Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

September 01, 2026 6:30 P.M.
Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 302, Manti, Utah

Attendees: Planning Commission Chair Cody Harmer, Board Members: Claudia Jarrett, Gene Jacobson, Jo-Anne Riley and Rick Allred. Also in attendance is Sanpete County Commissioner Mike Bennett, Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Heidi Sorenson, and Board Member Justin Atkinson and Sanpete County Recorder Talisha Johnson joined via Google Meet. Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Heather Pyper has been excused.

Planning Commission Chair Cody Harmer calls meeting to order.

Approval of the Agenda

A motion is made by Jo-Anne Riley to approve the agenda.

Claudia Jarrett seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed and the motion passes. Vote by voice: Cody Harmer, yes ; Gene Jacobson, yes; Claudia Jarrett, yes; Jo-Anne Riley, aye; Justin Atkinson, yes; Rick Allred, yes.

Jeff Strange concept review for RV Park in Mount Pleasant's Buffer Zone.

Mr. Harmer asks Jeff Strange to state his name for the record. Mr. Strange introduced himself and stated that he wanted to see if their concept could be brought to reality and to learn what the county thinks about it. Mr. Strange explained that they talked to Mount Pleasant City regarding their ordinance, noting that the city ordinance is different from the county's. He stated that according to their survey, they have 4.23 acres in combined parcels. He noted that the county requires 5 acres for an RV park, and they wanted to know the possibility of doing a variance or conditional use permit to reduce the required acreage down to the amount of property available. He noted they talked to Mount Pleasant City because the property is in the buffer zone, and Mount Pleasant City's ordinance requirement is 2 acres. He stated that it seems odd when looking at other RV parks around that are not utilizing a full five acres. He added that their drawing does not even use all four available acres because part of it is in the buffer zone and part is in the city Industrial Zone. Mr. Strange clarified that they want to use the back portion of the property, which is the buffer zone, rather than both sections. Mr. Harmer stated that he did not see a way for it to apply as a variance. He expressed that the conversation that needs to be had is whether the county should allow the zoning to follow the

city's size and density when dealing with an RV park in the buffer zone, similar to how residential zoning is handled. He stated that it is a legitimate question that needs to be looked at, though it would require changing the county ordinance rather than a simple conditional use permit. He noted that when the RV park section was originally put into the ordinance, he did not think there was any thought of what might happen regarding a buffer zone or if a buffer zone even existed at that time. He then asked the board for questions or comments. Mr. Jacobson stated that he reviewed the county ordinance extensively. He explained that the board has always had the mindset that they could defer to whatever the city's buffer zone requirements were, but the only place in the county document that actually addresses deferring lot sizes or proportions down to a city's zoning is in the industrial section. He expressed shock at finding this and stated his hope that future plans include discussing changes so the buffer zone deferral applies to each zoning area if it is in a buffer zone and the city is looking at annexation. Mr. Jacobson added that he personally does not have a problem going down to the smaller acreage. Mr. Strange stated that the other undesirable option for the city would be turning the property into half-acre lots, where fourplexes could potentially be placed as a conditional use under RA-1 zoning. Mr. Jacobson asked for the specific code reference regarding fourplexes. Ms. Sorensen clarified that under the county's multi-family housing section, four units maximum is listed as a conditional use in the RA zoning. Mr. Harmer acknowledged there has been misconception on that topic in recent years. He reiterated that the board should look at modifying county documents so buffer zone areas more closely match adjacent city zoning, though nothing could be resolved that evening. Ms. Jarrett stated that she is totally opposed to that idea. She stated, "a buffer zone is county property. It is. And we have strict requirements relative to what we can do in county property." She noted that the buffer zone was put there in the event a city wanted to annex, but the city could always back out or plans could go haywire. She emphasized that it remains county property, everyone is held accountable to county specifications, and she does not want to see the commission setting precedents to accommodate one project. She acknowledged it is a good plan, but stated it goes outside the planning commission's duty to uphold ordinances. Mr. Jacobson responded, stating that if the ordinance explicitly allowed deferring to city buffer zone requirements, he would have no argument, but because it

