

Town of Spring Lake, Utah

Notice of Public Hearing on the adoption of a Fee Schedule for fees related to building permits for repairs, remodels, and upgrades.

Notice is hereby given that the Town of Spring Lake, Utah will hold a public hearing to consider the adoption of a Fee Schedule for fees related to building permits for repairs, remodels, and upgrades.

Public Hearing Details

Date: April 1, 2026

Time: 6:00 pm

Location: 3744 West 12240 South, Spring Lake, Utah 84651

Purpose of Hearing:

The purpose of this public hearing is to receive public comments regarding the proposed adoption of a fee schedule for establishing building permit application fees and other related administrative fees. The proposed fee schedule is intended to support the Town's administration of its building permit process and ensure compliance with applicable building codes.

Public Comment:

Interested persons are invited to attend the public hearing and provide comments. Written comments may also be submitted prior to the hearing to:

Rebecca Batty, Town Recorder or Wade Menlove, Mayor

Beccs.batty@gmail.com or wade.menlove07@gmail.com

Availability of Documents:

A copy of the proposed fee schedule is available for public review at:
Springlakeutah.gov

Posting:

This notice is posted in accordance with Utah Code requirements, including:

- Utah Public Notice Website
- The Town's official website
- As least one public location within the Town

Draft Minutes - Town of Spring Lake

Council Meeting Agenda

Meeting to be Held

March 18, 2026 – 6:00 P.M.

3744 West 12240 South

Spring Lake, Utah 84651

NOTICE IS HEREIN GIVEN THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF SPRING LAKE WILL HOLD A TOWN COUNCIL MEETING ON WEDNESDAY MARCH 18, 2026, AT 6:00 PM. JOIN US DIGITALLY AT

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85335878612?pwd=UquEaalBbNfs2KLxNrbeXBaH9sQyUb.1>

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: MAYOR WADE MENLOVE

Councilmembers Present: Mayor Menlove, Councilmember Bascom, Councilmember Judd, Councilmember Marsh, Councilmember Charles.

Staff Present: Temporary Town Recorder, Spencer Foster, Town Recorder Becca Batty, Deputy Recorder Brenda Warner.

Public Present: Sign-in sheet uploaded as attachment to the minutes.

Mayor Menlove: Called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm and did the roll call. Councilmember Judd was late.

2. OPENING CEREMONIES

a. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: BY INVITATION

Mayor Menlove: Led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

b. PRAYER/MOMENT OF SILENCE: BY INVITATION

Jason Knapp: Offered a prayer to begin the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

THIS IS THE TIME SET ASIDE FOR THE PUBLIC TO BRING FORWARD TO THE COUNCIL ANY ITEM THAT THEY WISH TO DISCUSS. PLEASE KEEP YOUR COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES MAXIMUM.

Candace Madsen: Brought up a concern about being contacted by people wondering if she would be willing to sell her property. Asked if the Council would be willing to take people's phone numbers instead of giving the people her address and phone number. She has safety concerns about people doing this and would rather the Council just get people's numbers instead so she can call them. Where she is a widow and alone at the property she is concerned about her safety. Don't give out numbers or tell them where the property is.

Mayor Menlove: Stated this makes sense and is a valid concern.

Brenda Warner: Especially in her situation it makes sense.

Candace Madsen: There's a lot of individuals who could be in the same or similar situations as her.

Mayor Menlove: Great comment. Thanked her for bringing this to the Council's attention. Commented that he is now seeing turtles at the lake instead of Eagles. He has seen a lot of people at the lake with the heat.

Layne Batty: He noticed that they swept the road and have been keeping the road clean.

Mayor Menlove: Asked Layne if he has still been experiencing traffic on his road.

Layne Batty: Stated that he put up a sign that says, "Residential area, do not use engine breaks." Since then, traffic has really calmed down. He still sees a few big trucks, but nowhere in comparison.

Mayor Menlove: Has wondered because he has seen the trucks coming up the highway. They are coming up the highway fast enough that they don't have time to slow down and assume they are going on through.

****AGENDA ACTION ITEMS****

TOWN COUNCIL MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS

3. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 18, 2026 AND MARCH 4, 2026 TOWN COUNCIL MEETINGS

Mayor Menlove: Did everyone have a chance to review the minutes from the last two meetings? If nobody has any concerns, can he get a motion?

Councilmember Charles: Made a motion to approve the minutes from February 18, 2026, and March 4, 2026.

Councilmember Marsh: Seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor say I. Vote was unanimous and passed. Minutes approved.

4. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – ORDINANCE NO. 26-03 AMENDING INTERIM LAND USE CONTROLS TO PROVIDE LIMITED EXEMPTIONS TO THE MORATORIUM FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS TO LEGALLY EXISTING STRUCTURES

Mayor Menlove: Appreciated the comments last time the Council met. They have had the ordinance all ready to go, but it just made sense to table the ordinance until they have some procedures in place. Asked if they can skip to item number 5 on the agenda and talk about that first. Unless we're ready to adopt processes, then number 4 still needs to be tabled.

Spencer Foster: Yep.

5. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – BUILDING PERMIT PROCESSES

Mayor Menlove: Shared with the Council a rough draft of some things he put together. Looked at examples of processes from around the county. Put together a few things that made sense to him for this. Whatever the town does needs to be very clear and easy to understand the processes. He put together a fee schedule based on averages of several different towns fee schedules. Tried to look at Santaquin but it seems like they must have a city login to be able to look at these things. Asked the council if they have questions or if they are on the right track with this. Did they have a chance to look through this?

Councilmember Charles: Had a chance to look through and it was clear. His concern is that he wants to be fair, but the town wants to make sure they cover their expenses too. They kind of modeled this off Santaquin's inspector. They can do the math on it quickly and talk about it. They need to make sure that what the inspector told them will fit with these fees.

