



Planning Commission Meeting

Tuesday, August 18, 2026 at 6:30 pm

Attendees: Chairperson Lee Bennett, Commissioner Mary Cokenour, Commissioner Julie Bailey, Assistant City Manager Megan Gallegos, City Recorder Melissa Gill

Meeting Location: 648 S Hideout Way

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes Review/Approval (action)

Attachments:

- **2026-06-02** (2026-06-02.pdf)

3. Public Comment
4. Presentation Eric George (discussion/action)

Attachments:

- **George Presentation** (George_Presentation.pdf)

5. Monticello City General Plan

Attachments:

- **DRAFT-1 2027 GenPlan** (DRAFT-1_2027_GenPlan.pdf)

- a. General Plan (discussion)
 - b. Moderate Income Housing Element (discussion)
 - c. Land Use Element (discussion)
6. Building Permit Update (discussion)
7. Administrative Communications
8. Next Meeting Agenda
9. Adjournment (action)

Audio File

<https://soundcloud.com/user-250815044/2026-08-19-planning-commission>

Notice of Special Accommodations

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND ALL CITY MEETINGS In accordance with the Americans with

Disabilities Act, anyone needing special accommodations to attend a meeting may contact the City Office, 587-2271, at least three working days prior to the meeting. City Council may adjourn to closed session by majority vote, pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-4 & 5

Contact: Melissa Gill (melissa@monticelloutah.org 435-587-2271) | Agenda published on 08/14/2026 at 9:28 AM



Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes

Tuesday, June 2, 2026 at 6:30 pm

Attendees: Chairperson Lee Bennett, Commissioner Mary Cokenour, Commissioner Julie Bailey, Assistant City Manager Megan Gallegos, City Recorder Melissa Gill

Meeting Location: 648 S Hideout Way

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

Chairperson Bennett called the Monticello City Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 pm. The following visitors were present: Mayor Kevin Dunn

2. Minutes Review/Approval (action)

Minutes:

MOTION to approve the minutes of 05-04-2026 was made by Commissioner Bailey and seconded by Commissioner Cokenour. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote results:

Ayes: 3 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

3. Public Comment

Minutes:

There was no public comment.

4. Monticello City General Plan

a. General Plan (discussion)

Minutes:

Assistant City Manager Gallegos reported that the Public Works element of the General Plan would be broken down into categories (water, sewer, sanitation, and streets) and that the Parks and Recreation element would be broken down into categories as well (parks, recreation, and trails). Chairperson Bennett suggested the Transportation element be broken down into categories also (city streets, highways, etc.)

Gallegos further stated that she would be condensing input from City Council and Administration regarding the General Plan into a master document for the Planning Commissions review, assuring the Commissioners that staff meetings to discuss the components were expected to resume in August.

Mayor Dunn provided an update on a recently attended UDOT meeting. He stated that during the meeting he advocated for four-laning the major highways

leading out of Monticello due to the increased traffic and lowering the speed limit through town. UDOTs response was that lowering the speed limit was not possible, and adding four lanes was not to be done in the immediate future. There was discussion among the Commission about the lack of official crosswalks in town with the school crossing on Main Street being the only official one.

b. Moderate Income Housing Element (discussion)

Minutes:

The Commission discussed HB 492, which restructured state code regarding moderate-income housing. It was noted that the element required population and economic data being compiled by staff before further discussion.

There was discussion regarding Energy Conservation. Those included solar electricity systems and the potential for residential wind turbines. The Commission noted they may need to draft code for wind turbines.

c. Land Use Element (discussion)

Minutes:

There was a great deal of discussion regarding the Zoning Map for Monticello. Chairperson Bennett pointed out that 30% of land in Monticello is zoned G-1 (Government). She explained that the reason for the imbalance was primarily due to the Millsite, stating it was controlled by the Department of Energy (DOE) and was unable to be developed. During the discussion it was noted that while redrawing zoning lines to expand residential areas (R-1, R-2) was important, it would likely require decreasing Agricultural (A1) land.