currently only exists in industrial zoning, a county ordinance change would need to occur first. Ms. Jarrett replied that the county has never deferred to a city for what goes on county property and expressed that the concept puts the cart before the horse. Mr. Jacobson asked if the city had stated they would not annex. Mr. Strange clarified that Mount Pleasant City did not say they would not annex. He explained that when he asked Mount Pleasant City what it would take to annex, the city stated they would have to look at all the industrial property leading up to the site to create a better master plan. He noted the city did not want to annex just that single parcel, but wanted to address the whole block. He explained that the city indicated the annexation process itself takes about six months, but the planning leading up to it could take six months to a year, whereas they wanted to get the project moving quicker than a year and a half. Mr. Jacobson stated that he talked to Mount Pleasant City that day regarding water. He explained that the commission previously approved a subdivision based on Mount Pleasant City stating they would provide water, but immediately after approval, the city instituted a moratorium, leaving the approved subdivision without water. He stated he called the city to see if that was still the case, and the city informed him they are discussing how to request compensation for any county development that uses city water. Mr. Jacobson asked Mr. Strange if they have water to compensate the city with, noting he did not see it on the document. Mr. Strange replied that he believes four shares of irrigation water come with the sale document, which is what is currently being used or rented there, though it does not come with well rights. Mr. Strange added that he had reached out to the utilities three weeks prior. He stated that in talking with Colter regarding an RV park, Coulter mentioned, "I wouldn't shut that down," but noted he would have to look in more detail if it were fourplexes. Mr. Strange confirmed they have discussed power, water, and sewer with them. Mr. Jacobson noted that he did not see a development agreement stating the applicant would be willing to pay their percentage of utility lines put in within the last five years. Mr. Strange confirmed they would be willing to participate in a development agreement. He explained that Mike Bols, who is financing the project, had him reach out to the city specifically to ask if they needed to bring water shares to the table, and the city told them no at that time. He noted the city stated they would need to compensate Todd Beasley for the water line connection, power is adjacent to the substation, and sewer runs right past the property. Mr.

Jacobson clarified that because it is a concept plan, he was throwing out items for them to consider. Mr. Strange appreciated the feedback and stated they had thought along those lines, but got hung up on the ordinance requirement and needed to see the plausibility before making formal agreements. Ms. Jarrett asked if they had purchased the property yet. Mr. Strange clarified that the property is under contract, and he spent two and a half hours talking to Ken Peel, who owns the property. Mr. Allred noted that there are a couple of other RV parks in Mount Pleasant and asked for their thinking on bringing another one in. Mr. Strange explained that across the street at the Contoy Arena, almost every weekend when events are held, people are dry camping because other locations are full. He stated they feel supplying an RV park for those event weekends would be sufficient. Mr. Allred mentioned that he lives down the street and sees people with horse trailers, noting most stay in their horse trailers rather than using RV parks. Mr. Strange observed that people park horse trailers on one side of the arena and set up RVs on the south side, noting there were at least 30 RVs parked there two weekends prior during an event, with overflow spilling into the industrial park. Mr. Allred mentioned he spoke with John McKay, who hardly gets any overflow business from the Contoy Arena despite being nearby. He added that the proposed plan appears to accommodate smaller trailers of 20 feet or less. Mr. Strange clarified that the middle pull-through and back-in spaces are designed quite a bit longer to fit larger rigs, noting there are eight or nine drive-through spaces. Mr. Jacobson stated that the county has a 5-acre minimum for a building lot, whereas buffer zone areas around cities allow half-acre or one-acre lots, meaning the county already defers some zoning standards in those areas. He reiterated that looking into changing the ordinance for buffer zones is a valid conversation. Mr. Harmer asked if deferring zoning standards in buffer zones around cities had been done elsewhere in the county. Mr. Jacobson and Mr. Harmer discussed existing lot size standards in buffer zones. Ms. Jarrett asked if there was any possibility of acquiring additional property on either side. Mr. Strange explained that they contacted the property owners to the east, but they want to sell their entire 13-acre parcel rather than a sliver. He noted they talked with the power company on the west side regarding a triangular parcel, discussing buying it and leasing back the portion the power company uses inside their fence. He added that while the power company indicated they could entertain the idea, nothing is in writing yet. He stated they also