Mayor Menlove: Asked if Councilmember Charles can report on their meetings with both Staheli and Associates and Sunrise Engineering.

Councilmember Charles: Stated that Staheli is just an inspection firm. They do a flat rate and say that it would be about \$95/hour for their costs to be able to do it. They charge just exactly what their time is. On their inspections they figure just \$100 for those. They must include their travel time in that, but generally they charge about \$100 for an inspection. Plan reviews for them are typically about 3 hours. That would equate to about \$285 in plan review costs. The inspection fee would be more than Santaquin, whose inspection fee is about \$75. The inspector from Santaquin was a bit different with the plan reviews as well.

Mayor Menlove: Randy Spadafora who is Santaquin's inspector. He's a bit different in the way he does his fees. By the way, Staheli does Genola as well. Randy does Goshen. Goshen doesn't have a contract with Santaquin, they have a contract with Randy himself. Part-time after hours. The way Randy explained it to the mayor was that the fee schedule for him is based on the value of the home or the value of the project. A typical fee schedule for a \$200,000 home and the building permit fee for this would be about \$1,300. Randy bases his plan review off that. His plan review fee is 65% of whatever the building permit fee would be. 75% of that he keeps and the remaining 25% goes back to the town. Not sure why he does that and the amount being that way instead of 50%. His inspection fee is \$75. He also has a \$300/year fee for a retainer. The mayor said that this makes a little bit of sense because if you are reviewing \$1,000,000 the plan review is going to be way

more intense than one that is \$200,000. The plan review is going to be built into the building permit fee. For the Staheli's their fees are based on time.

Councilmember Charles: Brought up that the Stahelis are a father and son duo. If one of them is out of town, that is one of the concerns with Randy. If he is out of town or if he is looking to retire, what would they do with inspections. With the Staheli's, there are two of them so if you need a backup, you have one. They also met Sunrise Engineering. Sunrise offers building inspection reviews, but that's just one of the things they offer. They offer a lot of things. They offer General Plan creation and can help with a lot of different things with this. Asked the Mayor if Sunrise ever got him their fee schedule.

Mayor Menlove: Just barely. Sunrise didn't show a fee schedule for something like a building inspection though.

Councilmember Marsh: Asked if they had taken a scenario of a \$500,000 home and made a comparison of what this would be?

Mayor Menlove: They can do it quickly. But they have made one with a \$200,000 home.

Councilmember Charles: It would be \$1370.

Mayor Menlove: Provided copies of some analysis to the Council and stated that they have some notes on them for what he did for this research and the meetings they had with Staheli, Sunrise, and Randy. The council went through his notes and the costs for the town and did this based on each company.

Robert Bascom: Pointed out that sometimes they must redo inspections. Do they take this into account and is there a fee for this?

Mayor Menlove: A lot of places place this cost on the home if there needs to be another inspection done. The homeowner is charged.

Councilmember Judd: His basic math is saying that through Staheli, the town would collect \$650, the difference between them and Randy is \$498. So, with Randy, they would collect an additional \$172.

Mayor Menlove: This also does depend on what the town implements as its fee schedule. Brought up impact fees and how these work.

Spencer Foster: Emphasized that your building permit process isn't meant to be a revenue generator, but you can have an overage and collect a little bit. You must think about staff time and all the things they are doing with the process. To have a little bit of a buffer in how much you collect is ok, but you don't want this to be a revenue generation tool.

Mayor Menlove: If the town gets to a point where they are paying for the recorders to do their job and deal with paperwork, then that must be considered. Randy is a super nice guy and easygoing. He told the mayor that in the next few years, he's hoping to retire and if he can get a contract with a few small towns that would be perfect for his retirement. That is his background and where he comes from. He said that he does worry about the times when Randy is out of town where Staheli's had a backup person.

Councilmember Charles: That was one thing that impressed him with Staheli's. They asked them a lot of questions. The Staheli's also inspected all the state-owned properties and gave him a list of these and how that works. They specifically asked them if they get busy, can they accommodate a small town like Spring Lake. They told them that they make it work and should be there within a day of when the inspection needs to take place. Said that this impressed him about them.

Mayor Menlove: Asked Spencer what the process is going forward. Do they have to adopt a fee schedule by ordinance? And the building permit process?

Spencer Foster: Resolution. We'll adopt the fee schedule and process by resolution. Anything administrative that you adopt with be through a resolution.

Mayor Menlove: If the council agreed could they adopt it or would they need to wait?

Spencer Foster: We will need to write up the resolution and then we'll have it for you at your next council meeting.

Mayor Menlove: So, we're not ready yet to adopt something.

Spencer Foster: No.

Mayor Menlove: Told everyone about Nate Davis and his desire to get his project done. They need to get moving on getting this adopted. Explained who Nate Davis is and what his project is that he wants to work on.

Councilmember Charles: Explained that he doesn't see why they shouldn't be able to be ready with something to approve by next council meeting. He liked the application that the mayor came up with. It's simple and straightforward and if they need to fine-tune it, they could later. It's a good basis that could be used to start. With procedures, the only question he had was with inspections on things like water heaters per state code. Brought up the inspector who came from Orem to the last council meeting and how they had a simple document that showed what needed inspections.

Councilmember Judd: His concern is that once you adopt something whether you enforce it or not, eventually someone is going to come in and enforce it or change it even higher. It never goes away; it just keeps going higher with time. He wants the town to limit whatever they are going to require a permit for so that they don't start down a path where eventually everything must have a permit. He sees the value of the permit, but his concern is that it may not be the city's responsibility to make sure everything that is done in a house is done to code. He doesn't think this falls on the city, it falls on the individual instead. The city should be there for a major part of the construction of the building, but if someone changes the water heater in their house, he doesn't think that's liability on the city. Doesn't think that the town requires a permit for all that is necessary. Thinks that a building inspector when he comes in to sell the house should be the one who says whether something is correct in the home. He's afraid they are going to go down a path where the town is going to hate themselves.

