

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 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 Deputy Clerk Heather Pyper and Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorensen. Board Members Justin Atkinson & Dallin Carter have been excused.

Ms. Pyper requested that all Commissioners and staff speak directly into their microphones. They noted that while the in-house computer audio system functions well, the external recording quality makes it difficult to understand the proceedings. Ms. Jarrett acknowledged the request and reminded all participants to ensure they are speaking clearly into their microphones for the record.

Planning Commission Vice Chair Pro-Tem Claudia Jarrett calls meeting to order with a welcome to Cody, noting the Commission's gratitude for his return following his recent accident. It was announced that Cody had communicated with Heidi and requested that Ms. Jarrett run the meeting, which was approved by the Commission.

Ms. Jarrett proposed a modification to the agenda to table the discussion on the solar energy ordinance for the evening. It was noted that because the ordinance is currently under a moratorium, the Commission has additional time to address it, allowing for better use of the work meeting. Ms. Pyper explained that Linda had not yet received the resolution from Representative Troy Shelley. The base text of the distributed document consists of compiled drafts from Mike, Gemini, and Copilot. Ms. Jarrett emphasized the importance of the meeting minutes recorded by Ms. Pyper, noting that they provided valuable insights and suggestions from the previous work meeting. These suggestions from the minutes are highlighted in green text, while the sections from Gene's AI-generated document are highlighted in red text. Mr. Harmer stated they would contact Representative Shelley directly to obtain the resolution. It was noted that while the document is unlikely to change the current trajectory of the Commission's work, it would be reviewed upon receipt so the Commission can consider all available information and refine the ordinance as needed.

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 P.M.

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

Discussion of the Land Use Ordinance Section 14.94.040 (Nuisances Specified) to incorporate noise regulations in the Buffer Zone.

Ms. Jarrett proposed allocating the first portion of the meeting to reviewing the noise ordinance draft, as it was closer to completion, before dedicating the remainder of the work session to the matrix. The Commission agreed to this timeline. Ms. Sorensen presented two reference options, a specific town-oriented document, a broader state-level document, and the Commission determined to review and work off the simpler, town-oriented draft first. Ms. Jarrett noted that the initial strategy for this item was to amend the existing county nuisance ordinance rather than creating an entirely new standalone regulation. This approach aims to keep the noise language specific to targeted residential concerns without infringing upon existing agricultural operations and industries throughout Sanpete County. Ms. Sorensen read the draft definition of a noise nuisance aloud. The draft defined a noise nuisance within Sanpete County as any sound within an assigned Buffer Zone that negatively impacts the health, welfare, and comfort of nearby residential or agricultural areas, provided it meets criteria involving decibel limits, steady tonal noise, low-frequency vibrations, or repetitive animal noise. The draft also required complaints to be accompanied by audio or video evidence for zoning enforcement to coordinate with the nearest city for local enforcement. Ms. Jarrett clarified that requiring audio or video evidence places the burden of proof on the complainant; ensuring county code enforcement is not overextended trying to investigate unsubstantiated claims. Ms. Riley raised a concern regarding enforcement "teeth" and asked how repeat violations would be handled. Ms. Sorensen referenced the current county nuisance ordinance (Section 14.94.050), reading the existing penalty structure, which outlines notices of violation, county-authorized abatement, and billing the property owner for incurred expenses. The Commission discussed expanding on this by explicitly stating that violations will be handled progressively based on severity and frequency, escalating from verbal and written warnings to citations, and eventually to a misdemeanor or criminal violation for non-compliance. The Commission then debated the practicality of using decibel levels to prove code violations, noting that decibels are notoriously difficult to measure and verify objectively. It was proposed to remove specific decibel references entirely and replace them with a reasonable person standard, which relies on what a standard individual would

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 P.M.

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

deem disruptive or unreasonable. Mr. Harmer suggested adding language encouraging a good faith attempt by neighbors to resolve noise issues between themselves prior to county intervention. Mr. Allred stated the complexities of neighbor dynamics, noting that while direct contact is ideal, it can sometimes escalate tensions if a relationship is already strained. The Commission agreed to include the good faith attempt clause as an encouraging guideline, while ensuring that if a resident feels uncomfortable or unsafe approaching a neighbor, they retain the option to register a complaint directly with zoning enforcement. The Commission finalized the direction for the amendment, confirming that the noise language will not be a standalone ordinance or restricted solely to animals, but will instead be integrated as a new subsection within the existing county nuisance code alongside regulations for weeds and garbage. Ms. Jarrett confirmed that Ms. Pyper captured all requested revisions, including the shift to a reasonable person standard, the progressive enforcement language, and the good faith resolution clause, and the Commission concluded its review of the item.

Discussion of Solar Energy Facilities Ordinances.

Tabled until the August meeting

Discussion of updates to Land Use Matrix and Definitions.

Ms. Jarrett directed the Commission to the Land Use Matrix items, highlighting the extensive compilation prepared by Mr. Jacobson. Ms. Jarrett commended the document for its detailed layout, which couples each land use definition with its matrix placement and offers practical suggestions for specific conditional use parameters. It was determined that refining the raw matrix data first would automatically streamline and populate the broader definition documents. Mr. Jacobson explained that the compiled data compresses and isolates the inferred land uses, narrowing the focus to 77 unresolved units out of 331 total definitions. These discrepancies arose from cross-referencing three conflicting historical ordinances alongside business sector regulations, which created inconsistencies where some uses appeared in a matrix but lacked definitions, or vice versa. The remaining resolved definitions successfully aligned with state codes, existing internal sections, and the general plan. Mr. Jacobson presented a list highlighting the first 11 critical line items exhibiting significant

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 P.M.