reached out to the owner of the old train track property, but he was not interested in selling. Ms. Sorensen reminded the board that the property would need to go through a subdivision process to make it a legal buildable lot. Mr. Strange and the board discussed property splitting rules dating back to 1980 and confirmed the parcel would simply need to meet standard subdivision process requirements. Ms. Riley asked if there is any possibility for approval under the current ordinance. Mr. Jacobson answered, "Not under current ordinance. No." The board discussed that allowing the request would require a public hearing to amend the ordinance language to defer buffer zone standards to city lot sizes. Mr. Jacobson expressed uncertainty about whether such an amendment would pass or if it should be a guaranteed right, suggesting it would likely need to operate similar to a conditional use application. Ms. Jarrett noted that Mount Pleasant City has not annexed property in a long time and suggested that if the city wants to develop the area by the Contoy Arena, the applicant could push the city to proceed with annexation. Mr. Strange reiterated that Mount Pleasant City refused to annex just their parcel alone because it is not directly adjacent, as intervening parcels create a peninsula shape. The commission and Mr. Strange discussed adjacent parcels owned by Demicks and the power company along Fifth East. Mr. Strange asked how combining county buffer zone land with city industrial land affects the 5-acre requirement if the total combined area touches five acres. Mr. Jacobson explained that an RV park is permitted in all county zones through a conditional use permit, but noted that Mount Pleasant City does not allow RV parks in an industrial park. Board members discussed that having a single parcel straddle both city limits and county jurisdiction creates legal issues. Mr. Jacobson quoted a reference regarding boundary lines, stating, "No, a single continuous RV park generally cannot straddle or cross a municipality, city or town and county boundary line or cross separate county lines without being treated as two separate legal parcels requiring distinct approvals from each respective local government." Mr. Strange asked if that reference was from Sanpete County documentation. Mr. Jacobson confirmed that he believes it is in the Sanpete County code. Ms. Jarrett and Mr. Jacobson advised the applicant that changing an ordinance or pursuing annexation involves public hearings and a lengthy timeline. Mr. Strange noted that their parcel contains just over 3 acres in the county portion. Mr. Harmer stated that the commission cannot grant any preliminary approval as things stand

under the current ordinance because it requires a formal ordinance change process. He estimated it would take at least six months before the commission could realistically look at the issue due to their active workload with the solar ordinance and data center moratoriums. Mr. Strange asked how he could present precedent examples to the board for a future work meeting. Ms. Jarrett advised Mr. Strange that if he finds precedent examples where property overlapping city and county boundaries was handled in the past, he can bring those examples to the next work meeting. Mr. Strange thanked the commission for their time, and the discussion concluded.

Discussion and Preliminary approval for a 9-lot Major Subdivision (Hidden Cove Estates) application by Lynn Rindlisbacher. The proposed subdivision is located east of Fairview in the RA-1 zone. Lot 1 of .54 acres, Lot 2 of .54 acres, Lot 3 of .54 acres, Lot 4 of .54 acres, Lot 5 of .54 acres, Lot 6 of .54 acres, Lot 7 of .54 acres, Lot 8 of .54 acres, Lot 9 of .61 acres. Parcel # *S-21789*.

