

Draft Minutes - Town of Spring Lake

Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

Meeting to be Held

April 1, 2026 – 7:30 P.M.

3744 West 12240 South

Spring Lake, Utah 84651

NOTICE IS HEREIN GIVEN THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF SPRING LAKE WILL HOLD A COMMISSION MEETING ON WEDNESDAY APRIL 1, 2026, AT 7:30 PM. JOIN US DIGITALLY AT

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

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: JASON KNAPP

Commissioners Present: Jason Knapp, Layne Batty, Ryan Moore, and Joy Benson.

Commissioners Absent: Richard Behling.

Alternates Present: Von Menlove.

Alternates Absent: Greg McDavitt.

Staff Present: LAA, Spencer Foster, Deputy Town Recorder, Brenda Warner.

Chair Knapp: Conducted a roll call to start the meeting. Commissioner Behling was not present. As a result, Alternate Von Menlove sat in as a voting commission member.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Chair Knapp: Opened the public comment. No comments tonight. Public comment closed.

AGENDA ACTION ITEMS

TOWN PLANNING COMMISSION MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS

2. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 18, 2026, MEETING

Chair Knapp: Any concerns or changes to the minutes.

Commissioner Batty: Didn't see anything that needed to be changed. Made a motion to accept the minutes for the March 18, 2026, meeting.

Commissioner Menlove: Seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor say I. Vote was unanimous. Motion passed and minutes were approved.

3. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – RESULTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN SURVEY

Chair Knapp: Explained the General Plan survey processes the town has gone through thus far. Explained how the results were calculated and that there was a presentation at the last commission meeting. The survey results are intended to be the large portion of the guidance the commission uses for the General Plan for the town. The commission needs to be aligned with the results of the survey to be able to create the plan. Pulled up results of the survey to discuss further at the meeting tonight. Will try to keep the presentation tonight reasonably short. Showed the actual result from the survey to those in attendance. Each of the commissioners should have received a summary of the results in their packet for the meeting tonight. Asked for thoughts on what the most efficient way to go through the results tonight would be.

Commissioner Batty: Recommended that they discuss the results in the way Jason had provided to the commission. He went through and detailed the percentage of responses for each question and provided that to the commission.

Chair Knapp: Asked if the commission wanted him to put those results on the projector screen and they talk about those.

Multiple Commissioners: Yes, that would be good as they already talked about the survey questions at the last meeting.

Chair Knapp: Pulled up the document the commission was talking about to present to those in attendance tonight. Walked the commission through the first section of the document. This section shows where there was agreement or consensus throughout the survey. Strong support for maintaining rural open space, quiet and low density, rural character, and agriculture preservation. Strong preference for limited growth. Growth should consider the rural character of the town and shouldn't impact existing land uses.

Councilmember Marsh: How does the town balance being able to bring in additional revenue (i.e., new businesses).

Chair Knapp: It depends on what revenue growth is needed for. Brought up the feasibility study and that the forecast stated they would have an excess of funding if they maintained the services that are currently available. The projection in the study covered 5 years.

Commissioner Menlove: Brought up future businesses and commercial. At some point the town will need to have future commercial businesses to have revenue. They will need to plan where businesses should be in the plan.

Commissioner Benson: At some point they will have to discuss those people who haven't annexed that are adjacent to Spring Lake. If they don't annex into Spring Lake, they will annex into another municipality.

Chair Knapp: Good comments. The next section talked about what type of housing the community wants. Single family and ADUs but no townhomes or condos. Lot size preference was 1 acre or more. Brought up concerns of needing to be on a water system based on the size of the lot.

Commissioner Moore: Talked with the Mayor of Woodland Hills. Their minimum lot size is 19,000 sq. ft. and 70% of them are on a septic tank.

Chair Knapp: But they are on a public water system. That's what the commission is trying to point out. Spring Lake isn't on a public water system so they would qualify for any lot size less than 1 acre because of this. Growth is going to be limited as a result. Very little support for infrastructure improvements. The most support was for roads and next was for a town hall. However, most respondents stated that current infrastructure is adequate. Strong signal in the survey to avoid growth inducing infrastructure and to avoid expensive urbanization.

