

From: [Nissa Farley](#)
To: [Joselyn Romero](#); [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Statement
Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 8:35:21 AM

Nissa Farley
8176 W Dry Canyon Cir,
Herriman, UT 84096

Good Morning,

I apologize I could not attend the meeting in person this morning. Please have this statement read during the public comment portion. I appreciate the work the county has done on our behalf to revise the county animal ordinance. Where I am frustrated is that it feels that the county employees that are working on these revisions have forgotten that they are doing this on behalf of the residents that live in the county. The majority if not all residents that will be impacted by this proposal live in Hi County I and High Country II. Both of those communities have HOA boards that have requested to work directly with the MSD and County Attorney on revising the ordinance in a way that continues to protect the nature of our communities, and the horse heritage this county was founded on. For whatever reason, the county has not chosen to work with the board of directors in either community. I ask that the Planning Commission vote against the proposal in its current form and allow the county to work directly with the HOA boards in Hi Country to better understand the dynamics at play and the impacts the ordinance will have on these two communities. Two of my primary concerns are that the number of horses per acre and commercial use of animals appear to be arbitrary, not based on actual research. It appears the county is greasing the squeaky wheel to respond to a small number of Hi Country residents that complain frequently rather than acting in the best interest of all residents in these zones. The residents in Hi Country have requested research from the county to support their decisions, but it has not been provided. The proposed number of horses and the commercial use of animals are more restrictive than neighboring cities. Typically both the number of horses and commercial use are LESS restrictive in the county areas. Where is the research that justifies making our county more restrictive? The Mountainous Planning District has not had an opportunity to take public comment or vote on this revised proposal. As a recommending body to the Planning Commission, residents should have that opportunity to be heard by the Mountainous Planning District prior to the Planning Commission voting. Also, I want to point out that some Hi Country residents were told in the past they did not need a Conditional Use permit to have a horse in a horse community. Rather than changing the ordinance to respond to HOA politics, it would be better to have the MSD consistently administer the existing ordinance. We have heard recent complaints that the MSD is not responding to Hi Country residents that are requesting to obtain Conditional Use permits. The county was asked in a previous public hearing to provide an answer as to why the MSD was not responding to residents requesting Conditional Use Permits. The county is yet to respond. Thank you for your consideration and opportunity to be heard.