Mr. Rindlisbacher is present. Ms. Sorensen reported that the application is complete, noting the applicant attached a plat map and affidavit, confirmed receipt of Fairview City utilities, included the buffer zone form, obtained road access compliance signed off by Tom Seely, provided a signed police, fire, and ambulance waiver, attached a title search, verified taxes are paid up to date, and included an engineering letter regarding the storm water plan. Mr. Harmer asked Lynn Rindlisbacher about the payment process for Fairview City utilities and whether it was paid or partially paid. Mr. Rindlisbacher stated they have not paid anything yet while awaiting preliminary approval, noting they know the estimates and intend to pay cash to install the utilities rather than bond, though county road cuts handled by Tom Seely will involve fees. Mr. Harmer noted that bonding for county roads involves an approval process through the county commissioners. In response to Mr. Harmer, Mr. Rindlisbacher confirmed the subdivision will be completed all at once rather than phased. Mr. Jacobson complimented the engineering work provided on the subdivision, noting it was very well done and praised the inclusion of the storm drain plan. Mr. Jacobson requested two minor corrections for the final plat: first, removing extraneous legend items such as double and dotted lines on sewer laterals that do not pertain to the subdivision; second, explicitly carving

out the remainder parcel. Mr. Rindlisbacher agreed to clean up the legend items and noted the remainder parcel carving was supposed to have been fixed on the copy. Mr. Rindlisbacher confirmed the remainder parcel is not Lot 10, and Mr. Jacobson noted there is substantial frontage along county gravel roads on the south and east sides for egress and ingress. Mr. Jacobson inquired about the property topography and whether home basements would require sewer lift stations to pump uphill. Mr. Rindlisbacher responded that main levels should not require lift stations, but homes set further back with basements might require individual basement lift stations depending on grade and elevation, which would be up to the homeowner or builder. Mr. Jacobson agreed that individual residential lift stations are common and simple to install. Mr. Jacobson also praised the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) submitted with the application. Mr. Rindlisbacher noted the CC&Rs were adapted from a prior subdivision to ensure custom, higher-quality homes. Mr. harmer asked why Mr. Rindlisbacher chose to designate a remainder parcel rather than creating additional lots. Mr. Rindlisbacher explained he has no intention of further development for many years and intends to continue ranching the remaining land. Ms. Jarrett asked if utilities must be installed prior to preliminary approval. Mr. Harmer clarified that utility installation is required prior to final approval, not preliminary approval. Mr. Allred noted that he and Mr. Jacobson visited the site the previous day and ran into neighbor Sammy Kogianes. Mr. Allred noted that Sammy Kogianes was not opposed to Mr. Rindlisbacher's property development, but voiced frustrations regarding separate county matters. Ms. Jarrett asked Ms. Sorensen if work had been done to revise the waiver form relative to police, fire, and ambulance services, noting that some municipalities provide certain services but not others. Ms. Sorensen explained the form currently applies universally because not every municipality supplies all three services, noting Fairview supplies fire protection but not police. Ms. Jarrett suggested updating the form or adding three distinct lines to the buffer zone form for police, fire, and ambulance coverage to ensure prospective buyers have full clarity regarding available emergency services during due diligence, as lack of fire protection impacts home insurance rates.

A motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to recommend preliminary approval for a 9-lot Major Subdivision (Hidden Cove Estates) application by Lynn Rindlisbacher. The proposed subdivision is located east of Fairview in the RA-1 zone. Lot 1 of .54 acres, Lot 2 of .54 acres, Lot 3 of .54 acres, Lot 4 of .54 acres, Lot 5 of .54 acres, Lot 6 of .54 acres, Lot 7 of .54 acres, Lot 8 of .54 acres, Lot 9 of .61 acres. **Parcel # *S-21789***.

Rick Allred seconded the motion. All in favor none oppose. The motion passes.

Mr. Harmer instructed Mr. Rindlisbacher to proceed with putting in the improvements, noting that the subdivision looks good and only requires the minor legend corrections mentioned by Mr. Jacobson. Mr. Rindlisbacher noted there was also a correction regarding power on the plat and agreed to review everything again to confirm accuracy while working on the road itself. Mr. Jacobson advised Mr. Rindlisbacher to coordinate directly with Tom Seely regarding the road cuts, noting that he counted at least 18 saw cuts required on the roadway. Mr. Jacobson explained that under the roadway design and construction manual, after completing saw cuts, digging, compaction, and testing, a secondary saw cut of approximately 18 inches is performed to prevent overlapping seams. Mr. Jacobson suggested discussing with Tom Seely whether ripping out one large asphalt patch or boring under the street for gas and utilities would be more effective. Mr. Rindlisbacher agreed and acknowledged that gas lines across the street can likely be bored.

