

Huntington City Planning Commission

Minutes

June 11, 2026

The Huntington City Planning Commission met at a public meeting June 11, 2026 at Huntington City Hall located at 20 South Main Street. The meeting started at 5:30 p.m.

Item #1 – Roll call included the following attendance record:

Commission Chair: Don Gordon

Commission Members: Patrick Fehlberg, Brad Hansen (excused), Shantelle Kay, Stacy McElprang

Alternate:

City Council: Tom Kay

Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement: Jessica Lee

City Recorder: Brandy Wagner

Item #2 – Approval of May 14, 2026 minutes

PATRICK FEHLBERG MOVED TO APPROVE THE MAY 14, 2026 MINUTES; MOTION SECONDED BY SHANTELE KAY AND CARRIED.

Item #3 – Discuss: Proposed Title 9 Amendments

- Flag Lot Regulations – **Jessica** reviewed proposed flag lot regulations developed in collaboration with Todd Thorn of SERDA. The discussion included the definition of a flag lot and the need to incorporate the regulations into three sections of the City Code: the definitions section (9-2-2), the conditional use table (9-8-2), and a new section (9-7-1.9) outlining the specific requirements for flag lots. **Patrick** suggested revising the language in Section B to reduce the maximum distance from two hundred fifty (250) feet to one hundred seventy-five (175) feet. Stacy noted that flag lots may be beneficial within established town blocks but may not be appropriate for larger properties located on the outskirts of town. Patrick explained that property owners may request an exemption; however, developments outside the city limits would still be required to comply with existing subdivision requirements, including the construction of streets where applicable. The Commission agreed to forward the proposed Flag Lot Regulations to a public hearing.
- ADU Summary Table – **Jessica** explained that the proposed ADU Summary Table condenses the requirements contained in Section 9-17-3 into a simplified reference table. The table would be placed immediately following Section 9-17-3 and would include language stating that, in the event of a conflict, the text of the code supersedes the summary table. **Patrick** suggested adding language to the setback requirements addressing structures located two hundred (200) feet or less from the front of the property. **Jessica and Stacy** expressed concern that using two hundred (200) feet in the ADU regulations while establishing one hundred seventy-five (175) feet in the Flag Lot Regulations could create confusion for residents. After discussion, the Commission determined that the **Flag Lot Regulations** would state that the combined access and frontage distance shall not exceed two hundred (200) feet. The following language was added to the **ADU Summary Table** under

Access & Setbacks – Setbacks:

Front: 25 feet

Side: 10 feet minimum, 20 feet total

Rear: 25 feet

Maximum distance of 200 feet from the public street to the face of the structure

The Commission agreed to forward the ADU Summary Table to a public hearing.

- Codification Updates and Technical Corrections – **Brandy** explained that the next agenda item originated from the City's codifiers. During the codification process, several outdated references to Utah State Code were identified. A table outlining the necessary updates was provided for review.

The Commission agreed to forward the proposed updates to a public hearing. The codifiers also identified an incomplete reference in Section 9-1-9(D), which contained the placeholder phrase "(date of adoption)." After reviewing city ordinances, Brandy determined that the applicable date was February 21, 2007, when Ordinance 1-2007 was adopted. The Commission agreed that February 21, 2007, should be inserted into Section 9-1-9(D). Additional issues were identified in Section 9-2-2, Definitions. The definitions for "Structure, Pre-Existing" and "Use, Pre-Existing" each contained the placeholder "(date of adoption)." Brandy reported that she reviewed ordinances dating from 2001 to the present but was unable to determine the intended dates. As a result, the Planning Commission was required to establish appropriate dates and language. **Jessica** explained that the purpose of the definitions is to identify structures or uses that predate current regulations and may therefore qualify as legal nonconforming structures or uses. **Patrick** suggested using the federal HUD standardization date for building regulations for the definition of "Structure, Pre-Existing." The Commission agreed to use June 15, 1976. For "Use, Pre-Existing," the Commission agreed to define the term as: *"A use which validly started within the last 25 years of the current calendar date and has not been abandoned for more than six months."* The codifiers also identified a reference in Section 9-3-6(B) to "9-2i." The Commission determined that the referenced section no longer exists and that removing the reference would not alter the intent of the code. The Commission agreed to forward this amendment to a public hearing. Another correction was identified in Section 9-7-1.5. During codification, the language in subsection (A) was changed from "cannot be constructed or maintained" to "can be constructed or maintained." The Commission determined that the intended language should read "may not be constructed or maintained" and directed that the correction be made. The Commission agreed to forward the amendment to a public hearing. The final codification issue involved Section 9-10-1(A)(1), which appeared to be incomplete. Upon review, the Commission determined that subsection (1) was redundant because it duplicated language already contained in Section 9-10-1. The Commission agreed to remove subsection (1) and forward the amendment to a public hearing.

Item #4 – Handout – Annexation Packet

Jessica presented the newly developed annexation packet, which was created to assist residents by simplifying the annexation process and providing clear guidance regarding timelines, requirements, and procedures. The packet includes a timeline that residents may use as a reference throughout the process. The timeline outlines the anticipated dates and timeframes associated with each step of an annexation request. The packet also contains an annexation policy summary that outlines the requirements established in the City Code for properties seeking annexation. In addition, the packet includes an application that requires applicants to compile and submit all necessary documentation for City Council review and approval. The final component of the packet is the annexation petition, which will also be submitted to the City Council for consideration and determination regarding the proposed annexation. **Patrick** inquired about the Boundary Commission. It was explained that the Boundary Commission is a county-level entity involved in the annexation process.

Item #5 – Agenda Items for July 9th meeting

- A. Public Hearing for Title 9 Amendments

Item #6 – Adjournment

STACY MCELPRANG MOVED TO ADJOURN; MOTION SECONDED BY PATRICK FEHLBERG AND CARRIED. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:32 P.M.

Brandy Wagner, Huntington City Recorder