Brenda Warner: Sounds like a place I want to live.

Mayor Menlove: By allowing 1 acre lots, does that open the town up to potential lawsuits if they don't provide services to those buildings on that size of lot?

Spencer Foster: Didn't think that opens the town up for lawsuits.

Councilmember Charles: Didn't think this as well. This would be a good question for an attorney to answer.

Commissioner Menlove: Pointed out that the citizens are responsible for providing themselves with the services they need. The town isn't necessarily responsible for always providing this. Talked about shared wells. Also brought up a pipe that will provide future options for the town down the road.

Chair Knapp: The next question in the survey was about priorities for the town. The top priorities for the town are to preserve the identity and culture of the town and limit growth. Went into section two which discusses divergences in the survey. Discusses residents versus non-resident differences in the survey. Residents prefer a minimum growth option. Non-residents preferred a moderate growth option. Residents preferred 1 acre + lot size. Non-residents preferred ½ acre + lot size. Residents had low support for sewer and culinary water. Non-residents had a high support for sewer and culinary water. Residents had decent support for improving roads and having a town hall. Non-residents had moderate support for many infrastructure improvements but low support for having a town hall. Residents have a higher preservation mindset while non-residents have a higher support of development and infrastructure. Residents were less supportive of tax increases than non-residents. No support for town homes and apartments from residents while non-residents offered some support. The next section of the presentation talked about what this means for the General Plan. The survey results strongly indicate that the community for Spring Lake strongly prioritizes preservation of rural character, agricultural, and low-density development, and support limited growth based on infrastructure capacity. The survey suggests 1-acre minimum lot size with some support for ADUs but not support for townhomes and apartments. For affordable housing requirements ADUs is one of the methods that many towns and cities use to meet the affordable housing requirements from the State in their General or Moderate-Income Housing Plans.

Councilmember Charles: With the 1-acre survey question, what were the acreage options in that question?

Chair Knapp: Gave the acreage options in the questions.

Councilmember Charles: Pointed out that this could be a bit contradictory where 1 acre lots in certain areas of the Town could incentivize quite a bit of growth. Mentioned the Ogden Valley budget that was provided as an example to the council and that 40% of their budget was toward roads. Wanted to point out that there might be some rippling effects of having this 1 acre minimum in their General Plan.

Chair Knapp: He was surprised with the results as well because he was expecting to see more results at the 2–5-acre amounts, but the results were different than he expected.

Commissioner Moore: Thinks that some people may have assumed that the question was talking about the east side of town for this and not the western agricultural section of the town. People may have been confused with the location that was being discussed for this lot size question.

Councilmember Charles: Is just trying to figure out the process of how the town needs to do the General Plan with these lot sizes.

Commissioner Menlove: Can the Planning Commission designate certain areas with bigger lots? He said he sees this changing over time as well.

Brenda Warner and Others on the Commission: Yes.

Commissioner Moore: Pointed out that most people don't consider the west side of Spring Lake as a residential area, they see it as an agricultural area.

Chair Knapp: If that's the case, then as the commission does the General Plan they will consider options for larger lots in that section of the town. It's open for discussion as part of the process.

Councilmember Charles: He's just trying to think through this question and its interpretation. On one side of the town, you have larger acre lots and on the other you have smaller acre lots. Growth depending on the size of the acreage may change the rural feel of the town.

Chair Knapp: That's a good point. As you go out toward the agricultural area we could do larger lot sizes. The results of the survey don't mean that the commission must have 1-acre zoning everywhere. The town can have different zones for different areas. The commission will want to talk about how they want to get different zoning maps done as well. They may want to put out a few options and meet with different areas of the town to see what each area wants their zoning to look like.

Commissioner Benson: Pointed out that some of the respondents in the survey wanted sewer and water. The truth is, they own some property, they want to build on it, but there is no water. She is sure that some of those who answered that question the way they did was because they do need water.

Commissioner Moore: Emphasized that this is probably based on location of their land in the town.

Chair Knapp: It will be helpful to have some meetings like this. Asked Spencer if the town can hold these types of meetings, what does the format need to be like? Does it need to be like a formal meeting or can it be more of an open house style.

Spencer Foster: If the meeting is notified correctly, they can do it however they would like.