Councilmember Charles: Strongly disagreed with Councilmember Judd's comments. Stated that he did his own water heaters without a permit, but he took the liability for this. Brought up how the town could be liable if they don't require certain things to be done with a permit. Emphasized that they don't want to open the town up to liability by not requiring a process for certain things, specifically those things that are state required.

Mayor Menlove: Agreed with Councilmember Judd about not wanting to be picky about certain things. But he also said that they can't get away with not requiring something if it's required by the state. Pointed out how liability switches to the individual if a process is in place and the individual decides not to abide by it. If it's something that's not required by state code, they shouldn't require it.

Councilmember Judd: He would be really interested to find out what's required by state code and what isn't.

Mayor Menlove: In the next week or two that's something the town should check on and see what is required and what it's Paul seemed to think that water heaters were required.

Robert Bascom: If you're going to hire an inspector, that's the person you need to go to and ask.

Councilmember Marsh: Told a story about installing a water heater and not having a strap on it for earthquakes. The liability would have been on him if he was told to have it on there and he didn't.

Mayor Menlove: If he needs to replace a water heater, he's probably just going to go to Lowe's and do it.

Councilmember Charles: For the record, because he's gone on the record so strongly, he's used a licensed plumber when he's done stuff instead of getting a permit and he's insured. He took that risk, but the liability is on him not the city.

Greg McDavitt: If it's in the state code, we already adopted it anyway. You could always say in the process, "Follow the state code and if you choose not to, it's on you."

Brenda Warner: Stated that the website says, yes, a permit is required in Utah to install or replace a water heater. A certified building inspector generally must inspect the installation to ensure it meets local code requirements.

Mayor Menlove: Asked specifically how building code works and what it says you must do. Does the building code specify what must be inspected? In the next two weeks, the council needs to investigate that. Asked Spencer if they need to do anything to hire Staheli as far as a resolution is concerned?

Spencer Foster: You can make a resolution to sign a contract with them. You don't have to make a resolution because technically the mayor has administrative authority for this, but if you want your Council's opinion you could make a resolution from the Council approving the mayor to sign a contract with whoever you choose.

Mayor Menlove: Does anyone feel strongly about either inspection option so we can create a resolution for this and the permitting process?

Spencer Foster: So, you'll have a resolution for your processes. One for your fee schedule. That can be one resolution if you want. And then a resolution for you to be able to sign a contract with whoever you choose to go with for inspection services.

Councilmember Marsh: Pointed out that they need to have something that will protect the town from additional fees as well. Recommended that Staheli's seems like a better option.

Spencer Foster: What he just stated would go into the contract that the mayor will be approved to sign. The mayor would oversee reviewing that contract and making sure that everything in the contract is good. The mayor could send that to the rest of the council and ask for comments and review as well.

Mayor Menlove: So, a resolution to approve a fee schedule, a resolution to sign a contract with Staheli, and a resolution to approve the process.

Spencer Foster: You can do a resolution for the fee schedule and process separate or combined. However you want to do this. You can make either two resolutions or three resolutions.

Mayor Menlove: Wants to come to the next council meeting with those things ready. If the council wants to review fee schedules over the next two weeks as well that would be good. He stated that he met with a contractor to learn more about how the permitting process would work for the town as well. Went through the steps for this. Asked if they only need to pass the process for an upgrade, remodel, or repair? That's all that the amendment addresses. Then the town would pass the process for new construction later when they are ready to lift the moratorium completely.

Spencer Foster: However you want to do it.

Mayor Menlove: If the council did that, then they would have more time to look specifically into new construction processes.

Councilmembers Charles and Marsh: Think that's a good idea.

Mayor Menlove: Pointed out that he changed some of the permit process documents and how they read to require a \$100 inspection fee as a minimum. Stated that over the next two weeks we will get some resolution ready and review a bunch of things regarding this process.

WORK SESSION/TRAINING

6. DISCUSSION – SPRING LAKE'S INITIAL BUDGET

Mayor Menlove: Spencer, tell us quickly about this item.

Spencer Foster: You all should have received an invitation for budget training on April 2 at noon from ULCT. They are going to walk us through setting an initial budget. To legally spend any money as a town, you do have to have a budget adopted. You now are getting money from taxes, and you are also going to have some grant funding from the county who we need to invoice. You'll have about \$100,000 you can spend on things you need. To legally be able to spend that money you must have a budget that covers you until July 1st. We'll have to go through adopting the budget in front of the public in a public hearing. We'll go over that on April 2 in training when ULCT walks us through this process.

Mayor Menlove: Does it have to have a notice period?

Spencer Foster: Because you are setting your initial budget, we can do a tentative budget and final budget in the same meeting rather than spreading those out into two different hearings. Explained how this would work with the timing of public hearings.

Mayor Menlove: But we can't even do that until after April 2?

Spencer Foster: You can start working on budget stuff. If you want to go through and predict how much money you think you will have by July 1, you should do that. You can start creating your budget based on this. Think about where you want to spend your funds, etc.

Mayor Menlove: Do you want to talk about that other item you had for us as well?

Spencer Foster: Yea. Explained that he was looking into options for the town to do a Google Drive. The Utah Cyber Center has a grant opportunity for setting this up. Asked if the council would like him to do this for the town and see if the Cyber Center would be willing to cover this as a start up cost. Needs direction on whether to go forward with this.

Council and Mayor: Gave Spencer the go ahead to start this process.

