

MINUTES
MONROE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
September 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 September 15th, 2026, at 7:00 P.M. Opening prayer was offered by Commissioner Riddle.

Present:

Commissioners:

Talon Gadd

David Riddle

Riley Lindsay

Lance Roberts-excused

Amy Moore

Citizens:

Candice Barney

Prescott McCarthy

Allison Leavitt

2. Approval of previous meeting minutes August 25th, 2026.

Motion to approve the minutes of the August 25th, 2026 meeting was made by Commissioner Moore and seconded by Commissioner Riddle. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Citizens' comments.

No citizens came forward to address the Commission.

4. Consider lot line adjustment located at 65 W 200 N. Submitted by Allen Geisler.

Allen Geisler of 190 North 100 West appeared before the Commission to request a minor lot line adjustment. He explained that he originally purchased the property for his elderly mother, and that she currently has no ground-floor bedroom due to the rigid interior configuration of the older home—requiring her to sleep in the living room. To address this, he seeks to add a ground-floor bedroom addition to the rear of the existing house. However, as currently configured, the addition would result in a zero-foot setback from the adjacent property line, which does not meet the city's minimum 10-foot setback requirement.

Mr. Geisler further noted that an existing cement patio and second-story deck already encroach approximately 1.75 feet over the current property boundary—an issue he was unaware of when the original lot split was approved and recorded. To resolve both the setback and the

encroachment issues, he requested that the property boundary be shifted 15.25 feet into the adjacent lot he also owns, which he intends to develop with a new single-family residence.

Mr. Geisler presented visual aids and outlined five criteria under Utah state law that he argued justified the variance: unreasonable hardship, special circumstances, preservation of property rights, consistency with the general plan and public interest, and adherence to the spirit of the ordinance. He noted that while the adjusted second lot would fall below the city's 14,000 square-foot minimum lot size—coming in at approximately 0.28 acres versus the required 0.32 acres—it would still be larger than many existing lots in the surrounding neighborhood. He also presented plans for a new driveway access to the existing home from the north, as the current driveway falls within the parcel to be developed.

Commission members and City Recorder Leavitt raised several concerns during discussion:

Lack of a formal survey: Commissioner Lindsay, identifying himself as a licensed land surveyor, expressed concern that Mr. Geisler's measurements were based on informal field measurements rather than a certified boundary survey. He noted that in Monroe's lot-and-block system, property lines do not always align with occupation lines, and that a survey could materially change the analysis—potentially revealing that the encroachment is smaller than assumed, or that the lines fall in a different location entirely.

Sub-minimum lot size: Commissioner Lindsay and Chair Gadd expressed discomfort with approving a lot line adjustment that would create a lot approximately 2,000 square feet below the 14,000 square-foot minimum. Commissioner Lindsay noted this could set a problematic precedent.

Jurisdiction over variances: City Recorder Leavitt clarified that the Planning Commission's role is to evaluate compliance with existing ordinances. If the Commission declines to approve the adjustment due to non-compliance, the applicant's next step would be to apply to the city's Appeal Authority for a formal variance. She emphasized that the Appeal Authority's decision is final and cannot be overturned except through the courts, and encouraged the Commission to gather sufficient information before the matter proceeds to that body.

Creation of a non-conforming lot: Leavitt further clarified that approving a lot line adjustment that results in a sub-minimum lot would effectively create an illegal lot, which would be unbuildable under current ordinance unless the ordinance were later amended.

The consensus of the Commission was that a formal boundary survey should be obtained before any further action is taken, as the survey results could significantly change the nature of the request.

Motion to table the lot line adjustment request submitted by Allen Geisler until a formal boundary survey and additional supporting information are provided was made by Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Riddle. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Consider Red Hill Estates Subdivision exemption to allow zoning administrator to accept preliminary application without drainage report.

Prescott McCarthy appeared before the Commission to provide an update on the Red Hill Estates Subdivision application and to request a specific exemption. He explained that his previous engineer was unable to complete the required engineering and drainage plans in time for this meeting, and that he has since retained a new engineer who can have all plans—including hydrology, drainage, utility layouts, and improvement plans—ready for the following month's meeting.

Because the Red Hill Estates property is located within a sensitive land zone, city ordinance requires that engineering and improvement plan documentation be submitted at the preliminary application stage, rather than being deferred to the final application as would normally be permitted. Mr. McCarthy requested that the Commission allow him to present all required preliminary subdivision improvement plans at the final application stage instead.

Discussion also touched on the master transportation plan, which designates a collector road corridor through and adjacent to the subject property. Mr. McCarthy argued that the precise route shown in the plan traverses terrain that is, in his assessment, physically impractical—including areas with near-vertical slopes and a significant drainage catchment. City Recorder Leavitt acknowledged that the transportation plan may warrant review in that area, but noted that any formal deviation from the plan would require Mr. McCarthy to apply and pay fees for an amendment to the city's General Plan transportation master plan. It was noted that the existing dirt road network in the vicinity may already largely serve the intent of the planned corridor, and that subsequent phases of the development—on parcels Mr. McCarthy does not yet own—could address the remaining connectivity requirement. Staff indicated this matter would need to be documented and addressed when the full application is submitted.

City Recorder Leavitt confirmed that, from the city's perspective, allowing the improvement plans to be submitted at the final stage rather than the preliminary stage does not create significant risk to the city, particularly given the modest size of the proposed subdivision. She noted, however, that if the final application does not meet all requirements, it will not be approved and will need to be corrected before proceeding.

