

Town of Cedar Fort

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

August 11, 2026 | 7:00 PM

Town Hall, 50 East Center Street, Cedar Fort

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Cedar Fort Planning Commission was called to order at approximately 7:02 PM.

1. Roll Call

Commission Members Present:

- Kent Withers
- Lynette Groff
- Cayden Draper
- Bart D Berry

Staff Present:

- Kandice Johnson, Recorder

A quorum was present. Refer to the sign in sheet.

2. Prayer / Thought

A prayer was offered by Todd Berry.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Bart D Berry.

REPORTS

No reports were given.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes: Planning Commission July 14, 2026

The Commission discussed the July 14, 2026 meeting and clarified that no official meeting had been held due to the lack of a quorum; therefore, there were no minutes from that meeting to approve.

It was also noted that the June meeting minutes had inadvertently not been included on the current agenda. The June minutes will be placed on the September agenda for consideration.

No action was taken on the July 14, 2026 minutes.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. MG40 Zone

The Commission continued discussion regarding the MG40 Zone, particularly the intended uses and appropriate designation of property currently associated with mining and grazing.

It was noted that the discussion originally began with the possibility of carrying the existing MG40 language forward into the revised Town Code. After further review, Commission members expressed that it may be more appropriate to redefine the zone rather than simply transferring the existing language.

Discussion included whether the zone should remain primarily agricultural and whether recreational uses should be permitted. Members discussed possible recreational structures or uses and the importance of requiring appropriate legal access before development could occur.

It was reported that property owners who had been contacted indicated that they wished for their property to remain agricultural.

The Commission discussed reviewing other jurisdictions, including county standards, for examples of permitted uses and definitions that may be appropriate. A member agreed to obtain applicable language and share it with the Commission for review.

The Commission generally discussed moving toward an Agricultural Zone designation rather than maintaining the MG40 designation. Because changing the designation and applicable regulations would require an amendment to the Town Code, the matter would need to proceed through the public hearing process.

The Commission agreed to continue reviewing proposed language and revisit the matter at the next meeting, at which time a public hearing date could be considered.

2. Ongoing Business

Ongoing matters were discussed in conjunction with the individual business items on the agenda. No separate formal action was taken under this item.

3. Code Revision - Cul-de-sacs

The Commission discussed the Town's cul-de-sac requirements in connection with current and future development.

Discussion centered primarily on how cul-de-sacs may affect future connectivity between developments. It was noted that a cul-de-sac may create difficulties when neighboring property develops later if there is no opportunity to extend a roadway through the development.

The Commission discussed the benefit of using stub roads or other future roadway connections where appropriate so that streets can eventually connect with adjoining properties.

The Commission agreed that discussion regarding cul-de-sac standards should continue as the Town works through its code revisions and future development applications.

No formal action was taken.

4. AR-40 Zone

The Commission discussed the AR-40 Zone in conjunction with the MG40 Zone discussion.

Members discussed maintaining agricultural uses within the area and determining which additional uses, if any, should be permitted. The Commission discussed the importance of clearly defining the purpose of the zone and its permitted uses as part of the ongoing revision of the Town Code.

The Commission agreed to review proposed language and continue the discussion at a future meeting, with the expectation that proposed zoning changes would ultimately proceed through the required public hearing process.

No formal action was taken.

5. Cedar Berry Estates Phase 1

Preliminary Review / Temporary Access Easement Discussion
Proposed Cul-de-sacs
Prescriptive Access

Representatives of Cedar Berry Estates presented an updated map and discussed the status of Phase 1 and the proposed roadway layout.

The Commission reviewed previous approvals and discussions concerning the development, including the preliminary plan and the previously proposed cul-de-sac. It was discussed that concerns had been raised regarding cul-de-sacs and the need to maintain future roadway connectivity to adjoining properties.

An updated concept was reviewed showing a roadway/stub connection that could eventually connect to Church Street. The possibility of extending a road along the property line was also discussed. The intent would be to provide future connectivity while avoiding the creation of an unnecessary main thoroughfare through the development.

Temporary access and access near the rodeo grounds were discussed. The developer indicated that access would be maintained and that additional details could be provided regarding how the proposed access would interact with existing improvements in the area.

The Commission also discussed the location of Town water infrastructure and the advantages of locating water lines, valves, and related infrastructure within the roadway where appropriate. Members discussed problems that can occur when valves and collars are located along the edge of a roadway where they may be damaged.

Access toward Spring Creek was discussed, including the need to preserve Town access. The Commission indicated that access should be maintained even if the roadway is not immediately improved.