Chair Knapp: Good feedback.

Multiple Commissioners (Recording Difficult to Hear): Discussed where the 5 versus 1 acre lots should be in the town.

Chair Knapp: What is being said is that the commission needs to go with different parts of the community to discuss where these different sized lots need to be. Continued with the results. Next section talked about agricultural protections and rights to farm and have animals. Told an example of driving through Arizona and there was a development right next to a dairy farm and wasn't sure how this was put in place.

Brenda Warner and Commissioner Menlove: They are probably complaining now.

Chair Knapp: Growth management framework. The survey suggests limited growth and infrastructure. Development and infrastructure need to come in together not apart. The survey suggests that growth pays its own way. The survey stated that respondents supported light commercial if done correctly. Limited, carefully located commercial development would be acceptable to the town.

Commissioner Menlove: Where the commercial is located will be very important.

Brenda Warner: Keep it out there on the highway.

Chair Knapp: Bottom line for this is that the Town of Spring Lake wants to preserve a rural, agricultural, low density community allowing 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.

Multiple Comments: Good, sums it up nicely.

Chair Knapp: Mentioned that he thinks they use this as the basis for developing the General Plan for the community.

4. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION – NEXT STEPS FOR CREATION OF THE GENERAL PLAN

Chair Knapp: Moving on to the part of the process that will now be developing the general plan. Went through the elements that the State requires for the town to put into their General Plan. The state requires a Land Use element. He went through what this means and what is required in this section. The state also requires a Transportation and Traffic Circulation element. He then went through what this means and what is required in this section. The town will need to work with MAG to be able to do this section. There are other, optional elements to consider in the plan as well. There is a Moderate-Income Housing element. Spring Lake is small, so this isn't required of the town to have. Water Use and Preservation elements are optional. Spring Lake is exempt from this element as well. Other optional elements are: Public services, environmental protection, historic preservation, and recreation.

Commissioner Benson: Thinks that they really need to focus on the two required elements and do a good job on those elements.

Chair Knapp: Stated that he does have a start of a draft of a General Plan that he has been working on based on the results of the survey, but that this draft needs a lot of work. Once the commission has worked through the process of finalizing the draft the commission will have to publish a notice of intent to take this to the council. They will have to let many agencies know they are doing this before they have a public hearing to review the draft plan. After the public hearing(s) they will make revisions and then take the updated plan to the council for recommendation. The town council then adopts, makes revisions, or rejects the plan. Once the plan is approved, the town sends the plan to MAG and other agencies. He put in some of the resources that are available to the town for this process and discussed with the commission what these are.

Mayor Menlove: If the commission needs money or resources to create the plan the council will need to finish its budget to allow the commission to spend some money on this process.

Chair Knapp: Yea, the most important thing for the commission to spend money on with this is to get advice from an attorney to make sure the town is doing everything correctly with the plan.

Mayor Menlove: What about an annexation plan, will that be part of the General Plan as well?

Spencer Foster: This should be a part of the plan. It's a good idea to do it as part of the plan.

Commissioner Benson: Pointed out that other municipalities must respect the town's annexation plan as well.

Chair Knapp: Clarified that just because our annexation plan covers a certain area, doesn't mean that other municipalities are exempt from being able to annex a certain piece of land. The landowner still has the option to annex into the other area if their land is in another annexation plan.

Spencer Foster: Stated that if the town doesn't have an annexation policy plan, they can't annex land into the town. You want to include this in the General Plan and include it in the land use element when you do your future land use map.

Mayor Menlove: There can even be overlap in the annexation maps between cities, right? So, the land can be in multiple maps potentially.

Spencer Foster: Yea. You can't annex land unless you have an annexation plan.

Brenda Warner: Would that be the way that a property owner would get back into a town?

Chair Knapp: What she's talking about is a property owner that is already in the boundaries of Santaquin. That would require a de-annexation from Santaquin.

Spencer Foster: Are they annexed into Santaquin already?

Chair Knapp: Yes.

Spencer Foster: Yea they would have to de-annex first. You can't put part of Santaquin in your annexation plan map. You will do the map up to the abutting section of the property.