REPORTS

7. MAYOR

Mayor Menlove: When they met with Sunrise, they discovered that they don't do a lot with private individuals. They do more with communities. They help people with general plans, transportation plans, and grant applications. TPA grant assistance discussed. The town missed the grant timeline, but Sunrise contacted the town to see if they wanted them to apply for a grant. The mayor said that the town isn't going to spend \$80k to do their first general plan. The town is going to have a basic plan. Sunrise told them that maybe in December of this year they could apply for a TPA grant for the town to make some other plan.

Spencer Foster: The LAA program can help you apply for this as well, so you don't have to pay Sunrise.

Mayor Menlove: They said they don't charge to do it but then the expectation is that you will end up using them for the project.

Spencer Foster: Pointed out that you can use the LAA program to do this instead. Explained who he helped apply for these types of opportunities (Hideout, Francis, Kamas, Coalville, Fairfield, Cedar Fort). Thinks all these communities are going to get them, so you might as well use the LAA program to do this. If that person is competent. "I hope I am".

Mayor Menlove: Sunrise basically told them to go for something small, like \$10k, to develop a transportation plan, and then in five years apply for a bigger grant to help redo the general plan. Stated that he also met with Payson City and MAG about the Disaster Mitigation Plan. The biggest thing with that is probably the WUI maps and ordinances. They also talked about earthquakes. Spencer mentioned that they do need to send an invoice to Utah County for the grant funding they were promised for startup funding in the amount of ~\$85k.

Spencer Foster: \$83-84k.

Mayor Menlove: They are going to submit an invoice to the county for these funds. He also has an appointment with Chief Spencer from Payson Fire/EMS to talk about these services. Councilmember Bascom stated that she will attend that meeting with him. The Chief will come with a proposal for services for this.

Brenda Warner: 3-minute warning.

Councilmember Charles: They also need to follow up on their meeting with the County Sheriff's. Does the council want him to follow up on that?

Mayor Menlove: Yea he wanted to wait on getting this money from the county first before talking more with the Sheriff's.

Councilmember Charles: There was that tax that the town needs to switch over as well?

Spencer Foster: Thought we have done all the tax stuff they needed to so far.

Mayor Menlove: Brought up that Truth in Taxation needs to take place for what they are talking about to happen. Explained about the county's collection of special service taxes and how the town needs to consider this for their payment to the county for continued services.

Councilmember Charles: Need to start the process of discussion about this contract with the county.

Mayor Menlove: Explained how payment for this contract would probably look. He explained that Goshen's agreement has an officer attending their council meetings and a set number of hours. He doesn't think they should be paying more than Goshen for less services than Goshen is having.

8. TOWN COUNCIL
9. STAFF MEMBERS
10. PLANNING COMMISSION
11. OTHER

CLOSED MEETING

POSSIBLE MOTION TO ENTER INTO CLOSED MEETING FOR THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF PROPERTY; PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION; THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETANCE, OR THE PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL; OR THE DEPLOYMENT OF SECURITY PERSONNEL, DEVICES, OR SYSTEMS.

ADJOURNMENT

Councilmember Charles: Made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Councilmembers Marsh and Bascom: Seconded this motion.

Vote: All in favor say I. Unanimous. Meeting adjourned.



Spencer Foster, Temporary Town Recorder

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing special accommodations, including auxiliary communicative aids and services, for this meeting should notify the Town at 801-310-9632 or by email at sfoster@magutah.gov at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The Town does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda has been posted at the designated meeting place, the springlakeutah.gov website, and the Utah Public Notice Website.

RESOLUTION NO. 26-04

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR BUILDING INSPECTION SERVICES

WHEREAS, the Town of Spring Lake is a municipality organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah; and

WHEREAS, the Town is authorized under Utah law, including Utah Code Title 10 and 15A, to regulate construction activities and enforce building codes within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Town has adopted or is in the process of adopting procedures requiring building permits for certain construction activities, including repairs, remodels, and upgrades; and

WHEREAS, the Town does not currently employ full-time Building Official or inspection staff and therefore requires contracted services to perform plan review and building inspections; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council finds that contracting with a qualified provider of building inspection services is necessary to:

- Ensure compliance with applicable building codes;
- Protect the health, safety, and welfare of Town residents;
- Provide timely and professional inspection services; and
- Support the administration of the Town's building permit process;

WHEREAS, the Town Council desires to authorize the Mayor to execute an agreement with a qualified provider for such services, subject to the terms and conditions approved by the Town.

NOW THEREFORE, the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah hereby ordains as follows:

1. – Authorization of Agreement

The Town Council hereby authorizes the Mayor to negotiate, finalize, and execute an agreement on behalf of the Town with _____ for the provision of building inspection and related services.

2. – Scope of Services

The agreement may include, but is not limited to:

- Building permit plan review;

- On-site inspections for construction projects;
- Code compliance verification;
- Issuance of inspection reports and recommendations;
- Assistance with enforcement actions, as needed.

3. – Term and Compensation

The agreement shall include terms regarding:

- Duration of services;
- Compensation and fee structure;
- Insurance and licensing requirements;
- Termination provisions.

All terms shall be reviewed and approved by the Mayor and, where appropriate, the Town Attorney.

4. – Compliance with Law

All services provided under the agreement shall comply with:

- Applicable provisions of the Utah Uniform Building Standards Act (Title 15A);
- Any building codes adopted by the Town; and
- All other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

5. – Administrative Authority

The Mayor and/or designated Town staff are authorized to:

- Coordinate services with the contracted provider;
- Approve routine administrative matters under the agreement;
- Ensure implementation of the Town's building permit and inspection processes.

6. – Ratification

All prior actions taken by Town officials consistent with the intent of this Resolution are hereby ratified and approved.

7. – Effective Date

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah, this ___ of _____, 20__.