5. Administrative Communications

Minutes:

Gallegos reported that the Veterans Park new playground grand opening and Pinewood Derby were successful, with approximately 200 attendees.

City Recorded Gill confirmed that the updated RV codes had been updated on the City website.

6. Next Meeting Agenda

Minutes:

General Plan Elements (Moderate Income Housing, Land Use, Energy Conservation) – Building Permit Update

7. Adjournment (action)

Minutes:

MOTION to adjourn was made by Commissioner Cokenour and seconded by Commissioner Bailey. The motion passed unanimously and Chairperson Bennett adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:36 pm.

Vote results:

Ayes: 3 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

Audio File

<https://soundcloud.com/user-250815044/2026-06-02-planning-commission>

Notice of Special Accommodations

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND ALL CITY MEETINGS In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, anyone needing special accommodations to attend a meeting may contact the City Office, 587-2271, at least three working days prior to the meeting. City Council may adjourn to closed session by majority vote, pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-4 & 5

Contact: Melissa Gill (melissa@monticelloutah.org 435-587-2271)

George Farm Development

82 Lot Subdivision Preliminary Concept



Google Earth

Image © 2026 Airbus



Page 6

900 ft

George Farm Development Preliminary Concept Financials

Land Acquisition	Infrastructure Costs	Soft Costs	Total Est. Costs
\$500,000	\$2,750,000	\$150,000	\$3,400,000

10 Year Infill Rate with 82 lots with an average price of \$56,000 without fees and hookups

Phase 1 Investment, Land + Soft + 40% of Infrastructure = \$1,750,000

Year	Investment Balance	10% Annual ROI	Sales	Balance
1	\$1,750,000.00	\$175,000.00	-\$459,200.00	\$1,465,800.00
2	\$1,465,800.00	\$146,580.00	-\$459,200.00	\$1,153,180.00
3	\$1,153,180.00	\$115,318.00	-\$459,200.00	\$809,298.00

Phase 2 Investment + 30% of infrastructure = \$825,000

Year	Investment Balance	10% Annual ROI	Sales	Balance
4	\$1,634,298.00	\$163,430.00	-\$459,200.00	\$1,338,528.00
5	\$1,338,528.00	\$133,853.00	-\$459,200.00	\$1,013,181.00
6	\$1,013,181.00	\$101,318.00	-\$459,200.00	\$655,299.00

Phase 3 Investment + 30% of infrastructure = \$825,000

Year	Investment Balance	10% Annual ROI	Sales	Balance
7	\$1,480,299.00	\$148,030.00	-\$459,200.00	\$1,169,129.00
8	\$1,169,129.00	\$116,913.00	-\$459,200.00	\$826,842.00
9	\$826,842.00	\$82,684.00	-\$459,200.00	\$450,326.00
10	\$450,326.00	\$45,033.00	-\$459,200.00	\$36,159.00

Total Sales = \$4,592,000

Total ROI = \$1,192,000

Eric George

(970) 903-3734

oldeschoollc@gmail.com

GENERAL PLAN 2027

CITY OF MONTICELLO, UTAH

The City of Monticello is located in San Juan County, Utah at the intersection of federal highways US-191 and US-491. It is the county seat and was first incorporated as a town in December 1910. The City is considered a 5th class municipality and San Juan County is a 4th class county in Utah. Under Utah law, Monticello is not a specified municipality for land use planning purposes.

Monticello is located within the Ancient Sky Project Area of Utah's Inland Port Authority, which also includes land within the City's area of potential future expansion. The public schools in the City are part of the San Juan School District and the medical clinic and hospital fall under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Health Services District administered by San Juan County. The population of the City was 1,824 in the 2020 federal census and is estimated to be about 2,200 at the present time.

PART ONE:

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Developing the 2027 general plan was a process through which the City learned in detail about the desires and concerns of its citizens and the needs of City administration. It began when the City Council decided that the 2018 general plan was inadequate for changed circumstances and no longer complied with Utah law. The end product is a document that complies with Utah code and which the City will use to guide regulatory decisions, budget development, and administrative priorities.