Motion to approve that the preliminary subdivision improvement plan requirements for Red Hill Estates may be accepted at the final application stage rather than at the preliminary stage was made by Commissioner Riddle and seconded by Commissioner Moore. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Discuss and Consider updates to Monroe City Land Use Zoning Ordinance standards for Recreational Vehicle Park (13.7.6), Certain Conditional Uses (Tiny Home Villages 13.7.10) including pocket communities, Street improvements for larger lots (12.14.6), update Utah statutory reference numbers, as well as text amendments to provide clarity and correctness to the Monroe City Land Use Zoning Ordinance.

112 City Recorder Leavitt led a substantive working discussion on a range of proposed ordinance
113 updates, with input from commissioners and Council Member Barney. She noted that by placing
114 these items on the agenda, the city has initiated a 90-day window during which any incoming
115 applications related to these topics would be required to wait for or conform to the revised
116 standards.

117 **Tiny Home Villages and Pocket Communities:** Leavitt explained that the city's current ordinance
118 allows up to 16 tiny homes per acre but that this figure was likely adopted from another
119 jurisdiction without extensive local deliberation. She outlined a number of policy questions the
120 Commission would need to resolve, including: how many units to permit per acre; whether tiny
121 home villages should be allowed in sensitive land zones, geological hazard zones, or floodplains;
122 whether units should be restricted to long-term or short-term rental; and what infrastructure
123 requirements (water meters, septic, power hookups) should apply to each unit.

124 Commissioners expressed considerable skepticism about whether tiny home villages are an
125 appropriate fit for Monroe. Commissioner Moore noted that her research suggested tiny home
126 developments tend to be more viable in urban or college-town settings, and that rural examples
127 she reviewed were generally of poor quality. Commissioner Lindsay agreed, stating that Monroe
128 is not positioned to be a high-density community given its limited infrastructure and services,
129 and emphasized the importance of defining the community's long-term goals before making
130 allowances that could be difficult to reverse. He drew a contrast with Richfield, which has
131 experienced significant high-density development pressure and has the urban amenities to
132 support it.

133 Council Member Barney referenced Monroe's General Plan, which characterizes the city as a
134 "bedroom community," and noted that most residents commute to work elsewhere. The group
135 discussed concerns about long-term maintenance and appearance of small-unit developments,
136 the risk that any approved tiny home units could ultimately be converted to short-term rentals,
137 and the practical difficulties of enforcing occupancy restrictions.

138 City Recorder Leavitt noted that if the Commission chooses not to permit tiny home villages, the
139 simplest approach is to not include the use on the city's land use table—if a use is not listed, it is
140 denied. She stated that this would be a straightforward policy choice and that Kendall (the city's
141 planning consultant with Jones & DeMille/Civic Link) could assist with drafting language.

142 **RV Park Standards:** Leavitt noted that the city's current RV park regulations lack adequate
143 substance. She suggested that the updated RV park ordinance could include provisions for
144 permanent or semi-permanent structures such as cabins or silos—accommodating uses like
145 those at Mystic Hot Springs and similar properties—while maintaining appropriate standards.
146 She indicated that Kendall could provide draft RV ordinance language for the Commission to
147 review before the next meeting.

148 **Street Improvements for Larger Lots:** The Commission discussed the need to clarify when asphalt
149 paving is required. Leavitt proposed that any commercial development should be required to

150 asphalt regardless of lot size, while large-lot residential subdivisions might be permitted to use
151 unimproved roads up to a certain number of lots. She noted concern from the city's engineer
152 that having numerous homes scattered across large acreage on dirt roads creates challenges for
153 fire department access. A threshold—such as requiring asphalt once a subdivision exceeds a
154 certain number of lots—was identified as something the Commission should define.

155 **Statutory Reference Number Updates:** Leavitt noted that the state has renumbered subdivision-
156 related statutes so that all references must now begin with "12" rather than "9" or "10." Kendall
157 would update all references throughout the city's ordinance to bring them into compliance.

158 **Two-Year Completion Deadline:** Leavitt reminded the Commission that under the current
159 ordinance, approved subdivisions must have all improvements completed within two years of
160 approval, or the applicant must start the process over under any rules then in effect. She noted
161 this provision protects the city from situations like the Hot Spring Estates, where a decades-old
162 approval without drainage or infrastructure requirements caused downstream flooding
163 problems.

164 **Master Drainage Study:** Commissioner Lindsay raised the suggestion that Monroe consider
165 commissioning a master drainage study, similar to the transportation master plan. He expressed
166 concern that piecemeal curb-and-gutter improvements could accelerate stormwater runoff and
167 create flooding problems in downstream properties. He noted that cities that have approved
168 subdivisions without understanding cumulative drainage impacts have faced legal liability. Leavitt
169 agreed this was worth exploring and indicated she would inquire about planning grant programs
170 that might fund such a study, similar to the UDOT grant used for the transportation master plan.

171 The Commission reached general agreement to proceed to a public hearing on all ordinance
172 update items at the next meeting, in order to gather public input before making final
173 determinations. Leavitt noted that Kendall would prepare draft language for RV park standards
174 and that commissioners should come prepared with their priorities for each topic.

175 Motion to hold a public hearing at the next meeting to discuss updates to the Monroe City Land
176 Use Zoning Ordinance, including standards for Recreational Vehicle Parks (13.7.6), Certain
177 Conditional Uses including Tiny Home Villages (13.7.10), and Street Improvements for Larger
178 Lots (12.14.6), was made by Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Riddle. The
179 motion carried unanimously.

180 7. Other Business.

181 No other business was discussed.

182 8. Adjournment.

183 Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Chair Gadd. The motion
184 carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:56 P.M.