Signed: _____

Wade Menlove, Mayor

Attest: _____

Town Recorder

TOWN COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED

Councilmembers:	Yes	No	Abstain	Excused
Wade Menlove	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharon Bascom	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Charles	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Judd	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Marsh	_____	_____	_____	_____

RESOLUTION NO. 26-05

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS FOR REPAIRS, REMODELS, AND UPGRADES

WHEREAS, the Town of Spring Lake is a municipality organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah; and

WHEREAS, the Town is authorized under Utah law, including Utah Code Title 10 and 15A, to regulate construction activities and enforce building codes within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, building permits are generally required prior to initiating work to construct, enlarge, alter, repair, or improve structures or systems in order to protect public health safety, and welfare; and

WHEREAS, the Town desires to establish a clear efficient, and reasonable process for residents to obtain permits for repairs, remodels, and upgrades, including but not limited to interior renovations, system improvements, and minor structural work; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council finds that adopting a formal process will:

- Ensure compliance with applicable building codes;
- Provide clarity to residents and contractors;
- Provide safe construction practices; and
- Allow the Town to administer permits in a consistent and predictable manner;

WHEREAS, the Town Council desires to adopt the building permit process attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

NOW THEREFORE, the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah hereby ordains as follows:

1. – Adoption of Building Permit Process

The Town Council hereby adopts the Building Permit Process for Repairs, Remodels, and Upgrades, attached as Exhibit A, as the official policy and procedure for the Town.

2. – Applicability

This process shall apply to all construction activities within the Town that involve:

- Repairs, remodels, or upgrades to existing structures;
- Installation or modification of electrical, plumbing, or mechanical systems;
- Structural or non-structural improvements requiring review under applicable codes;

The Building Official or designated administrator shall determine whether a permit is required for specific work.

3. – Administration

The Town Council hereby authorizes the Building Official, Town Clerk/Recorder, or designated staff to:

- Receive and process permit applications;
- Coordinate plan review and inspections (including third-party services when necessary);
- Issue permits upon determining compliance with applicable codes and requirements;
- Enforce compliance with the adopted process and applicable building standards.

4. – Compliance Required

No person shall commence work requiring a permit under this process without first obtaining the appropriate permit. Failure to obtain a permit may result in:

- Stop work orders;
- Additional fees; or
- Other enforcement actions as allowed by law.

5. – Exemptions

Certain minor repairs or maintenance activities may be exempt from permit requirements, as defined in Exhibit A and consistent with applicable building codes.

6. – Fees

Permit fees shall be established by separate resolution or fee schedule adopted by the Town Council.

7. – Effective Date

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah, this __ of _____, 20__.

Signed: _____

Wade Menlove, Mayor

Attest: _____

Town Recorder

TOWN COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED

Councilmembers:	Yes	No	Abstain	Excused
Wade Menlove	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharon Bascom	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Charles	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Judd	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Marsh	_____	_____	_____	_____

Exhibit A

TOWN OF SPRING LAKE BUILDING PERMIT PROCEDURES

Repairs/remodels/upgrades

Any owner or owner's authorized agent who intends to construct, enlarge, alter, repair, move, demolish, or change the occupancy of a building or structure or to erect, install, enlarge, alter, repair, remove, convert, or replace any electrical, gas, mechanical, or plumbing system, the installation of which is regulated by the Building Code, or to cause any such work to be performed, shall first make application to the Spring Lake Building Department and obtain the required permit. Permits shall not be required for work exempt from a permit as outlined in the adopted codes (see When Do I Need A Permit) document. Work exempted from a permit does not deem to grant authorization for work to be done in any manner in violation of the Building Code. A homeowner may be subject to a Class B Misdemeanor if work requiring a permit is performed without first securing the permit(s) required. Anyone who received payment or equivalent value to perform work requiring a permit may be subject to a Class C Misdemeanor if the work is performed without first securing the permit(s) required.

Building Standards

1. All use approvals and building permit approvals shall be valid for a maximum period of 180 days from the date of approval. If work has not commenced, or a use or building has been established within one hundred eighty (180) days from the date of approval, the approval, permit, or license, as required and approved, shall be void, and a new application, approval, permit, or license shall be required.
2. No material, plan modification, or use variation from the approved plan shall be allowed unless such variations shall first have been approved in writing by the Building Department or designee and all fees are paid (see Spring Lake Fee Schedule)
3. This list may not be all-inclusive. Please refer to Town Code Title 9 (Building Regulations), Title 10 (Land Use), and Utah Code § 10-6-160 (Fees Collected for Construction Approval -- Approval of Plans).
4. All work will be done according to the Utah State Building code

Procedures

1- Obtain the following documentation from the town recorder/deputy recorder; (a)-Building Permit Application, (b)-Building Permit Procedures, and (c)-Building Permit Requirements, (d)-Do I Need a Building Permit. Follow the instructions on both the Building Permit Procedures Document and the Building Permit Requirements. Fill out all necessary information and return the application to the town recorder/deputy town recorder

2- The town recorder will do a quick review making sure all information has been provided and will then forward the permit to the Building Inspector (if inspection is required), and the Permit Coordinator. The Building Inspector (if required) and Permit Coordinator must both approve the application and return it to

the town recorder/deputy recorder who will then notify the applicant of the approval within two weeks of submission of application

3- If the application is denied by the Permit Coordinator it will be forwarded to the town council for review. Applicants must attend the town meeting to answer questions and provide clarifying information. The town council will have the option to approve, deny, or table the item to gather more information

4- Upon approval by the Permit Coordinator, the applicant shall pay to the Town Treasurer all applicable fees concerning the permit before construction, repairs, remodeling, upgrades, etc. can begin. Once the fees have been paid the Town Recorder will then issue the building permit.

5- It is the applicant's responsibility to contact the City Recorder for all necessary inspections. Required inspections will be checked on the building permit. The Building Inspector requires at least twenty-four-hour notice on all inspections.