Chair Knapp: One last section he wanted to talk through is consistency with how the commission makes decisions. He put together a draft of some guiding principles for the commission to follow. Asked the commission if they had any comments about the guiding principles document that he created. They won't act of the document tonight, but they would pass a resolution next time.

Commissioner Batty: Stated that he thinks it's good and that they will use the document going forward, but no changes tonight.

Chair Knapp: Asked Spencer for the next meeting if he can draft a resolution for them to approve the guiding principles document.

Spencer Foster: Said that he can do this.

Chair Knapp: He went over the next steps for the General Plan. Before the next meeting he will circulate a draft outline of the General Plan for the commission to review. He is going to put some thought behind the elements in the plan and the commission can review them. If they need to take anything out of the plan, they can. Before the April 15 meeting, he is hoping that they can review and discuss the initial General Plan outline. He would also suggest that the commission have more detailed discussions related to the two required elements of the General Plan (Land Use and Transportation elements). The town also needs to determine a methodology on how they want to present and get additional feedback from the community regarding these elements. Earlier in the meeting they talked about potential open house meetings with different sections of the community to get specific feedback. Do they want to do something like that? Told the commissioners to be thinking about how they want to approach this. There's a lot more to do after that but hopes that will give the commission some direction between now and their next meeting.

Commissioner Batty: Told Jason that he's doing a good job. Thanked Jason for putting this together.

Brenda Warner: This sounds like a place I want to live.

Spencer Foster: Joked about the Town's motto. Orem's is, "Family City USA". Spring Lake's could be, "Sounds like a place I want to live". No development though.

Chair Knapp: Anything else the commission needs to discuss?

CLOSED MEETING (IF NECESSARY)

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.

REPORTS

5. CHAIR
6. VICE CHAIR
7. COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Moore: Told the commission that DNR approached him and told him they wanted to do some fire mitigation on his property. Told the commission about the situation and the considerations that would make him go through with the mitigation versus not move forward with it. Said that they requested to take 60% of the trees with the equipment they would bring on to his property.

Mayor Menlove: Talked about past requests that members of the Town have received. Also asked about the WUI and insurance impacts with this.

Chair Knapp: The town can also post some things online to get the word out to the community.

Mayor Menlove: Talked with Payson city about some of these things and they discussed sprinkler systems and how they help with these situations.

Councilmember Judd: Talked about a situation where a sprinkler system saved a home where the fire department would have caused additional damage.

8. STAFF MEMBERS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Batty: Made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Menlove: Seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor say I. Vote was unanimous. Motion passed and meeting was 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. 26-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF SPRING LAKE, UTAH, ADOPTING PLANNING COMMISSION GUIDING PRINCIPLES TO INFORM LAND USE DECISION-MAKING

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

WHEREAS, the Town Council has established a Planning Commission pursuant to Utah law to make recommendations and decisions regarding land use, zoning, and development; and

WHEREAS, the Town desires to promote consistent, transparent, and legally grounded decision-making aligned with Utah Code Title 10 Chapter 9a; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission Guiding Principles document has been prepared to provide a framework for lawful, preservation-focused, and community-oriented planning decisions; and

WHEREAS, these guiding principles emphasize key priorities including protection of rural character, stewardship of natural resources, respect for private property rights, infrastructure and fiscal responsibility, and consistency with the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that adopting these guiding principles will support the commission in carrying out its duties in a manner that promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the community; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission intends that these guiding principles serve as a policy framework to inform decision-making but not to supersede adopted ordinances or applicable law, as reflected in the document itself.

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

1. – Adoption.

The Planning Commission hereby adopts the document title “Planning Commission Guiding Principles”, attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by this reference, as a policy framework to guide the Planning Commission in its duties.

2. – Purpose and Effect.

These Guiding Principles are intended to:

- Promote consistency and predictability in land use decision-making;
- Align Planning Commission actions with the Town’s General Plan and applicable law;
- Reinforce the Town’s priorities related to rural character, natural resource protection, and responsible growth; and
- Provide a clear framework for evaluating land use applications and recommendations.

These Guiding Principles shall not:

- Supersede or replace any adopted ordinance, regulation, or state law; or
- Create independent regulatory requirements beyond those established by law.

