before realizing it violated land use guidelines. Because a definition must never contain restrictive conditions, he separated those clauses and highlighted them in green to serve as foundational notes for the zoning matrix. The matrix will ultimately dictate how each category intersects across the county's seven distinct zoning districts, determining whether a use is permitted, prohibited, subject to a special use permit, or bound by an overlay district. Mr. Jacobson requested that due to time constraints, the board take the typed document home to review, modify, or trim any definitions they felt were excessive. He noted that once the text is finalized, the commission will tackle the time-consuming process of assigning permissions across the seven individual zones. He used a "restaurant" as a secondary example, showing how a primary definition can be restricted to two concise sentences, while specific structural variations, such as a restaurant featuring a drive-up window, are broken out as sub-titles containing targeted public safety restrictions, such as prohibiting drive-ways near major road intersections. He noted that because the structural matrix is fully digitized within an artificial intelligence framework, he can instantaneously generate standard cross-zone permissions based on prevailing state codes and national planning models as a starting point for board review. Ms. Jarrett asked for clarification regarding the origin of the titles on the worksheet, noting that she did not see a specific entry for an "alcohol production facility" within the county's active business license ordinance. She questioned if the list matched the clerk's licensing entries or if separate subcategories were introduced by the software. Mr. Jacobson clarified that he utilized the baseline headers provided on staff checklists, and noted that standard subcategories, such as distilleries, were likely consolidated or expanded automatically by the AI system during data processing. Mr. Jacobson proposed that the titles on the worksheet be reorganized chronologically to match the numerical code sequences utilized by the business license ordinance rather than remaining in alphabetical order. Ms. Jarrett agreed that synchronizing the text blocks is highly achievable. Mr. Jacobson emphasized that establishing identical titles between the land use definitions and the business license ordinance is critical to ensuring administrative continuity. Mr. Jacobson

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

acknowledged that while the current land use ordinance is arranged alphabetically, the commission should proactively align the two regulatory frameworks during this review cycle. Mr. Harmer clarified that the intent of the board's work is to alleviate administrative strain on the clerk and recorder's offices rather than adding more clerical work. Mr. Jacobson proposed that the respective county departments hold a coordinated working session to determine whether the Land Use Ordinance should be overhauled to mirror the numbering system of the business license code, or if the business license code should be modified to match the Land Use Ordinance numbers. Ms. Pyper stated that this procedural path had been previously evaluated by staff. She clarified that because the county tracks multiple active businesses that do not possess land-use components, the Land Use Ordinance must be modified to map cleanly to the existing business license categories, rather than vice versa. Mr. Jacobson asked how the county would categorize an entity that does not fall under traditional planning and zoning purviews. Ms. Pyper responded that resolving those specific boundary gaps is a collaborative task that the Planning Commission must figure out together during upcoming sessions. The commission reached a general consensus that the preferred method is to integrate the land-use definitions directly into the existing business license framework to avoid disrupting established clerical structures. Mr. Harmer verified that the complete tracking document is hosted on the shared Google Drive. Ms. Pyper confirmed its availability and stated she would adjust the file sharing privileges to grant full editing access to all board members so they could log real-time modifications directly into the master document. Mr. Harmer noted that this comprehensive review would serve as the primary assignment for the upcoming work sessions, with the goal of finalizing a clean draft for formal approval at the next regular meeting. He noted that the commission has two scheduled work meetings on the calendar before the next voting session, providing ample time to reconcile the text. Mr. Jacobson asked if the board should proactively add missing industrial definitions as they encounter them during the cleanup, pointing to a recent local inquiry regarding a commercial log cabin manufacturing operation. Mr. Harmer and Mr. Jacobson agreed that expanding the document to capture missing uses is an excellent safeguard to prevent the county from having to repeat the formal amendment process in the near future. Mr. Jacobson read a targeted, technical definition for a "log cabin fabrication and assembly facility" into the record for