6- After repairs, remodels, upgrades are complete, and all required inspections have been submitted to the town recorder, A Certificate of Completion will be issued by the Town Recorder.

7- The applicant can request a review by the Board of Adjustment upon rejection by the City Council, by completing the following information and submitting it to the town recorder.

I, _____, residing at _____, have read and understand the procedures above for obtaining a building permit, and do not agree with the Council's decision to reject my application. I hereby make a formal request to the Board of Adjustment to review my building permit application

For _____, located at _____,

Tax Serial # _____.

Exhibit B

**TOWN OF SPRING LAKE
BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION**

**Spring Lake Ut, Address, Phone number,
Office/Inspection Hours Monday-Friday????**

Type of construction. New residential New Commercial repair/remodel/upgrade
addition/garage to existing building shop/shed other

Owner's Name _____ Application Date _____

Owner's Mailing Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Contact (Name/Phone/Email) _____

Contractor's Business Name _____ License # _____

Contractor's Mailing Address _____ Phone # _____

Approximate Job Site Address/Location _____

List Any Existing Structures on Property _____

Property Parcel # _____ Lot Size (acres) _____

Power Utility Provider Name _____ Fuel/Type (Natural Gas or LPG) _____

Is there an existing fire sprinkler system? (Yes/No) Distance to the nearest fire hydrant in feet _____

Description of Work _____ Value of Work \$ _____

Health Department Approval – Please complete attached form. If applicable, obtain health department approval prior to application submittal. The above applicant agrees to comply with Utah County Health Department and Utah State regulations for the installation and/or connection to the required potable water and wastewater facilities, when applicable for the proposed work. Wastewater Approval _____ Date _____ or Public System _____ Date _____ Potable Water Quality Approval _____ Date _____ or Public System _____ Date _____ Water Source Protection yes/no _____ APPROVED: _____, Utah County Health Department

APPLICANT: PLEASE READ CAREFULLY I agree to comply with all County and State Building laws and ordinances, and that the representations in this application for a building permit are true and accurate, and any misrepresentations or errors herein are the sole responsibility of the applicant, and shall in no way incur or accrue the liability or obligation to enforcing officers or agents. This permit becomes null and void if work on construction authorized is not commenced within 180 days, or if no inspections are performed for a period of 180 days, or if construction or work is suspended or abandoned for a period of 180 days at any time after work is commenced. USE OR OCCUPANCY OF A STRUCTURE IS PROHIBITED UNTIL AFTER FINAL INSPECTION IS APPROVED AND "CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY" IS ISSUED

Owner's or Contractor's Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____

Building Submittal Fee \$ _____ Invoice # _____

RESOLUTION NO. 26-06

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A BUILDING PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE AND VALUATION TABLE

WHEREAS, the Town of Spring Lake is a municipality organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah; and

WHEREAS, the Town is authorized under Utah law, including Utah Code Title 10 and 15A, to regulate construction activities and enforce building codes within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Town has established a building permit process for repairs, remodels, and upgrades to structures within the Town; and

WHEREAS, the building permit fees in Utah are commonly based on the valuation of the construction project, including materials and labor, and are used to support plan review, inspections, and administration of building regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council finds that adopting a fee schedule and valuation table will:

- Ensure fair and consistent fee calculations;
- Provide transparency to residents and contractors;
- Allow the Town to recover the reasonable cost of services provided;

WHEREAS, the Town Council has reviewed the proposed Building Permit Fee Schedule and Valuation Table, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council has held a duly noticed public hearing on April 1, 2026 in accordance with Utah Code to receive public comment regarding the proposed fees.

NOW THEREFORE, the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah hereby ordains as follows:

1. – Adoption of Fee Schedule and Valuation Table

The Town Council hereby adopts the Building Permit Fee Schedule and Valuation Table, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

2. – Basis for Fee Calculation

Permit fees shall be calculated based on:

- The total valuation of the project, as determined by the Building Official or designee;

- The valuation table and fee structure outlined in Exhibit A;

Project valuation may include:

- Labor and materials;
- Contractor bid amounts;
- Standardized valuation tables (e.g., ICC or similar references).

3. – Plan Review and Inspection Fees

The fee schedule may include:

- Plan review fees (typically a percentage of the permit fee);
- Inspection fees;
- Re-inspection fees;
- Administrative or processing fees;

Where applicable, the Town may;

- Pass through third-party review or inspection costs to the applicant; or
- Incorporate such costs into the adopted fee schedule.

4. – State Surcharge

In accordance with Utah law, a state surcharge (currently 1% of the building permit fee) shall be collected and remitted as required.

5. – Administration

The Town hereby authorizes the Building Official, Town Recorder, or designated staff to:

- Determine project valuation;
- Calculate and collect applicable fees;
- Coordinate with contracted building inspection providers;
- Ensure compliance with the adopted fee schedule.

6. – Amendments

The Town Council may amend the fee schedule and valuation table from time to time by resolution, following any required public notice and hearing.

7. – Severability

If any provision of this Resolution or Exhibit A is found to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions.

8. – Effective Date

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah, this ___ of _____, 20__.

Signed: _____

Wade Menlove, Mayor

Attest: _____

Town Recorder

TOWN COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED

Councilmembers:	Yes	No	Abstain	Excused
Wade Menlove	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharon Bascom	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Charles	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Judd	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Marsh	_____	_____	_____	_____

Exhibit A

**BUILDING PERMIT FEES AND VALUATION TABLE
TOWN OF SPRING LAKE**

The following table is used to calculate building permit fees based on the valuation of the construction project. Utilize the square footage for the construction project and the dollar amounts below to calculate the project valuation.

Valuation (per square foot).

