



MINUTES

MONROE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 15th, 2026

1. Meeting called to order- Prayer- Roll call.

The regular meeting of the Monroe City Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Talon Gadd on Tuesday, June 16th, 2026, at 6:00 P.M. Opening prayer was offered by Commissioner Riddle.

Present:

Commissioners:

Candice Barney

Talon Gadd

David Riddle

Riley Lindsay

Lance Roberts

Citizens:

Tyler Timmons

2. Approval of previous meeting minutes May 19th, 2026.

The minutes from the May 19, 2026 meeting were presented for approval. Commissioner Roberts noted he had reviewed the minutes and found no items requiring correction or adjustment.

Motion to approve the minutes of May 19, 2026, as provided was made by Commissioner Roberts and seconded by Commissioner Moore. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Citizens' comments.

No citizens' comments were recorded.

4. Discussion on proposed amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance

Spelling and Terminology Corrections

Commissioner Moore identified a spelling error on page 9, where a word appeared to be misspelled and should read "document." Commissioner Lindsay further suggested that the term "establishment document" should be changed to "boundary establishment document" throughout, for clarity and consistency with the referenced state code (§57-1-45). Commissioner Lindsay explained the broader context of the boundary adjustment and boundary establishment

provisions, noting that the state-level changes were intended to give property owners a simpler, less costly mechanism to resolve boundary disputes without requiring a full subdivision plat amendment.

Page 14 – Agricultural Land Exemption Language

Commissioner Moore flagged an apparent incomplete sentence under §54(a) related to the bona fide division of agricultural land “for the purpose.” After discussion, it was agreed that the phrase “for the purpose” should be removed so the passage reads: “a bona fide division or partition of agricultural land, as provided in [referenced code].”

Page 17 – Land Use Authority Matrix

Tyler Timmons from R6 raised a question about whether the City Council may serve as the land use authority for subdivision-related decisions, noting that recent state-level changes largely removed the legislative body from the subdivision approval process in favor of staff and planning commission review. The Commission discussed the various structures other cities have adopted, including mixed boards. It was noted that the ordinance contains a footnote stating that a decision of the land use authority is considered an administrative act even when the land use authority is the City Council, which may sufficiently address the concern.

Page 41 – Statement of Utilities

The Commission discussed the existing "letter of feasibility for utilities" provision and agreed it was insufficiently specific. Commissioners expressed concern that a developer could simply declare certain utilities infeasible and avoid installing them, resulting in future road damage and city costs when utilities are added after the fact. The consensus was to replace "letter of feasibility" with a "statement of provided utilities," and to require a minimum of water, power, and natural gas to be installed—with stubs at each lot—prior to final approval. It was noted that telecommunications/internet, while desirable, could remain optional given that those providers typically self-fund installation. Construction standards would govern the specifics of stubbing requirements.

Water Pressure and Hydraulic Modeling

Commissioner Moore asked whether the ordinance adequately addresses situations where a hydraulic study reveals that minimum pressure requirements (40 PSI per DEQ standards) cannot be met. The Commission agreed that language should make clear that any required improvements—such as a booster pump—are to be paid by the developer, not the city. Tyler Timmons noted that the existing phrase "and other improvements as necessary" may cover this, but the Commission felt it would benefit from clearer articulation.

Minor vs. Major Subdivisions

Commissioner Lindsay raised concerns about the potential cost burden placed on small-scale subdivision applicants, noting that requiring full engineering studies for three-lot subdivisions

could easily cost \$30,000–\$40,000 in studies alone, discouraging modest development. The Commission discussed the historical rationale for eliminating the minor/major subdivision distinction, specifically the problem of developers avoiding subdivision requirements by repeatedly splitting parcels in increments of two or three lots. It was clarified that splitting one lot into two is not considered a subdivision and does not require this process; subdivision status is triggered when three or more lots are created. The Commission acknowledged this is an area warranting further discussion. Tyler Timmons noted that the agricultural land exemption (page 60) provides some relief for minor splits of agricultural parcels under three lots, and that many study requirements include "if required" or "as determined by the city" language that provides some administrative flexibility.