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

consideration. The text defines the use as a facility utilized for the receipt of raw logs or timber, and the on-site milling, cutting, shaping, notching, finishing, and preparation of log cabin components, as well as the temporary assembly, disassembly, storage, and shipment of such components for downstream construction at an off-site location. The definition explicitly encompasses log milling operations, cabin kit fabrication, temporary assembly yards, storage and staging yards, and accessory transport and dispatch functions. Mr. Jacobson noted that once this definition is accepted, the commission's primary task will be to determine which specific zones can accommodate the use, such as business, commercial, or industrial zones. He pointed out that rather than rezoning massive swaths of agricultural land when a developer requests this use, the county can utilize an overlay district or a conditional special use permit within the agricultural zone, providing several flexible planning options without destabilizing current county zoning maps. Mr. Harmer asked the commission if they preferred to evaluate specific zone assignments item-by-item as they read through the definitions. Mr. Jacobson noted that because his AI-generated green sheet pre-populates standard zone permissions based on established state land-use codes, the commission already possesses a functional foundation. He concluded that while the board must review and adjust every automated entry to ensure it fits local county needs, the technological layout has made the formatting process very simple. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Harmer concluded the review portion of the meeting.

## **Approval of May Minutes.**

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission minutes from May 05, 2026, with no corrections.

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

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission minutes from May 19, 2026, work meeting with no corrections.

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

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

## **Other business (if necessary)**

Robby Layton stepped forward and stated his name for the record, identifying himself as the representative for a proposed new racetrack facility named the Laytona Motor Speedway. Mr. Layton introduced Stacey Gardner, his corporate controller, who joined him at the microphone. Mr. Layton stated that their objective for the evening was to present preliminary project metrics to the commission and secure a directional review. Mr. Harmer noted that because this matter was not formalized as a standard agenda item for the night's public hearings, it would be reviewed under the "Other Business" sector of the meeting. He invited the applicants to describe their project. Ms. Gardner explained that the organization is requesting a temporary, single-event permit to authorize a race event scheduled for June 20, 2026. Mr. Harmer asked staff if the commission possessed a complete file of the tracking data for the request, noting that he was calculating the remaining timeline. He asked if the applicants were seeking a permanent conditional use permit (CUP) or a restricted one-time permit. Ms. Sorensen, clarified that the property previously functioned as an active racing venue known as "Wild Bill's Raceway." When the previous operational ownership changed, the original conditional use permit legally expired under county code. Mr. Jacobson suggested that the commission could safely issue a temporary authorization provided that targeted operational conditions are attached to the land. Mr. Jacobson expressed support for attaching operational conditions directly to the property parcel to streamline the process, which would prevent the new owners from having to undergo a redundant public application cycle every calendar year. Mr. Layton reported that the venue had been an active operational track for approximately 30 years before being abandoned in 2022. His company officially purchased the real estate in December of last year. Mr. Jacobson asked Mr. Layton if he would prefer to establish firm operational guidelines tonight so that as long as neighboring landowners do not file formal complaints regarding environmental dust or structural decibel noise, the track could operate without annual administrative hearings. Mr. Layton responded that while they can actively implement engineering measures to minimize engine noise, the nature of the track guarantees a substantial volume of surface dust. Mr. Jacobson noted that because the track's noise footprint is audible as far away as Spring City, the venue will likely generate neighborhood feedback once racing operations resume. He expressed a personal