The 2027 general plan considered public comments heard at City Council and Planning Commission meetings, public hearings, responses to a survey conducted by the City, recommendations from City employees, and suggestions from interested parties. More voices from a greater cross-section of the populace were heard in response to this planning effort than had been heard during preparation of prior general plans. The City is pleased with the interest shown by everyone and believes the 2027 plan is better for that input.

The planning process establishes focus areas, called elements, to describe the City's desired goals. Each element has a set of objectives developed by City administration and is discussed in the Part Two of this plan. A diagram of the City's planning process is shown on **page ****.

MOVING FORWARD FROM THE 2018 GENERAL PLAN

The prior general plan was approved in 2018 and was a mix of ambition and restraint. Overall, the goals focused on retaining the small, rural, agrarian character of Monticello and anticipated little growth in population or economy. Several objectives were put forth to assure that the City would retain its rural character. By the time the City started work on the 2027 general plan, three things were apparent. First, the goals of the 2018 plan restrained expansion and growth of the local economy. Second, the objectives in the 2018 general plan were too numerous, redundant, and not tied into the City administrative system. Third, the state had made important changes in general plan requirements, putting much of the 2018 plan out of compliance.

In the end, only 19% of the 2018 objectives were fully implemented. Although the 2018 plan had little influence on budgets or priorities, it was successful in holding the City to its rural agrarian character. The dismal success of the 2018 general plan inspired the City to establish new goals that were more optimistic and better integrated with administrative systems.

MONTICELLO IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

In order to know how to plan for the City's future, City administration gathered data from numerous sources to develop projections for the five-year period covered by the 2027 general plan. They are the best estimates given current data, but may change as unforeseen circumstances present themselves. Projections are a moving target, and the City may need to adjust data, objectives, and priorities as needed.

Changing Demographics >Kaeden to provide<

Trends for Income and Employment >Kaeden to provide<

Changing Economic Needs >Kaeden to provide<

>>INSERT PLANNING DIAGRAM<<

PART TWO: PLANNING ELEMENTS

This section contains the areas of focus for Monticello's future. Called planning elements, they were developed by City staff and the Planning Commission and relied on input from the public, other interested parties, and employees. Every attempt was made to keep the

objectives for each element as realistic as possible and to emphasize what could be completed within the five year period covered by the 2027 general plan. Several of the elements shown on the diagram at **page **** were split into smaller parts to facilitate descriptions and management of objectives. Only objectives over which the City has administrative authority were included in the 2027 general plan. That means that some good suggestions and valid needs may have been left out of the plan because the City has no means to direct, require, or fund those desires. A summary of the objectives for each element begins on **page ****.

LAND USE PLANNING ELEMENT

Land use refers to the use of land within the corporate City limits. It includes the ordinances that define zones and the maps that identify where the zones are located. Land use also includes the process for approving subdivisions, building permits, and non-conforming uses. The City has the right under Utah law to exercise its authority in such matters, but must assure that its ordinances and processes comply with Utah law. Although state code required that municipalities address land use in general plans, the City would have included this critical element even without it being a mandate.

Several land use objectives were present in other planning elements in the 2018 general plan. The 2027 plan strives to avoid duplication in order to better administer implementation of objectives. For example, those affecting energy conservation are discussed in the Energy Conservation element. However, the regulation of residential zoning was rewritten and restructured in 2025 and 2026 by the Utah Legislature, thus land use codes reflect the state changes. Hence, there is some overlap with the Moderate Income Housing element.

Accomplishments from the 2018 General Plan:

- The single-family residential zone (R-1) was revised twice to comply with changes to Utah code. Recently City code was updated to allow small homes on smaller lots with reduced frontage requirements, allowance of long-term rentals, and clarification for how some measurements for setbacks are taken.
- The multi-family residential zone (R-2) was revised twice to comply with changes to Utah code. City code was recently changed to add small homes and tiny homes, revised lot or parcel sizes and frontage requirements for the smaller dwellings, and short-term rentals.
- The agricultural zone (A-1) was reviewed and discussions begun to make changes to expand housing opportunities. Discussions were underway at the time work began on the 2027 general plan.
- Changes to incorporate accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as permitted uses in residential zones were underway at the time work began on the 2027 general plan.