Discussion and preliminary approval for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Ridgeway Subdivision) application by Russell Ridgeway. The proposed subdivision is located west of Mount Pleasant in the Agriculture Zone. Lot-1 of 9.64 acres. Parcel # *S-22334X*.

Ms. Sorensen presents the item. She confirmed the application has been started, including a plat map attached to the affidavit, site plan, approved septic tank permit, signed road access compliance on a county road, signed police, fire, and ambulance waiver, completed title search, up-to-date tax payments, flood plain evaluation, and a storm water plan. Ms. Sorensen brought to the board's attention that a well had already been drilled down in the corner of the property, as shown on the survey plat. She noted that the sanitary protection

zone around the well extends onto neighboring properties. She stated Mr. Ridgeway provided a letter from neighboring property owners, the Saluone's, recognizing and accepting the protection zone on their property, and noted he contacted other adjacent property owners via email who indicated they would likely be okay with it as well. Mr. Harmer and Mr. Jacobson discussed that the Utah Division of Water Rights approves well locations without considering parcel or subdivision boundary lines. Ms. Sorensen noted that while the sanitary protection zone is mentioned in county ordinances, boundary line overlaps are not an easement issue that would prevent a subdivision, provided neighboring acknowledgments are received. Mr. Allred raised a question regarding the access road, noting it is a dead-end county road. Mr. Allred stated he called Road Superintendent Tom Seely to confirm its status and learned that Mr. Seely's approval was pending a turnaround spot for snowplows, as the county does not currently plow that road. Mr. Allred noted the road is not 24 feet wide, is overgrown with weeds and brush, and has Mount Pleasant City utility poles located outside the fence line rather than inside, placing them too close to the roadway center. Ms. Sorensen reviewed Mr. Seely's signed road access document, which specifies a 24-foot drive, 30-foot approach, 12 inches of 6-inch minus road base, and a 66-foot easement. Mr. Jacobson noted that if a 24-foot road is installed from the center, gravel will touch the existing utility poles, whereas the county roadway design manual requires poles to be set back 10 feet on the furthest part of the 33-foot easement from road center. He added that an irrigation ditch full of reeds exists on the south side of the road with no recorded easement across church property to bury or relocate it. Mr. Allred noted that a concrete barrier recently built near the T-intersection redirects water away from Mr. Ridgeway's property into another ditch, meaning the old ditch might be filled with road base to widen the road on the south side without moving the utility poles. The commission discussed that moving utility poles would involve Mount Pleasant City and neighboring property easements. Ms. Sorensen and Mr. Harmer confirmed the property is on a maintained County B road. Ms. Sorensen noted he would speak further with Mr. Seely regarding clarification on road width requirements, maintenance expectations, and liability issues related to pole proximity before proceeding. Mr. Harmer concluded the discussion, noting the commission would conduct a site inspection to gather further information.

Motion is made Caudia Jarrett by table to recommend preliminary approval for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Ridgeway Subdivision) application by Russell Ridgeway. The proposed subdivision is located west of Mount Pleasant in the Agricultural Zone. Lot 1 of 9.64 acres. ***Parcel # S-22334X.***

Jo-Anne Riley seconded the motion. All in favor none oppose. The motion passes.

Discussion and Preliminary approval of a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Allred Acres Plat "A") including a vacation of Lot-1 Plat "A" Amended Mountain View Ranches Subdivision, application by Torey Allred. The proposed subdivision is located northeast of Spring City in the RA-2 zone. Lot 1 of 2.53 acres.

Parcel # S-60651.