The developer also discussed the possibility of installing sewer infrastructure or dry sewer lines during construction rather than having to disturb newly constructed roads at a later date. Discussion included the potential future regional sewer system and the possibility of using infrastructure for reclaimed or gray water. Members noted that there are considerations regarding the useful life of infrastructure installed before a sewer system becomes operational.

It was reported that the developer had previously discussed the concept with Eric and had been advised against installing the line at this time; however, the developer expressed concern regarding the cost and disruption of installing infrastructure after roads are completed.

The Commission indicated that it did not object to the developer installing infrastructure for future use, provided applicable standards and engineering requirements were followed.

The developer was asked whether any additional direction was needed from the Planning Commission. The developer indicated that no additional action was needed at this time and that the project would continue through the applicable review and approval process.

No formal action was taken.

6. Building Permit/Business License for Sopher Residence

The Commission discussed the business operating at the Sopher property and whether its current and proposed activities continue to qualify as a home-based business or require a Conditional Use Permit.

It was explained that the business provides mobile welding and fabrication services. Work is performed at outside job sites as well as at the property. The business currently has one employee, with the possibility of adding another employee as the business grows. It was stated that customers do not generally come to the property and that large semi-truck deliveries are not anticipated.

The business owner explained that use of the shop varies depending upon available work. At times the property may not be used for several weeks, while other projects may require regular work at the property for an extended period.

The Commission discussed how the nature of the business has changed from the prior year. The previous business license was described as being more consistent with a mobile business/home-office operation. Increased fabrication work occurring at the property raised questions regarding whether the current operation still qualifies as a home-based business.

Fire safety was a significant concern. The property is located near sagebrush and other vegetation, and welding and fabrication activities create a potential fire hazard. The business owner explained that vegetation had been disked and cleared in the work area and that water and fire extinguishers were available. The owner also discussed enclosing portions of the existing open-sided structure with steel sheeting to reduce fire risk.

The Commission discussed having the Fire Chief review the site and determine whether additional fire-mitigation measures would be necessary.

Questions were also raised regarding whether a home must actually be located on the property for an operation to qualify as a home-based business. Mayor Cook commented that the ordinance allows four or fewer employees on the premises while remaining within the home-based business provisions but noted that the ordinance may not clearly address whether a residence must be located on the same property.

Based on the nature of the proposed operation and the questions regarding the home-based business provisions, the Commission discussed having the applicant pursue a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). It was explained that this process would allow the Town to review the site plan, proposed use, fire mitigation, operating conditions, and other applicable requirements.

The applicant was advised that the Conditional Use Permit process would include submission of an application and required information, Planning Commission review, and, if appropriate, a public hearing before final consideration. It was also explained that conditions could be placed upon the use and that the permit would be subject to the applicable provisions of Town Code.

The applicant stated that he understood the process and was willing to provide the required information and comply with applicable requirements. Commission members expressed support for working through the application as efficiently as reasonably possible while completing the required review and noticing procedures.

No Conditional Use Permit application had been submitted at the time of the meeting, and no approval was granted.

7. West Canyon Road Speed Limit Signs / Road Restrictions

The Commission held an extensive discussion regarding West Canyon Road, including jurisdiction, speed-limit signs, truck traffic, road improvements, the gravel pit, public safety, and potential future ownership or control of the roadway.

Councilman Carter reported ongoing conversations with Utah County regarding the roadway. The County had requested that the Town remove the speed-limit signs currently installed along portions of West Canyon Road because of questions regarding which portions of the roadway fall under Town jurisdiction and which portions are under County jurisdiction.

The County indicated that, absent a traffic study establishing a different speed, the roadway would be subject to the applicable County speed limit. Concern was expressed regarding the appropriateness of higher speeds given the amount and type of traffic using the road.

It was reported that the County had agreed to conduct a traffic study. The study is expected to evaluate traffic volume, vehicle types, including large trucks, and existing travel speeds.

Commission members expressed significant concern regarding heavy truck traffic associated with the gravel pit. Members discussed previous recommendations intended to protect the agricultural/residential character of the roadway and reduce the impact of commercial haul traffic on residents.

Safety concerns included the volume and speed of trucks, vehicles passing one another, children and pedestrians using the roadway, and the intersection of West Canyon Road with SR-73. Several near-accidents and other incidents were referenced during the discussion.

The Commission discussed previous recommendations for an alternative commercial haul route that would direct gravel-pit traffic east rather than through the residential/agricultural area of Cedar Fort. Members stated that such a route could reduce conflicts between commercial truck traffic and local residential traffic.

Councilman Carter reported that discussions had also taken place with UDOT regarding improvements to the intersection with SR-73. Potential improvements discussed with UDOT include turn lanes and other changes intended to improve safety at the intersection. The project is being considered among UDOT's safety priorities, subject to available funding.

The County and gravel-pit operator have also discussed potentially paving portions of West Canyon Road. Commission members expressed differing concerns regarding paving. While pavement could improve the condition of the road, members were concerned that paving could encourage higher speeds and increased commercial truck traffic and could further complicate the question of jurisdiction.

The Commission discussed the importance of determining the Town's legal interest in West Canyon Road before additional major improvements are made.

A Notice of Interest was discussed as one potential method of documenting the Town's interest in the roadway. It was noted that similar action had been taken by Fairfield regarding roads within that community. The Commission discussed filing notices of interest for West Canyon Road as well as other roads where the Town's interest may need to be documented.

The possibility of obtaining roadway dedication from adjoining property owners was also discussed. It was reported that previous conversations indicated some landowners may not be willing to participate in dedicating the roadway to the Town.

Members emphasized that any improvements made by the County should be reviewed with consideration for Cedar Fort's road standards and future needs, particularly if the Town may eventually assume ownership or maintenance responsibility.

The Commission discussed contacting representatives from Fairfield to learn from their experience addressing similar multi-jurisdictional roadway issues.

No formal action was taken. The matter will remain an ongoing issue for continued coordination among the Town, Utah County, UDOT, affected property owners, and other involved parties.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ric Campbell

Rick Campbell, who identified himself as owning property east of the rodeo grounds, addressed the Commission regarding electrical service to his property.

Mr. Campbell stated that he had been working with Rocky Mountain Power regarding bringing electrical service to his property. He explained that an initial proposal involved installing a second set of power poles along the east side of the roadway even though Town-owned poles already exist on the west side.

After additional discussions with Rocky Mountain Power, Mr. Campbell stated that the utility may be willing to purchase approximately four of the existing Town poles and use those poles rather than installing duplicate infrastructure.

Mr. Campbell stated that this could benefit the Town by eliminating duplicate infrastructure, providing compensation to the Town for the poles, and transferring future maintenance responsibility for the poles to Rocky Mountain Power.

He asked who he should work with on behalf of the Town regarding the proposal. Mayor Cook indicated that Mr. Campbell could work with him and requested that Mr. Campbell contact him so they could discuss the proposal in greater detail.

Mr. Campbell also asked about the process for obtaining power to his property and whether a site plan or other Town approval would be required before drilling a well. Discussion followed regarding state well permitting and the Town's requirements when property is located within the required distance of the Town's culinary water system.

Mr. Campbell indicated that the initial well would be intended for agricultural use and that he was not currently planning to construct a home. He was directed to coordinate with Mayor Cook regarding the applicable administrative requirements.

Gary Cook

Gary Cook addressed the Commission regarding the welding/fabrication business discussed under Business Item No. 6.

Mr. Cook stated that he owns adjoining property and expressed concern that the business may not be permitted under the existing AR-1 Agricultural Residential zoning.

He raised concerns regarding the proximity of the welding operation to his property and haystack, as well as potential fire hazards, noise, grinding, hammering, welding, outdoor fabrication activities, and the possibility of increased inventory and expansion as the business grows.

Mr. Cook stated that, based upon his review of the Town ordinances, he believed a home-based business requires a residence and a bona fide resident on the property. He also questioned whether the proposed fabrication use could qualify for a Conditional Use Permit within the existing zone and referenced provisions of the Town Code regarding conditional uses and consistency with the Town's General Plan and zoning requirements.

The Commission explained that no Conditional Use Permit application had yet been submitted or approved. The concerns raised by Mr. Cook were identified as matters that could be considered as part of the formal application and review process, including zoning, site conditions, compatibility with surrounding property, fire mitigation, and the specific nature of the proposed use.

Mr. Cook was encouraged to provide his concerns and applicable ordinance references as the application proceeds.

No additional public comments were offered.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

"I make a motion to adjourn the meeting."

Motion: Lynnette Groff

Second: Bart D Berry

Vote:

Lynnette Groff — Yes
Cayden Draper — Yes
Kent Withers — Yes
Bart D Berry — Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

Minutes approved by the Cedar Fort Planning Commission on:

Date

Kandice Johnson, Town Recorder

DRAFT