- The two commercial zones (C-1, C-2) were reviewed and found to be confusing. Proposed changes to these zones were underway at the time work began on the 2027 general plan
- The City's code for subdivisions was reviewed and found to be out of compliance with Utah code. A revised code was prepared and approved but recent changes to Utah code necessitate another revision, underway at the time work began on the 2027 general plan.
- The Annexation Policy Plan was rewritten to conform with changes in Utah law and approved by the City Council in 2025.

Unattained goals and objectives from the 2018 plan:

- An ordinance was drafted that would protect dark skies by regulating placement and types of exterior lighting. The ordinance was not approved by City Council and at their direction no further work on the objective was undertaken.
- Work on regulation of portable storage units was incorporated into discussions of permitted uses underway at the time work on the 2027 general plan began.
- Revision of the future streets and zoning maps was shifted to the 2027 general plan.

Concerns and suggestions from citizens and employees (*City responses in italics*):

- Allow children to raise their 4H animals in the City. *The City has the option of regulating the presence of 4H animals in the City.*
- Allow more room for housing by adding land outside the City and by reducing the area designated for agriculture. *The City has limited ability to acquire (annex) new areas but can accept proposals for annexation of land into the City and sets the zone for the land. The City's zoning authority includes changing the location and designation of zones.*
- Don't allow high density development. *The City can determine the types of housing and lot sizes, but if land is the limiting factor to housing growth, high density locations within the City may be needed.*
- Eliminate barriers to make it easier to build homes. *Through its zoning and subdivision ordinances the City defines where dwellings are allowed and what types of housing can be built, but all dwellings must meet state codes and approval of subdivisions must follow state standards.*
- Expand the number and kinds of businesses. *Business recruitment is considered an economic development function, although the City defines what types of businesses are suitable for the commercial zones and where those zones are located.*
- Keep the City pedestrian friendly by having a business district in the center of town. *The City controls where commercial zones are placed.*
- Keep the City small, quiet, and safe, and develop more open space for public use. *The City has authority to designate zones for various uses and to provide for public safety. It also has review and approval authority over development proposals.*
- Most of the City businesses should be locally owned. *The City has no authority to require that a business be owned by a local resident or corporation.*
- Provide a variety of housing types such as multi-family dwellings and senior living centers. *The City defines the types of housing permitted in zones and controls where residential zones are located.*

- Safe pedestrian crossings on Main and Center streets. *These are federal highways under the jurisdiction of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) whose standards may conflict with the City's need to be pedestrian friendly. However, UDOT has voiced a willingness to work with the City on specific locations.*
- There is no pollution in Monticello and that's a good thing. *The City defines the uses allowed in zones and can remove or limit those uses that might pollute.*
- Unused houses and undeveloped land (land banking) should be eliminated in favor of housing. *The City has no authority to force a property owner to open a vacant house to occupancy or require vacant land to be developed.*

Objectives for the next five years:

- A. Revise as needed City land use ordinances to conform to state code, with particular attention to lot size, setbacks, portable storage units, and accessory dwelling units (ADU). This is an on-going process because the Utah Legislature often makes changes to existing state code. It typically requires about six to eight months for the City to update its code in response to state changes because the update process (also created by the state) requires public notices and two levels of public hearings. The City also requires legal review before an ordinance is approved.
- B. Complete revision of permitted uses for residential zones to allow more flexibility for housing developments. Consider adding townhome and condominium regulations. This process was underway when the City began work on the 2027 general plan and will require about four months to complete. But work cannot resume until the City's land use ordinances have been updated to comply with current state code.
- C. Complete revision of permitted uses for non-residential zones to allow more flexibility for business development. This process was underway when the City began work on the 2027 general plan and will require about four months to complete. But work cannot resume until the City's land use ordinances have been updated to comply with current state code.
- D. Revise the existing zoning map for Monticello to assure sufficient areas are available for residential and commercial uses as defined in the updated City codes.
- E. Revise the subdivision ordinance to conform with Utah code, including updates to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) sections. This process was underway when the City began work on the 2027 general plan and will require another four months to complete.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