Porch	\$30.00 per sq ft.
Carport	\$30.00 per sq ft.
Garage	\$44.00 per sq ft.
Unfinished Basement	\$31.50 per sq ft.
Finished Basement	\$75.00 per sq ft.
Main Level	\$169.09 per sq ft.
2nd Level	\$169.09 per sq ft.

Based upon the valuation, the following table will help you figure out the approximate building permit fee.

Total Valuation	Fee
\$1.00 to \$500.00	\$23.50 (minimum \$75 if inspection is required)
\$501.00 to \$2,000.00	\$23.50 for the first \$500.00 plus \$3.05 for each additional \$100.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000.00 (minimum \$75 if inspection is required)
\$2,001 to \$25,000.00	\$69.50 for the first \$2,000.00 plus \$14.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.00 (minimum \$75 if inspection is required)
\$25,001 to \$50,000.00	\$391.25 for the first \$25,000.00 plus \$10.10 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00
\$50,001.00 to \$100,000.00	\$643.75 for the first \$50,000.00 plus \$7.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00
\$100,001.00 to \$500,000.00	\$993.75 for the first \$100,000.00 plus \$5.60 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00

\$500,001 to \$1,000,000.00	\$3,233.75 for the first \$500,000.00 plus \$4.75 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof.
\$1,000,001.00 and up	\$5,608.75 for the first \$1,000,000.00 plus \$3.65 for each additional.

These permit fees were an average of several towns/cities.

ORDINANCE NO. 26-03

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 26-01 ESTABLISHING INTERIM LAND USE CONTROLS TO PROVIDE LIMITED EXEMPTIONS TO THE MORATORIUM FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS TO LEGALLY EXISTING STRUCTURES

WHEREAS, the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake previously adopted Ordinance No. 26-01 establishing interim land use controls, including a temporary moratorium on certain development activities; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council finds that limited exemptions are appropriate to allow routine maintenance, safety improvements, and minor renovations to legally existing structures during the moratorium period; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council desires to clarify that such exemptions shall not allow expansion, intensification of use, or new developments inconsistent with the purpose of the moratorium;

NOW THEREFORE, the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah hereby ordains as follows:

1. – Amendment to Moratorium Ordinance

Ordinance No. 26-01 is hereby amended to add the following section:

2. – Exemptions for Legally Existing Structures

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Ordinance, the moratorium shall not apply to, and the Town shall accept, process, and issue permits for, the following activities on legally existing structures (structures lawfully constructed or established prior to the effective date of Ordinance No. 26-01):

A. – Permitted Activities

- a) Ordinary repairs and maintenance, including but not limited to roofing, siding, painting, foundation, repairs, and window or door replacement;
 - b) Interior renovations and upgrades, including but not limited to kitchen or bathroom remodels, flooring, electrical, plumbing, HVAC, insulation, or energy-efficiency improvements;
 - c) Exterior upgrades that do not increase the building footprint, gross floor area, height, or overall volume of the structure;
 - d) Accessibility, health, or safety improvements required or encouraged by state or federal law, including but not limited to ADA-related modifications, smoke detectors, or egress improvements;
- and

- e) Minor exterior alterations such as decks, patios, or porches that do not exceed two hundred (200) square feet and do not change the use or intensity of the property.

B. – Conditions for Exemption

The above activities shall qualify for exemption only if all the following conditions are met:

- 1) The work does not increase the footprint, gross floor area, height, or density or intensity of use of the structure or lot;
- 2) There is no change of use that would require zoning approval or conditional use approval;
- 3) The improvements fully comply with the Utah State Construction Code (as adopted and amended by the State of Utah) and all applicable health, fire, building, and environmental regulations;
- 4) A building permit is obtained where required by law; and
- 5) The Town’s Building Official, or designee, determines in writing that the proposed work qualifies as a renovation or upgrade rather than new construction, expansion, or intensification of use.

2. – No Expansion of Rights

Nothing in this amendment shall be interpreted to allow subdivision, new principal structures, additions that increase building area, or any development otherwise prohibited by the moratorium.

3. – Severability

If any provision of this ordinance is held invalid, the remainder shall not be affected.

5. – Effective Date

This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon adoption and shall remain in effect for the duration of the interim land use controls established by Ordinance No. 26-01.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Town Council of the Town of Spring Lake, Utah, this __ of _____, 20__.

Signed: _____

Wade Menlove, Mayor

Attest: _____

Rebecca Batty, Town Recorder

TOWN COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED

Councilmembers:	Yes	No	Abstain	Excused
Wade Menlove	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharon Bascom	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Charles	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Judd	_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Marsh	_____	_____	_____	_____

Summarizing the Results of the General Plan Survey:

1. What the Data Clearly Says (*high-confidence signals*)
 2. Where there is Meaningful Divergence of Responses (*especially resident vs. non-resident*)
 3. What the Results Mean for the General Plan (*actionable direction*)
-

1. High-Confidence Signals (Very Strong Consensus)

These are areas where the survey results are clear and consistent.

A. Preservation is the Dominant Community Value

Across multiple questions:

- Rural/open space: **79%** (Q3); **74%** (Q7)
- Quiet/low density: **79%** (Q3); **70%** (Q7); **72%/79%** (Q11)
- Rural character “extremely important”: **71%** (Q4); **74%** (Q7)
- Agricultural preservation “extremely important”: **76% total** (Q5); **69%** (Q7)

Interpretation:

Spring Lake is clearly a **preservation-first community**, not a growth-accommodation community. This is not subtle – it’s overwhelming.

B. Strong Preference for Limited Growth

Q6:

- Minimal growth and carefully limited: **57% total**
 - Moderate growth if well planned: **38% total**
 - Growth to accommodate demand: **3% total**
 - Growth shouldn’t be limited: **1%**
- 95% of respondents want **limited or moderate growth**, not open-ended growth.