Heidi Sorensen and Chair Cody Harmer explained the multi-step process for the property. Ms. Sorensen noted that the parcel is currently in the Mountain View Ranches Subdivision. She explained that the applicants will vacate Lot 1 of that subdivision and create a new one-lot subdivision called Allred Acres using 2.53 acres around the existing house on the east side. She stated that the remaining west side of the parcel will be divided into two 1.06-acre agricultural split parcels that Spring City will subsequently annex. Mr. Harmer noted there was initial confusion on the procedure, but Ms. Sorensen worked closely with county attorney advice to establish that the county division must occur before Spring City can proceed with annexation. He added that Spring City has every intention of annexing the back portion once ready, and a signed buffer zone form agreeing to annexation is attached to the application. Ms. Jarrett asked how a 2.53-acre lot is created in an RA-2 zone. Mr. Harmer clarified that the RA-2 zone requires a minimum lot size of 1 acre, so a 2.53-acre lot complies with current county ordinance requirements. Mr. Harmer invited representative Brianna Schaefer to join the commission. Brianna Schaefer stated her name for the record and presented the preliminary plat. Ms. Jarrett asked what happens to Lot 8 of the original subdivision during this split. Mr. Harmer explained that Lot 8 is unaffected because the applicants are only vacating Lot 1 of the original 4.68-acre parcel. He detailed that vacating

Lot 1 removes it from the old subdivision so it can be re-established as the 2.53-acre Allred Acres lot while splitting off the two 1.06-acre remaining agricultural parcels for annexation into Spring City. Mr. Harmer asked Brianna Schaefer why they chose an agricultural split rather than a regular subdivision. Mr. Harmer explained that doing an agricultural split allows Spring City to annex the two back lots to connect directly to municipal water, sewer, and power, whereas keeping the house on the 2.53-acre county lot allows the homeowner to remain under county jurisdiction rather than annexing the residence into Spring City. Mr. Jacobson asked why parcel numbers or addresses were not assigned to the two new 1.06-acre parcels on the preliminary plat map, noting only names appeared on the plat. Sanpete County Recorder Talisha Johnson spoke up and explained that she cannot assign new tax parcel numbers until the property is officially separated and recorded at the county level. Mr. Jacobson asked how the commission can approve a preliminary plat without parcel numbers or addresses. Ms. Johnson explained that applicants can list "part of current parcel number" or reference the legal description of Lot 1 Mountain View Ranches on the plat prior to recording. She confirmed that parcel numbers are assigned at the exact time of final recording, so the final recorded plat will not show the new parcel numbers prior to recordation. Mr. Harmer suggested referencing the legal description of Lot 1 on the preliminary plat to identify the property boundaries precisely. Ms. Johnson agreed that listing the legal description as part of Lot 1 Mountain View Ranches provides proper legal identification for title searches and recording purposes, noting that ownership is not changing at this stage. Ms. Jarrett asked if final approval requires the commission to perform both a subdivision vacation and a new subdivision approval simultaneously. Mr. Harmer and Ms. Sorensen confirmed that both actions must occur simultaneously at final approval because the county cannot approve the new subdivision before vacating the old lot, nor can it vacate the lot with an existing home without approving the new subdivision plat. Mr. Jacobson asked if the applicant obtained written approval from all other property owners in the Mountain View Ranches Subdivision. Mr. Harmer explained that under updated Utah state law, subdivision vacations no longer require surrounding neighbor approvals or public hearings, making the statutory vacation process significantly simpler. Ms. Sorensen noted she verified this process with the State Property Rights Ombudsman

A motion is made by Cody Harmer to recommend preliminary approval for a 1-lot Major Subdivision (Allred Acres Plat "A") including a vacation of Lot-1 Plat "A" Amended Mountain View Ranches Subdivision, application by Torey Allred. The proposed subdivision is located northeast of Spring City in the RA-2 zone. Lot 1 of 2.53 acres. ***Parcel # S-60651***.

Rick Allred seconded the motion. All in favor none oppose. The motion passes.