>Is this broken into smaller parts?<

MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ELEMENT

Utah code defines moderate income housing as a dwelling where a household with an income no more than 80% of the area median income was able to occupy the dwelling by

paying no more than 30% of the household income for gross housing costs, including utilities. Federal census projections for Monticello include the following:

Median household income =	\$72,969 per year
80% of median household income =	\$58,375 per year
30% of median household income =	\$17,512 per year

A 2024 study of housing in San Juan County showed that Monticello residents pay roughly 33% of household income on gross housing costs.

Accomplishments from the 2018 General Plan:

- Multi-family residential zone (R-2) was revised to add small homes, tiny homes, and tiny home parks. These changes were in lieu of creating a zone specific to low and moderate income housing because the City felt that such a zone would highlight economic divisions in the community and provide no benefit for the housing situation.
- Single-family residential zone (R-1) was updated to add small homes on smaller lots, thus opening some existing lots to development through the Residential Infilling section of the City's subdivision code.
- The City Manager joined the board of the Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah. >Is this still true?<
- The commercial zones (C-1, C-2) permitted uses were revised to include live-work units.

Unattained goals and objectives from the 2018 plan:

- A redesign of the City website is currently underway and can include information about low and moderate income housing programs that may assist residents with their housing needs. However, a formal commitment to add the information was not made by the time work began on the 2027 General Plan. In addition, the City has no existing way to quickly update, add to, or remove information on its website.
- Incentives for development of multi-family rental dwellings was discussed but no specific actions were taken. In the meantime, Utah developed programs that may offer builders and financiers incentives to build in Monticello and these programs will be referenced in the 2027 general plan.
- Revision of the zoning map was shifted to the 2027 General Plan as a step in the City's effort to provide adequate space for residential and commercial development.

Concerns and suggestions from citizens and employees (*City responses in italics*):

- Agricultural land is not the best use when more housing is needed. *The agricultural zone (A-1) was reviewed and changes proposed to expand housing opportunities. Code revisions were moved to the 2027 General Plan.*
- Allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs). *This is required by state law and the City will revise its code to clarify the use of ADUs.*
- Available houses are overpriced for the local economy and young couples cannot afford to buy local housing. *The City does not control how much money an owner wants for a house. The City does not control how much a business pays its employees.*
- Don't allow high density development. *The City can determine the types of housing and lot sizes, but if land is the limiting factor to housing growth, high density locations within the city may be needed.*

- Eliminate barriers to make it easier to build homes. *Through its zoning and subdivision ordinances the City defines where dwellings can be located and what types of housing can be built, but all dwellings must meet state codes. Approval of subdivisions must follow state standards.*
- Establish a vacancy tax to collect money for housing development. *At present the City has no authority to assess such a tax. It is uncertain whether Utah law permits this type of tax.*
- Limit or eliminate second homes in Monticello. *The City has no authority to prevent houses from becoming second homes.*
- Offer incentives to builders to attract them to Monticello and encourage timely completion of projects. *The City has already had discussions about the shortage of builders in the area and has some options to reward timeliness. The Economic Development element will have other ways of making the city attractive to builders.*
- Reduce property taxes and reduce fees tied to subdivision approval and building permits. *The City has some authority to make changes, but must consider the cost of staff time for subdivision reviews and approvals, and the issuance and monitoring of building permits. Fees need to be reasonable but sufficient to cover administrative costs.*
- Set a limit on how much a landlord can raise rent in a given period of time. *It is unclear whether the City has the authority to set rent or place limits on rent.*
- The City needs affordable housing in a variety of housing types. *The City defines the types of housing permitted in zones and controls where residential zones are located. Several changes were previously made to house and lot sizes within residential zones.*
- Too many short-term rentals deny housing to permanent and seasonal residents. *The City establishes where short-term rentals are allowed and has the option of setting density standards. If a house is located where short-term rentals are permitted, the City has no authority to prevent the owner from turning the house into a short-term rental.*
- Unused houses and undeveloped land (land banking) should be eliminated in favor of housing. *The City has no authority to force a property owner to open a vacant house to occupancy or require vacant land to be developed.*
- Use private-public partnerships to build affordable housing. *The City has some options through Utah code changes and housing programs, but no action was taken by the time work on the 2027 General Plan began.*