3. – Effective Date

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

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

Signed: _____

Jason Knapp, Commission Chair

Attest: _____

Town Recorder

TOWN COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED

Councilmembers:	Yes	No	Abstain	Excused
Commissioner	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissioner	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissioner	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissioner	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissioner	_____	_____	_____	_____

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.

Town of Spring Lake
Planning Commission Guiding Principles
(Aligned with Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 9a)

1. Lawful and Principled Planning

The Planning and Zoning Commission shall carry out its duties in accordance with Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 9a, and all applicable state law. Decisions shall be grounded in adopted plans (including the General Plan), ordinances, and the public purposes articulated by statute.

Statutory anchor: Utah Code §10-9a-102; §10-9a-201

2. Preservation of Community Character and Natural Resources

Consistent with Utah Code §10-9a-401, the Town shall prioritize the preservation of Spring Lake’s rural character, including open space, natural features, scenic views, dark skies, environmental quality, small-scale agriculture, and the traditional ability to maintain farms and farm animals as integral elements of community identity and public welfare.

Statutory anchor: Utah Code §10-9a-401

3. Stewardship for Future Generations

Land use decisions shall reflect long-term stewardship of land, water, and natural resources, recognizing that development patterns established today will shape Spring Lake for generations. Short-term economic or private benefit shall not outweigh lasting community impacts.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401(1)(a), (c) – health, safety, welfare

4. Respect for Private Property Rights Within Public Interest

The Town recognizes the importance of private property rights as protected under Utah law. Regulations shall be reasonable, clearly stated, and applied uniformly, while advancing legitimate public purposes including preservation of rural character, agricultural uses, environmental protection, and orderly growth.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-102(1)(b)

5. Deliberate, Orderly, and Limited Growth

Growth shall occur only where it is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with existing land uses, including agricultural uses, and supported by adequate infrastructure and public services. The Town favors restraint and intentional pacing of growth over rapid expansion.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401(2) – land use, transportation, infrastructure

6. Protection of the Lake, Streams and Springs as Sensitive and Defining Resource

Spring Lake (the lake) and the streams and springs of Spring Lake are sensitive natural resources and defining features of the Town. Land use decisions shall prioritize protection of water quality, shoreline stability, natural habitat, and scenic value, and shall carefully evaluate cumulative impacts of development in vicinity of the lake, streams and springs.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401(1)(d), (g) – natural resources, environmental concerns

7. Compatibility and Minimization of Impacts

New developments shall be compatible with surrounding land uses, including farms and animal husbandry, and shall avoid or minimize adverse impacts such as noise, lighting, traffic, visual intrusion, and loss of open land.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401(2)(a)

8. Infrastructure and Fiscal Responsibility

Land use decisions shall consider long-term public costs, including roads, infrastructure, utilities, emergency services, and maintenance obligations. Development that creates disproportionate public burdens may be limited or conditioned to protect the Town’s fiscal sustainability.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401(2)(b), (c)

9. Clarity, Simplicity, and Enforceability of Regulations

Ordinances shall be clear, objective, and enforceable, providing predictability for residents, property owners, farmers, and applicants.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-103(2) – predictability and fairness

10. Transparency and Meaningful Public Participation

The planning process shall be transparent and accessible, with meaning opportunities for public participation consistent with Utah law.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-205 – public hearings

11. Consistency With the General Plan

Planning and zoning decisions shall be consistent with the Town’s adopted General Plan. Amendments to the Plan shall be considered deliberately and with significant public input and buy-in and shall not be done solely to accommodate individual proposals.

Statutory anchor: §10-9a-401; §10-9a-403

12. Integrity, Independence, and Civility

Commission members shall act independently, ethically, and respectfully, basing decisions on adopted policies, credible evidence, and the public interest rather than external pressure or personal preference.

Statutory anchor: Implied duty under §10-9a-103

Effect of Planning Commission Guiding Principles

These Planning Commission Guiding Principles are intended to provide a framework of consistent, preservation-focused decision-making. They do not supersede adopted ordinances or state law but shall inform the preparation of the General Plan, zoning ordinances, and recommendations on land use matters. They are intended to advance the public purposes identified in Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 9a.

DRAFT