Discussion of TPA Grant scope of work

Heidi Sorensen presented a discussion on the TPA grant scope of work. She explained that after speaking with Gabby, additional information was requested regarding the scope of work, and Gabby assisted in preparing the spreadsheet document now available on the Google Drive. Ms. Sorensen and Mr. Atkinson noted that a recent Zoom meeting was held with Gabby and Mr. Bennett to discuss specific planning and zoning additions to the scope. Mr. Harmer expressed appreciation to Gabby for her extensive, impressive work on the grant project. Mr. Jacobson asked if updating county maps is included in the grant to allow continuous updates when changes occur. Ms. Sorensen replied that all county departments are collaborating to expand GIS capabilities, which will make keeping zoning maps current significantly easier once fully implemented. She noted that the current zoning map is approximately 10 years old and terribly out of date. Mr. Harmer and Ms. Sorensen discussed adding a requirement to the subdivision application requiring surveyors and engineers to submit shapefiles alongside subdivision plats. Mr. Harmer noted he spoke with surveyor Troy Savage and Ms. Sorensen spoke with other surveyors, all of whom confirmed that providing GIS shapefiles is standard practice and poses no issue. Ms. Sorensen noted this requirement will allow new subdivisions to be uploaded directly into online county maps without staff needing to recreate GIS work. Mr. Jacobson ask about Heritage Hills. Discussion ensues. Ms. Sorensen requested that commission members review the grant scope of work spreadsheet on the Google Drive and submit any comments or suggested additions within the week. Mr. Jacobson requested that Gabby ensure the scope encompasses a comprehensive review across all county ordinances, the general plan, land use matrix, zoning, subdivision rules, and the roadway design manual to ensure cross-functional

alignment. Mr. Jacobson raised a concern regarding sensitive lands mapping, stating that the current boundaries are overly broad and inaccurately designate non-sensitive properties, creating major issues for property owners obtaining home insurance. Mr. Harmer offered to investigate how the sensitive lands mapping was originally established by state or federal entities. Ms. Sorensen and the commission discussed upcoming state WUI (Wildland-Urban Interface) mapping regulations taking effect in January, noting that municipalities will have the option to adopt WUI standards, whereas unincorporated county areas will fall under state-mandated requirements.

Approval of all August Minutes

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission minutes from August 4, 2026, with no corrections.
Cody Harmer seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Motion is made by Claudia Jarrett to approve the Planning Commission work meeting minutes from August 4, 2026, work meeting with minor corrections.
Gene Jacobson seconded the motion. All in favor, none oppose. The motion passes.

Other business (if necessary)

Ms. Jarrett asked in regards to setting a possible agenda for the upcoming Planning Commission work meeting. Mr. Harmer and board members agreed to continue reviewing and updating the Land Use Matrix, noting the importance of finalizing the matrix items. Ms. Riley suggested prioritizing the draft noise ordinance on the work meeting agenda if feedback from County Attorney Wes Mangum is received by then, noting that reviewing the attorney-approved draft should take only a few minutes. Ms. Sorensen noted she needs to renumber the sections before taking the draft to Mr. Mangum for review. Mr. Harmer and board members discussed the process for scheduling a public hearing for the noise ordinance. Ms. Sorensen and board members noted that public hearings require a 30-day advance notice for public advertising. Board members discussed that because the 30-day publication window would pass before the next meeting, a formal public hearing notice would likely need to be

set for a subsequent meeting to forward to the Board of County Commissioners for their public hearing process. The commission discussed the status of the data center moratorium and solar energy facility ordinance moratoriums. Mr. Harmer noted that while moratoriums provide temporary time to make regulatory progress, the commission should continue refining the solar ordinance by eliminating redundancies from compiled drafts. Mr. Harmer suggested extending the solar moratorium if the draft is not fully ready, noting the commission has every right to extend it while active progress is being made. Mr. Jacobson agreed to make the requested updates to the land use matrix draft and provide updated physical copies for the board at the next meeting. Ms. Jarrett confirmed the agenda items for the upcoming work meeting as; Review of the Noise Ordinance (placed first on the agenda). Ordinance update regarding underground utilities. Continued review and updates to the Land Use Matrix and Definitions.

Adjournment

With no further business before the Planning Commission, a motion to adjourn is made by Claudia Jarrett.

Motion was not seconded. The meeting is adjourned at 8:54PM.