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

fondness for the sound of motorsports but cautioned that formal controls must be evaluated. Ms. Sorensen noted that because the tracking files were brought to her office as a last-minute request that afternoon, she had not yet had an opportunity to pull the historic file or review the regulatory conditions attached to the previous owner's permit. Mr. Harmer stated that the zoning office would investigate the historical files downstream and requested that the applicants outline their near-term operational strategies. Mr. Layton stated that their immediate goal is to demonstrate strict compliance with county standards to secure a standard business license and a long-term conditional use permit for future racing seasons, in addition to securing authorization for this initial June 20 event. He reported that advance ticket sales have already reached approximately 3,000 attendees. To handle an influx of this scale, the track management team has drafted comprehensive safety and traffic control plans, and has filed a formal special events permit application with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Ms. Gardner detailed the specific components of the event safety plan. She reported that a dedicated, certified ambulance will be stationed on-site for the duration of the event. The track management team is coordinating with the Sanpete County Sheriff's Office to finalize security staffing numbers, which will be transmitted to UDOT to complete the state highway permitting process. Furthermore, a substantial network of event volunteers has been mobilized. Regarding environmental preparation, Ms. Gardner reported that extensive site work has been completed to restore the physical track infrastructure, including the total mechanical removal of surrounding sagebrush and dry undergrowth across the parking and spectator zones. Clearing this vegetation down to clean dirt effectively eliminates localized fire hazards from hot vehicle exhaust systems. Additionally, the venue layout incorporates dedicated emergency exit routes designed to seamlessly divert exiting traffic away from Highway 89. Ms. Gardner confirmed that the complete graphic venue layout and traffic diagrams had been uploaded to the county system. Mr. Harmer asked whether the pending UDOT permit would function as a standing, multi-event seasonal authorization or if the state would require independent reassessments for every race. Mr. Layton clarified that the current state application applies exclusively to the upcoming June 20 race event. He noted that because this single event is projected to draw a larger single-day crowd than the venue hosted over its prior 30-year history, UDOT officials have indicated

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

they will strictly evaluate the resulting traffic data before discussing any long-term highway access permit. Addressing spectator parking and capacity, Mr. Layton presented the mathematical layout calculated by the track's logisticians. Ticket sales are strictly capped at 2,200 general admission tickets. Utilizing an industry-standard metrics ratio of 2.5 passengers per vehicle, the venue requires a minimum of 736 designated parking stalls. The layout successfully accommodates this volume and includes an additional 120 primitive camping and RV stalls. Specialized parking volunteers will be deployed dynamically to guide arriving vehicles and prevent bottlenecks at the main gates. Ms. Gardner explained that the track is coordinating its traffic logistics directly with the Utah Highway Patrol, which prompted the direct involvement of UDOT. The track has contracted with Sanpete County Sheriff Jared Buchanan to field two uniformed county deputies on dedicated overtime shifts to provide continuous security and traffic control throughout the day. To mitigate highway congestion, track management has scheduled a staggered arrival and departure sequence. Arriving campers and RVs will be permitted to enter the property on Friday, June 19, and will depart on Sunday, June 21. While the main racing event is restricted entirely to Saturday, June 20, this staggered camping framework prevents thousands of vehicles from entering the state highway simultaneously. On the day of the event, the main venue gates will open four hours early at 11:00 AM, whereas the official racing lineup does not commence until 4:00 PM. Arriving spectators will be served by on-site merchandise vendors and local food trucks. To handle sanitary requirements for the sold-out crowd, Mr. Layton stated they have overestimated standard bathroom ratios by renting 40 portable restrooms and 6 standalone hand-washing stations. For emergency management, Sanpete County Search and Rescue official Josh Alsop will personally lead the track's internal safety and incident response team. Management is coordinating with Chief Shad of the Spring City Fire Department regarding fire standby assets, and is finalizing a service contract with Ephraim EMS to supply the primary on-site ambulance. Ms. Gardner emphasized that multiple track safety volunteers maintain active, professional certifications as local EMTs and volunteer structural firefighters, and will staff designated safety zones equipped with both stationary and handheld fire suppression equipment. Mr. Harmer noted that while the safety plan appeared highly thorough, operational reality can change rapidly during a live event. He shared that for