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

conflicts or duplications. Ms. Jarrett proposed that in the future we eventually replace the entire current land use definitions and matrix sections with this unified format to ensure perfect alignment. Mr. Jacobson confirmed that the tracking system automatically logs all Commission modifications into a memorandum for the county attorney, which includes pre-referenced state codes to streamline legal review. The Commission then reviewed the 11 conflicting line items sequentially. Regarding apartments and boarding houses, the Commission discussed separating the categories, noting that an apartment involves multi-family dwelling units while a boarding house functions with a single communal kitchen and shared amenities. The Commission removed boarding house from the apartment category to link apartments with multi-family housing, keeping boarding houses as a distinct line item. For the boarding house matrix, the Commission designated it as Conditional in Agriculture to accommodate potential long-term housing for agricultural workers, left it Permitted in Business Commercial, and designated it as Conditional in RA-1 and RA-2 zones. Apartments were maintained as Conditional across residential zones to cap dense multi-family builds, which the Commission agreed belong inside city limits rather than county territory, unless handled under specific overlay districts. For large-scale retail and wholesale, the differences were identified as minor discrepancies across different base documents. It was noted that large-scale retail generates significant customer traffic and parking demands, while wholesale aligns closely with warehousing. The Commission combined Wholesale and Warehouse into a single line item, eliminating the standalone warehouse entry. Both remaining categories were assigned Permitted status in both Business Commercial and Industrial zones to streamline business development without unnecessary conditional hurdles. Regarding churches and places of worship versus religious institutions, the two categories featured identical matrix treatments but duplicate terminology. The Commission consolidated the entries under Churches, Places of Worship, or Religious Institutions by expanding the primary definition to absorb the short description for religious institutions, subsequently deleting the duplicate line item. This combined category was designated as Conditional in Agriculture to preserve existing grandfathered sites and address rural infrastructure impacts, while maintaining Permitted status across RA-1, RA-2, and Business Commercial zones. On the subject of orphanages and residential facilities for elderly persons, the Commission

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 P.M.

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

discussed the necessity of maintaining localized oversight for care facilities. Ms. Jarrett shared an example of a residential rehabilitation home where conditional use parameters were essential to establish neighborhood safeguards regarding operating hours and visitors. The Commission merged the duplicate residential facilities categories into one entry to remove the redundancy, approving Conditional status across RA-1, RA-2, and Public Facilities zones to provide neighbors a voice through public hearings, while allowing Permitted status strictly in Business Commercial. When evaluating retirement homes versus assisted living, staff clarified that a retirement home focuses on age-restricted independent living with shared dining options, whereas assisted living provides 24-hour medical, housing, and administrative care licensed by the state. The Commission retained these as two distinct line items due to fundamental operational and regulatory differences. They transitioned both uses away from blanket conditional requirements, designating them as Permitted within Business Commercial and Public Facilities zones, while maintaining Conditional status in RA-1 and RA-2. For office space and technology IT services, staff reviewed the definitions, noting that while digital services focus on production and editing, technology IT can include physical equipment handling and storage. Ms. Sorensen noted that consolidating them would ease daily administrative enforcement. The Commission consolidated all three categories into a single comprehensive line item titled Office-Based IT, Technology, and Digital Services / Content Creators. This category was designated as Permitted across all major zones; including Agriculture, RA-1, RA-2, Business Commercial, Industrial, and Public Facilities, to accommodate low-impact home-based or digital businesses, excluding only sensitive lands. The Commission then evaluated the overlapping scope of general retail versus retail sales of new merchandise. They eliminated the broad retail catchall category entirely from the matrix and definitions, relying on the more detailed retail sales entries. The remaining retail sales matrix was adjusted to be Conditional in RA-1 and RA-2 to mitigate residential adjacency issues, and Permitted in Business Commercial and Industrial zones. The standalone dry cleaner entry was identified as fully absorbed by the broader laundry facility designation, prompting the Commission to delete the standalone dry cleaner line item. They maintained the broader laundry facility use as Permitted in Business Commercial and extended Permitted status to the Industrial zone. Regarding man-made water impoundments

Sanpete County Planning Commission Work Meeting

July 07, 2026 5:00 P.M.

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

versus dams and water impoundment structures, the categories were found to be nearly identical, differing only under the public facilities matrix column. The Commission noted that public facilities like municipal pools or golf course water hazards require zoning coverage. They combined the categories into a single unified entry, setting the use as Conditional across Sensitive Lands, Agriculture, RA-2, and Public Facilities, while designating it as Not Permitted in the half-acre RA-1 zone. The overlapping entries for professional, administrative, and business offices versus general offices created unnecessary distinction for basic commercial operations. The Commission consolidated all three entries into a single standardized category, designating it as Permitted across Agriculture, RA-1, RA-2, Business Commercial, and Public Facilities to allow operations like agricultural dairy accounting offices to proceed without zoning friction. Finally, the Commission reviewed the contractor and construction cluster to distinguish administrative contractor offices from heavy equipment storage yards, noting that agricultural zones are well-suited for storing larger machinery while small residential lots are not. They consolidated the first two office and service entries while maintaining distinct categories for heavy contractor yards. For combined contractor services covering administrative and office work, the use was permitted across Agriculture, RA-1, RA-2, Business Commercial, and Industrial zones. The contractor yard and shop entry, along with offices and equipment yards, and general and specialty contractors, were all designated as Permitted in Agriculture, Business Commercial, and Industrial, while being restricted to Conditional use in RA-1 and RA-2. For commercial and industrial construction, as well as small-scale industrial, the Commission designated the uses as Permitted in Agriculture, Business Commercial, and Industrial, while completely excluding them from the residential RA-1 and RA-2 zones. Having exhausted the allocated time for the work session, Ms. Jarrett tabled item number 12 for a future meeting and concluded the review of the matrix.