Interpretation:

Policies and resource planning should not be directed towards supporting significant growth. The community does not support significant growth initiatives.

C. Strong Preference that Any Growth Be Based on Conditions

Q7:

- Impact on rural character: **74%**
- Compatibility with existing land uses: **69%**
- Impact on residents (noise, traffic, etc.): **70%**
- Infrastructure adequacy: **45%**
- Long-term fiscal impacts: **49%**
- Only **3%** indicated growth should not be limited (**2% res./8% non-res.**)

Interpretation:

Some growth is acceptable only if it doesn't negatively impact what the community already has.

D. Strong Rejection of Higher-Density Housing

Q8:

- Single-family: **97%**
- ADUs: **56% (moderate support)**
- Townhomes: **3%**
- Apartments: **1%**

Interpretation:

This is extremely clear:

- **Multi-family is not supported**
 - **ADUs are acceptable (but not dominant)**
-

E. Larger Lot Preference

Q9:

- 1 acre or larger+: **67%**
- ½ acre or less: **33%**

Interpretation:

Strong signal toward:

- 1-acre baseline zoning
 - With some support for larger lots
 - Note: County requirements related to septic systems may also limit building on lots under 1 acre
-

F. Strong Rejection of Infrastructure Improvements / Expansion

Q12:

- Improving Roads: **30%**
- Town Hall: **28%**
- Current infrastructure is already adequate: **28%**
- **No other item received over 25% support**

Interpretation:

The Community is not supportive of major infrastructure expansion. Responses to this question are consistent with other expressed preferences limiting growth (since infrastructure expansion would be required to enable higher growth models)

G. Fiscal Conservatism

Q13:

- Willing to pay more taxes: **9%**
- Maybe, but situational and limited: **57%**
- No: **33%**

Q12:

- Current infrastructure is already adequate: **28%**

Interpretation:

Strong signal:

- Avoid infrastructure-heavy growth models
 - Avoid expensive urbanization
-

H. Top Priority Ranking

Q15 (averages):

1. Rural character (1.9)
2. Agriculture (2.4)
3. Low taxes (2.8)
4. Lake (3.4)
5. Limited growth (3.7)
6. Large-scale growth (5.5)

Interpretation:

This is one of the most powerful findings.

Clear hierarchy:

1. Preserve identity
 2. Preserve agriculture
 3. Control cost
 4. Growth is secondary (**both residents and non-residents**)
-

2. Key Divergence: Residents vs Non-Resident Landowners

Important nuances.

A. Growth Philosophy

Q6:

- Residents: **63% minimal growth**
- Non-residents: **69% moderate growth**

Interpretation:

This is a fundamental difference in worldview with non-residents preferring more growth than residents.

- Note: Neither residents nor non-residents demonstrated much support for significant growth (**3% res. / 15% non-res.**)
-

B. Lot Size Preferences

Q9:

- Residents favor **1+ acre (72%)**
- Non-residents favor **½ acre or less (85%)**

Interpretation:

This is not unusual:

- Resident preservation vs. non-resident landowner development interest divide
 - As noted above, County requirements related to septic systems may also limit building on lots under 1 acre
-

C. Infrastructure Improvements/Expansion

Q12:

- Residents: low support for sewer/culinary water expansion (**~13%/17%**)
- Non-residents: high support for sewer/culinary water expansion (**85%/85%**)
- Residents: moderate support for improving roads (**37%**) and providing a town hall (**31%**); low support for other types of infrastructure improvements or expansion (**7% - 21%**).

- Non-residents: moderate support for many other infrastructure improvements/expansion (**23% - 54%**); low support for town hall (**8%**)

Interpretation:

Culinary water and centralized sewer are key requirements to development potential.

- Resident preservation vs. landowner development interest divide
-

D. Willingness to Pay Increased Taxes

- Residents: only **7% yes**
- Non-residents: **31% yes**

Interpretation:

Very little support among residents to pay for growth-enabling infrastructure. Non-residents are slightly more willing to pay for the infrastructure, but still a low percentage.

E. Housing Types

- Residents: essentially no support for townhomes/apartments (**0%**)
 - Non-residents: some openness (**31%**)
-

3. What This Means for the General Plan

A. Core Policy Direction

Survey results strongly indicate:

“The community of Spring Lake strongly prioritize preservation of rural character, agricultural uses, and low-density development, and support limiting growth based on infrastructure capacity.”

B. Land Use / Zoning Direction

Survey results suggest:

- Base zoning: **1-acre minimum (or larger in some areas)**

- Allow:
 - Single-family homes
 - ADUs (with controls)
 - Do NOT broadly allow:
 - Townhomes
 - Apartments
-

C. Agriculture Protection

Survey suggests strong support to:

- Protect farm animal rights
- Avoid nuisance conflicts
- Maintain agricultural uses

This could potentially be embedded in:

- Zoning code
 - Right-to-farm policies
 - Buffer requirements
-

D. Growth Management Framework

Survey results suggest:

- Limited, phased growth
 - Infrastructure-first approvals
 - Concurrency requirements (*i.e., infrastructure capacity must be available at time of occupancy for any new development*)
-

E. Fiscal Policy

Survey results suggest strong support for:

- “Growth pays its own way”
 - Avoiding residents being required to subsidize infrastructure expansion
-

F. Limited, Light Commercial in Designated Areas

Q10:

- Support: ~54%
- Oppose: ~26%
- Neutral: 20%

Interpretation:

- Limited, carefully located light commercial development is acceptable
 - But not dominant
-

Bottom Line

The data tells a very clear story:

The community of Spring Lake wants to preserve a rural, agricultural, low-density community, allow only limited and carefully managed growth, avoid major infrastructure expansion, and maintain low fiscal burdens — while allowing modest flexibility such as ADUs and limited light commercial uses.