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

many years, he personally performed professional medical and fire standby services at nearly every race executed at the historical Wild Bill's venue. Based on that extensive field experience, Mr. Harmer pointed out a critical jurisdictional boundary, because the physical track resides within a legally mandated service district boundary, state licensing laws obligate the venue to utilize the North Sanpete Ambulance Service rather than contracting with Ephraim EMS. Mr. Layton explained that he had repeatedly attempted to initiate contact with the North Sanpete administrative office but had not received a operational response, which prompted his team to reach out to Ephraim as a practical alternative. Mr. Harmer instructed Mr. Layton to coordinate with him directly following the adjournment of the meeting. He identified Brian Bench as the active President of the North Sanpete Ambulance board and offered to leverage his personal relationships to resolve the communication gap and align the venue with state licensing mandates. Mr. Harmer noted that he thoroughly enjoyed his years working at the historic track and wants to ensure the new ownership group secures the exact mutual aid resources they need. Mr. Layton stated that his long-term business plan is to construct a major motorsports asset for the county. He pointed out that there are currently no active motorsports complexes situated within a 150-mile radius, with the nearest functional facility located in Grantsville, Utah, following the closure of the track in Price. The ownership group intends to build out the venue across multiple distinct phases, eventually installing permanent structural buildings, grandstands, and professional concession facilities. Mr. Atkinson proposed that the commission issue an immediate, one-time administrative approval authorizing the June 20 event, while deferring the comprehensive review of a permanent conditional use permit to a future regularly scheduled meeting. He noted that this single-use framework allows the track to operate its upcoming race while granting staff adequate time to process the long-term file. Mr. Harmer strongly concurred with the test-case approach, noting that utilizing the upcoming race as an empirical trial will provide invaluable real-world data regarding traffic, dust, and noise impacts, which will assist the commission in tailoring highly accurate conditions for a permanent CUP downstream. Mr. Atkinson asked whether the venue plans to sell or permit alcohol on the property. Mr. Layton stated that alcohol sales will be strictly prohibited at the venue. He explained that permitting alcohol consumption would demand a significantly higher police

## **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

presence, which would dramatically escalate the security costs borne by the business. While staff cannot realistically prevent individual tailgaters from arriving intoxicated, any person exhibiting public intoxication will be handled directly by the on-site deputies. Mr. Harmer expressed excitement regarding the revival of the local raceway, noting that his own children frequently ask when the track will reopen. He stated that a well-managed motorsports complex provides substantial economic and recreational value to Sanpete County and wished the developers success. He reiterated that he would personally resolve the EMS coordination issues. Ms. Riley asked if the board was required to pass a formal voting motion to authorize the single-use permit. Mr. Jarrett clarified that because temporary event permits fall directly under the administrative purview of the Zoning Administrator rather than requiring a board vote, a formal motion was unnecessary. She suggested that the board issue a collective "nod of approval" to signal their consensus. Ms. Jarrett recommended that Ms. Sorensen retrieve the historic Wild Bill's regulatory file, cross-reference it with the safety data submitted by Mr. Layton's team, and issue a temporary conditional use permit for the June 20 race. The commission voiced unanimous concurrence. Mr. Layton reported that he had consulted with state highway representatives that morning. Because this is classified as a isolated special event, UDOT is willing to issue individual special event permits per race to allow the track to host recurring high-profile events without triggering the immediate necessity for costly, multi-phase traffic engineering studies, provided the races do not occur on a daily basis. Mr. Atkinson asked about the projected frequency of future races under their master plan. Mr. Layton announced that his company has placed a formal purchase offer on a 200-acre land parcel situated directly north of the existing track boundary. The long-term master plan involves constructing a professional drag strip to establish a unified motorsports campus capable of hosting major weekend attraction venues and tourism events during the peak summer months. He explained that their current business model relies heavily on digital distribution; the upcoming race features high-profile internet and automotive influencers, and the event will be broadcast globally via a subscription pay-per-view live stream to generate the primary capital required to fund future physical infrastructure. Eventually, they intend to establish a local racing association to allow Sanpete County residents to bring their own vehicles out and return to traditional dirt-track stock car racing, noting that local community

# **Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting**

June 02, 2026 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

enthusiasm has been overwhelmingly positive. Mr. Olson asked what structural access possibilities the 200-acre northern parcel would provide relative to the state highway system. Mr. Layton explained that securing the northern acreage would grant the venue direct connection rights to an existing unpaved road to the north, which already possesses active electrical infrastructure. This acquisition would allow track management to route exiting traffic directly onto State Route 132, entirely bypassing the limited-access constraints of Highway 89. He confirmed he had already analyzed this secondary northern alignment with UDOT engineers, noting it would provide an ideal secondary emergency evacuation route for the entire campus. Mr. Harmer concluded the discussion by instructing the applicants to work in close coordination with Ms. Sorensen to finalize their temporary permit. He thanked them for their attendance.

## **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 9:05PM.