Objectives for the next five years:

- A. Coordinate with the Department of Workforce Services to bring affordable housing to the city.
- B. Create a first home investment zone in accordance with Utah code 63N-23 Part 7.
- C. Create a home ownership promotion zone in accordance with Utah code 63N-23 Part 5.
- D. Eliminate impact fees for construction of external Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).
- E. Establish a minimum requirement for the percentage of moderate income houses to be built in new subdivisions or continued development of phased subdivisions.
- F. Post affordable housing program information on the City website and keep it up to date.
- G. Reduce or waive impact fees for the construction of moderate income housing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

>>Is this broken into smaller parts?<<

WATER USE AND PRESERVATION ELEMENT

PARKS AND TRAILS ELEMENT

Is distinction between parks/trails and facilities clear?<<

RECREATION PROGRAM ELEMENT

PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES ELEMENT

>>Is this broken into smaller parts?

Is distinction between parks/trails and facilities clear?<<

ENERGY CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Accomplishments from the 2018 General Plan:

- Solar panels were donated to the City but City Council determined the capacity of the panels was a poor match for City facilities. Solar panels for City buildings will be included in the energy conservation plan.
- City building permit requirements encouraging energy efficient remodeling or rehabilitation are addressed by the building codes adopted by Utah and the City. Thus, the City building permit requirements were not changed.

Unattained goals and objectives from the 2018 plan:

- Revise ordinances to allow small wind turbines within the City. Small wind turbines are currently not allowed in any zone. Changing permitted uses to include them was moved to the 2027 General Plan.
- Implement an award program to recognize residents, businesses, and institutions that are leaders in energy conservation. Moved to 2027 General Plan for consideration.
- Update the City website to include energy conservation strategies for home owners. On-going updates to the website could include such strategies. Item moved to 2027 General Plan.
- Revise subdivision and planned unit development (PUD) ordinances to encourage energy efficient design. The PUD ordinance requires extensive updating to comply with Utah code and energy efficiency may be included. Moved to 2027 General Plan.
- Implement an energy conservation plan for City-owned buildings and fleet. Moved to the 2027 General Plan.

Concerns and suggestions from citizens and employees (*City responses in italics*):

- Provide electric vehicle recharging stations. *The City approved an ordinance for commercial charging stations for electric vehicles and two commercial EV charging stations are operational. The City is currently evaluating a proposal for a Tesla-style recharging station* >>update when decided<<
- Make it easier for homeowners to generate their own power. *The City has the option of refusing approval or renewal of any plat, subdivision plan, or dedication of street or other ground that includes restrictions, covenants, or binding agreements running with the land that have the effect of prohibiting reasonably sited and designed solar collectors, clotheslines, or other energy devices based on renewable resources.*
- The City administration building needs upgrades to windows and heating and cooling devices to assure safety and energy efficiency. *This will be considered in the development of an energy conservation plan for City-owned facilities and may include smart technology.*
- Will Monticello have to comply with a state requirement that electric sales include 20% dedicated to renewable energy? *No, the City buys its electricity from Empire Electric Association and therefore is not a retailer of electric power.*
- The City should show leadership in energy conservation by putting electric vehicles in their fleet. *The City has reviewed the possible acquisition of electric vehicles but City Council determined that present technology does not fit the City's operational needs.*

Objectives for the next five years:

>>Does the City plan to address administrative issues in the GP? If so, will they fit into an existing element or should a new element be created?<<