



MINUTES

MONROE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

August 25th, 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 August 25th, 2026, at 7:00 P.M. Opening prayer was offered by Commissioner Moore.

Present:

Commissioners:

Talon Gadd

David Riddle

Riley Lindsay-excused

Lance Roberts-excused

Amy Moore

Citizens:

Candice Barney

Prescott McCarthy

Karl Pieper

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

Commissioner Riddle made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Moore. Motion carried unanimously. 3-0.

3. Citizens' comments.

No citizen's comments were recorded.

4. Discussion of affordable housing development. Submitted by Karl Pieper.

Karl Pieper, a local contractor and property owner, presented a concept for a small-scale affordable housing development in Monroe. He framed the discussion as exploratory, asking whether the community and Commission had an appetite for such a project rather than advocating for a specific proposal.

Mr. Pieper described receiving multiple inquiries from prospective renters unable to afford current rental rates of \$1,700–\$1,800 per month, and seeking options closer to \$1,000–\$1,200 per month. He referenced a similar development of small homes near the football field in

Ephraim as a model — a cluster of individual one-bedroom, one-bath homes without garages, designed for young couples, newlyweds, or elderly residents on fixed incomes. The homes would be owned entirely by a single entity, connected by shared septic infrastructure, and could never be sold off individually. He described it as a pocket neighborhood or, as the conversation later identified, a "pocket community."

Mr. Pieper outlined several practical concerns he had already considered: the city's septic requirements, fire truck access and turnaround, parking for residents, and construction costs. He noted a conversation with Jason Bagley from the health department indicating that multiple homes could legally share a connected septic system provided the property remained under single ownership, with adequate leach fields and replacement fields on a common area. He proposed that this common area could also serve as shared green space.

Commissioner Riddle raised concerns about long-term density, noting that even one-bedroom units tend to see growing families over time, and referenced the significant expense of retroactively installing curb, gutter, and sidewalk in dense neighborhoods. He also raised questions about parking availability and how residents would safely access schools.

Commissioner Moore suggested the concept may require new ordinances and that, as a significant policy shift, it would be more appropriate to first bring it before the City Council — the elected body — to gauge the community's appetite before the Commission begins drafting new land use language.

City Council Member Barney clarified the current state of city ordinances: a "tiny home" is defined as a dwelling of 400 square feet or less on a permanent foundation, and a "tiny home community village" is conditionally permitted only in the Recreation Commercial and Light Industrial zones — not in residential zones. The maximum density for such a community is 16 dwelling units per acre, subject to health department, water, and parking requirements, all requiring a Conditional Use Permit. She noted that if the units exceed 400 square feet, the tiny home village designation would no longer apply, reverting the project to the standard rule of one dwelling unit per lot.

Mr. Pieper expressed that 400 square feet was too small for his vision, estimating 900–1,000 square feet as a more workable size for the intended demographic. He also confirmed that under current city water policy, each unit — even under single ownership — would require its own separate water meter, adding to per-unit costs.

The Commission discussed the possibility of characterizing the development as an apartment complex, a fourplex, or another existing use type under current ordinances. It was acknowledged that zoning for multifamily units does exist but that the septic requirements create significant land-use constraints.

The consensus that emerged was that the concept has genuine community merit — particularly given declining school enrollment numbers and the desire to retain young families in Monroe

— but that it does not neatly fit within existing ordinances. Commissioner Moore reiterated that the appropriate next step would be for Mr. Pieper to present the concept to the City Council, and that if the Council expressed interest, the Commission could then undertake the work of researching how other communities have handled similar developments and potentially drafting new ordinance language. City Council Member Barney concurred and offered to coordinate that presentation, tentatively scheduled for the September 8th City Council meeting.

5. Consider Red Hill Estates Subdivision exemption from Curb, Gutter, and sidewalk requirement. 12.14.6, 12.15.1, 12.15.2. Submitted by Prescott McCarthy.

Prescott McCarthy presented his plans for a proposed subdivision on property he owns along the road leading to Red Hill Hot Springs, located in a Geological Hazard area. He explained that he had initially mapped the property as high-density quarter-acre lots, which would have required full curb, gutter, sidewalk, and asphalt per the city's current road ordinance — estimated at approximately \$1.2 million — but that after spending time on the land, he found that density to feel inconsistent with the natural, open character of the foothills location.

He presented two alternatives. The first option retains the property as lots of two acres or greater, which under current ordinance would not trigger the curb, gutter, and sidewalk requirement, but results in elongated, awkward parcel shapes. The second — and preferred — option would create six one-acre lots and include a gravel road widened to 24 feet with six inches of road base, while seeking an exemption from the curb, gutter, and sidewalk requirement. He also indicated his intention to preserve a 60-foot right-of-way for a future north-south road corridor identified in the city's Transportation Master Plan, which could eventually provide an additional entrance to the Red Hill area as traffic to the hot springs increases.

Prescott noted that a retention basin had been considered in consultation with an engineer during the earlier high-density planning phase, and that he intended to retain that drainage infrastructure concept to accommodate any future paving. He acknowledged that without pavement, the drainage impact would be minimal.

The Commission discussed the legal threshold for granting a variance from the curb, gutter, and sidewalk requirement. City Council Member Barney referenced the five statutory criteria under Utah law — including unreasonable hardship, special circumstances attached to the property, preservation of property rights enjoyed by others in the same zone, consistency with the general plan, and observance of the spirit of the ordinance. Commissioner Moore expressed concern that the request did not clearly meet the variance criteria, particularly because financial considerations alone do not constitute a qualifying hardship. She also raised a concern about setting a precedent, noting that the adjacent lower-density subdivision had similarly avoided curb and gutter and had generated community criticism.

112 Jacee Barney clarified that Mr. McCarthy retains the legal right to file a formal variance
113 application, which would then be reviewed by the city's Land Use Authority. She encouraged
114 him to file the application if he wished to pursue that route formally.

115 Prescott acknowledged the Commission's position and indicated he largely anticipated this
116 outcome. He stated his intention to return the following month (September) with a formal
117 subdivision application for the three-lot or six-lot configuration — complying with current
118 ordinances — but requested flexibility on the timing of the drainage engineering plan, noting
119 his engineer was approximately two months out. City Council Member Barney indicated that
120 the Commission could consider moving forward with an initial review if it was comfortable with
121 the application minus the drainage plan, with the engineering to be submitted prior to final
122 approval.

123 It was confirmed that Mr. McCarthy's property is within the water pressure green zone, that
124 septic drainage conditions on the site are favorable, that the main road grades are
125 approximately seven percent (within the city's ten percent maximum), and that the road right-
126 of-way would be sized at 60 feet to accommodate future upgrades. No formal motion was
127 made, as the application packet had not yet been formally submitted.

128

129 **6. Other Business.**

130 No other business was raised.

131 **7. Adjournment.**

132 **Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Riddle and seconded by Commissioner**
133 **Moore. The motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:25 P.M.**

134

135