Storm Water and Drainage

Commissioner Lindsay raised the concern that concentrating runoff in a subdivision can cause downstream flooding and that ensuring adequate drainage is one of the most significant sources of municipal liability. The Commission discussed whether the ordinance adequately requires detention or retention. Tyler Timmons pointed to page 41.5, which requires a storm water plan stamped by a licensed civil engineer demonstrating compliance with adopted design standards, including the requirement that post-development discharge not exceed pre-development discharge for 10-year and 100-year storm events. The Commission agreed this provision provides a reasonable framework, though members emphasized the importance of diligent review at the concept and preliminary plan stages.

Street Lights

Commissioner Moore noted that while the ordinance references street light requirements and fixture standards, it does not specify how many lights are required or their spacing. The Commission agreed this is an area that may need to be addressed either in the ordinance or in the city's construction standards, and that the city power department should be consulted.

Water Rights

Commissioner Riddle raised the broader policy question of whether subdivisions should be required to turn over water rights to the city, noting that developers who subdivide agricultural land often sell off the associated water rights, effectively shifting the cost of supplying culinary water to city ratepayers. Tyler Timmons noted that requiring water right conveyances at subdivision is less common than at annexation, but is legally permissible. He also suggested the Commission explore whether the city could establish a first right of refusal on water rights offered for sale within city limits. Commissioner Lindsay questioned whether requiring a water rights documentation report was meaningful if the city does not intend to require conveyance. City Treasurer Barney agreed to investigate what was required of the White Fence Farms subdivision as a reference point, and the Commission agreed to keep the water rights documentation requirement in place as a placeholder while the broader policy question is studied further.

Impact Fees

Tyler Timmons noted that impact fees, if set appropriately, are intended to offset the infrastructure costs of new development. Monroe City's current water impact fee is \$5,327 plus a \$2,000 hookup fee. He noted that some communities (e.g., Richfield) have pushed impact fees as high as \$30,000 in order to have funds available to purchase water rights on the open market rather than requiring developers to convey them. The Commission acknowledged that impact fee levels are a policy lever for managing growth rate and infrastructure capacity.

Landscaping Requirements

City Treasurer Barney presented a document submitted by a citizen requesting that a landscaping requirement (including trees and shrubs) be added to subdivision standards. After discussion, the Commission expressed general opposition to mandating landscaping, citing concerns about individual property rights, the diversity of homeowner preferences in a small town, and the state's water-wise landscaping initiatives. The consensus was that landscaping standards are more appropriate for CC&Rs administered by a homeowners' association than for a municipal subdivision ordinance.

7:20 PM

5. Public Hearing. The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments concerning proposed amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance. The City is proposing various text amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance to increase consistency and compliance with current State requirements, address clarity and correctness issues, and relocate/integrate existing regulations for improved administration enforcement, and transparency.

The Chair closed the Planning Commission discussion at approximately 7:20 PM and opened the public hearing for the purpose of receiving public comment on the proposed amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance.

No members of the public offered comment.

The public hearing was closed at approximately 7:21 PM and the Planning Commission was reconvened.

6. Consider proposed amendments to the Monroe City Subdivision Ordinance to increase consistency and compliance with current State requirements, address clarity and correctness issues, and relocate/integrate existing regulations for improved administration enforcement, and transparency.

Following the close of the public hearing, the Commission considered the proposed amendments as discussed. The specific changes agreed upon through deliberation included: correcting the spelling error and amending "establishment document" to "boundary establishment document";

148 removing the phrase "for the purpose" from the agricultural land provision; replacing "letter of
149 feasibility for utilities" with a "statement of provided utilities" requiring a minimum of water,
150 power, and natural gas with stubs at each lot; and retaining the water rights documentation
151 requirement as a placeholder pending further policy discussion.

152 Motion to approve and move forward with the proposed amendments to the Monroe City
153 Subdivision Ordinance as discussed during the meeting was made by Commissioner Roberts and
154 seconded by Commissioner Riddle. The motion carried unanimously.

155 **7. Other Business.**

156 The Commission discussed the scheduling of the next regular meeting, originally set for July 21,
157 2026. Given the proximity to the Pioneer Day holiday week, the Commission agreed to cancel
158 the July meeting and resume in August.

159 Motion to cancel the July 21, 2026 Planning Commission meeting was made by Commissioner
160 Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Riddle. The motion carried unanimously.

161 **8. Adjournment.**

162 Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Roberts and seconded by Commissioner Riddle
163 at 7:25 P.M. The motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned.