

HONEYVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Notice is hereby given that the **Regular Meeting** of the **Honeyville City Planning Commission** will be held on **Wednesday December 17, 2025**, at 7:00 p.m., in the Honeyville City Hall, 2635 West 6980 North, Honeyville, UT 84314. Interested citizens are invited to attend.

Call to Order – Laurie Hunsaker

Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance – Kelli Shaw

Conflict of Interest, if any:

Public Comment Period: Comments will be listened to with no action taken. Items needing action will be placed on next month's agenda by request. Individuals will be given 5 minutes to comment.

Public Hearing – Nuisance Ordinance Text Amendment:

- A. Open Public Hearing:
- B. Close Public Hearing:
- C. Action Item: Motion of Recommendation for the Text Amendment to the Nuisance Ordinance

Public Hearing – Impact Fee Analysis:

- D. Open Public Hearing:
- E. Close Public Hearing:
- F. Action Item: Motion of Recommendation for the Impact Fee Analysis

City Council Meeting Report – Chair Laurie Hunsaker:

- A. Report:

Zoning Administrator Report/DRC – Kenny Funk:

- A. Zoning Admin Report/DRC:

Discussion Items:

- A. Fences
- B. Fences & Permit: Anna & Kelli
- C. Billboards: Kelli
- D. Planning Commission Scope and Responsibilities

Action Items:

- A. Appoint Planning Commission Chair
- B. Appoint Planning Commission Vice-Chair
- C. Approve 2026 Meeting Schedule
- D. Approval of Minute: 11/19/25

Agenda Items for Next Month

ADJOURNMENT

Posted on honeyvillecity.org, Utah Public Notice Website, at City Hall and at the Honeyville City Post Office: 12/16/25



Notice of Public Hearing of the intent to make Text Amendments to Title 4 Chapter 2 of the Honeyville City Code

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a **Public Hearing** will be held before the **Honeyville City Planning Commission** on **Wednesday, December 17, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. or shortly thereafter** in the **Honeyville City Hall** located at **2635 W. 6980 N. Honeyville, UT**

The purpose of this hearing is to take public comments on the intent to make text amendments to Title 4 Chapter 2 of the Honeyville City Code.

This Public Meeting will be held **IN-PERSON** at Honeyville City Hall. If you wish to make a Public Comment at this meeting, please be in attendance at 7:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brittiny Charlson". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Brittiny Charlson
Honeyville City Recorder
Posted 20th day of November 2025.

4-2-2: Declaration of nuisance

- A. Statement: Every act or condition made, permitted, allowed or continued in violation of section 4-2-1 of this chapter, is hereby declared to be a nuisance and may be abated and punished as hereinafter provided.
- B. Specified: Nuisances include, but are not limited to:
1. Befouling Water: Befouling water in any spring, stream, well or water source supplying water for culinary purposes.
 2. Privies, Cesspools: Allowing any privy vault or cesspool, or other individual wastewater disposal system, to become a menace to health or a source of odors or contamination to air or water.
 3. Garbage Containers, Offensive: Permitting any garbage container to remain on premises when it has become unclean and offensive.
 4. Garbage Accumulation: Allowing vegetable waste, garbage, litter, filth or refuse of any nature to accumulate within or upon any private alley, yard or area, except when it is temporarily deposited for immediate removal.
 5. Manure Accumulation: Permitting the accumulation of manure in any stable, stall, coral, feed yard, yard or in any other building or area.
 - a. Manure removal schedule shall be as follows:
 - Lot size up to 1 acre: at least once per month
 - Lot size above 1 acre and up to 2 acres: at least once per 2 months' time
 - Lot size above 2 acres and up to 3 acres: at least once per 3 months' time
 - Lot size above 3 acres and up to 4 acres: at least once per 4 months' time
 - Lot size above 4 acres and up to 5 ½ acres: at least once per 5 months' time
 - ~~6. Slaughterhouses, Feed Yards: Permitting any slaughterhouse, market, meat shop, stable, feed yard or other place or building wherein any animals are slaughtered, kept, fed or sold to remain unclean or in any state or condition detrimental to health or creating a nuisance because of odors, or in which flies or rodents breed.~~
 7. Discharging Offensive Water or Liquid Waste: Discharging or placing any offensive water, chemical spray, liquid waste or refuse of any kind into any street, alley, sidewalk, gutter, stream, wash, natural watercourse, ditch, canal or any vacant lot or which, as the result of continued discharge, will render the place of discharge offensive or likely to become so.
 8. Collecting Grease, Offensive Matter: Keeping or collecting any stale or putrid grease or other offensive matter.
 - ~~9. Flies and Mosquitoes: Having or permitting upon any premises any fly or mosquito producing condition.~~
 10. Public Drinking Vessels: Keeping any drinking vessel for public use without providing a method of decontamination between uses.
 11. Ablutions near Drinking Fountain: Permitting or performing any ablutions in or near any public drinking fountain.
 12. Boarding House or Factory, Sanitary Condition: Failing to furnish any dwelling house, boarding house or factory or other place of employment with such privy vaults, water closets, sinks or other facilities as may be required to maintain the same in sanitary condition.

-
13. Cleaning Privy Vaults: Neglecting or refusing to discontinue use of, clean out, disinfect and fill up all privy vaults and cesspools or other individual wastewater disposal systems within twenty (20) days after notice from an enforcement officer or official of the city.
 14. Stagnant Water; Offensive Substances: Permitting any lot or excavation to become the repository of stagnant water or any decaying or offensive substances.
 15. Obstructing Public Ways, Watercourses, Parks: Obstructing or tending to obstruct or interfere with or render dangerous for passage any street or sidewalk, lake, stream, drainage, canal or basin, or any public park without first obtaining the written permission of the city council.
- C. Additional Nuisances: The types of nuisances above stated shall be deemed in addition to and in no way a limitation of the nuisances subject to this chapter.

(Adopted by Ord. 1976 Code §§ 10-313, 10-314 on 1/1/1976; Amended by Ord. 2001 Code on 1/1/2001)



Notice of Public Hearing On Culinary Impact Fee Analysis

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a **Public Hearing** will be held before the **Honeyville City Planning Commission** on **Wednesday, December 17, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. or shortly thereafter** in the Honeyville City Hall located at 2635 W. 6980 N. Honeyville, UT

The purpose of this hearing is to take public comments on the Honeyville City Culinary Water Impact Fee Analysis.

This Public Meeting will be held **IN-PERSON** at Honeyville City Hall. If you wish to make a Public Comment at this meeting, please be in attendance at 7:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Brittiny Chlarson".

Brittiny Chlarson
Honeyville City Recorder
Posted 2nd day of December 2025.



HONEYVILLE CITY

DRAFT Culinary Water Impact Fee Analysis
November 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	2
Water Service Levels	2
Water Service Levels	2
Water Service Area.....	2
Excess Capacity.....	2
New Construction.....	2
Culinary Water System Impact Fee Calculation.....	2
Chapter 1: Overview of The Water Impact Fees.....	3
Summary	3
Costs to be Included in the Impact Fee	3
Utah Code Legal Requirements	4
Chapter 2: Impact From Growth Upon the City's Facilities and Level of Service	6
Projected Water Demands	6
Water Service Area.....	6
Existing and Proposed LOS Analysis.....	6
Chapter 3: Impact on Capacity from Development Activity	7
Excess Capacity.....	7
Chapter 4: System Improvements Required from Development Activity	7
Chapter 5: Proportionate Share Analysis.....	8
Maximum Legal Water Impact Fee per ERC	8
New Construction.....	8
Consultant Costs.....	8
Impact Fee Fund Balance	9
Summary of Gross Fee	9
Credits Against Impact Fees	9
Maximum Impact Fees by Meter Size	9
Certification.....	10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An impact fee is a one-time fee imposed on new development activity to mitigate the impact of new development on capital facilities. In conjunction with this Impact Fee Analysis, Jones & Associates has prepared the Honeyville Culinary Water Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) dated August 2025. The IFFP forms the basis for this impact fee analysis.

The recommended impact fee structure presented in this analysis has been prepared to satisfy the Impact Fees Act, Utah Code Ann. § 11-36a-101 et. seq., and represents the maximum impact fees Honeyville City ("City") may assess. The City will be required to use revenue sources other than impact fees to fund any projects that constitute repair and replacement, cure any existing deficiencies, or increase the level of service for existing users.

Water Service Levels

The City is anticipated to grow by 64 ERCs (equivalent residential connections) between 2025 and 2032.¹

Water Service Levels

Service levels are as defined by the Utah Division of Drinking Water (DDW) standard minimum requirements for sizing water infrastructure including sources, storage and distribution facilities. Meeting the State's minimum service levels is the City's existing service level.²

Water Service Area

There is one service area for culinary water that encompasses the boundaries of Honeyville City plus the annexation boundary.³

Excess Capacity

The IFFP states that no impact fees will be charged to recoup for excess water source or storage capacity although excess capacity does exist. This decision was made because the City has no available records to establish the actual cost of source and storage facilities.⁴

New Construction

Total new construction costs are projected to reach \$2,362,500.⁵ New development in the next six years accounts for 100 percent of these costs.

Culinary Water System Impact Fee Calculation

The maximum impact fee is \$2,139.92 for a 5/8" x 3/4" meter (one ERC) for indoor use. One ERC equates to 400 gpd.⁶ In addition, outdoor residential water use (10,000 sf max) equals 713 gpd or 1.7825 ERCs or \$3,814.41. Therefore, the total ERCs for indoor and outdoor water use equal 2.7825 ERCs or a maximum fee of \$5,954.33 for a 5/8" x 3/4" meter.

¹ Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 28

² Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 27

³ Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 26

⁴ Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 28

⁵ Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 29

⁶ Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 27

The City does not have any fund balance or any outstanding debt in its water utility fund and therefore no bond credits need to be made.

Indoor single-family and multi-family residential fees will be charged on a per door basis based on one ERC. Outdoor fee will be assessed to a new service where the applicant is unable to demonstrate both 1) proof of water shares or water rights, and 2) physical water at the subject property.

Nonresidential impact fees are calculated based on meter size and flow rates as shown in the following table

TABLE 1: CULINARY WATER MAXIMUM IMPACT FEES BY METER SIZE

			INDOOR ONLY ¹	OUTDOOR FEE	INDOOR + OUTDOOR, RESIDENTIAL ONLY ^{2,3}
Meter Size (inches)	Maximum Flow Rate (gpm)	Meter Ratio	Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee
5/8 x 3/4 (std)	20	1	\$2,139.92	\$3,814.41	\$5,954.33
1	50	2.5	\$5,349.80	\$9,536.03	\$14,885.83
1.5	150	7.5	\$16,049.41	\$28,608.08	\$44,657.49
2	250	12.5	\$26,749.02	\$47,680.13	see note 3
3	500	25	\$53,498.05	\$95,360.27	see note 3
4	1000	50	\$106,996.09	\$190,720.54	see note 3
6	1600	80	\$171,193.75	\$305,152.86	see note 3
8	to be determined by City Engineer				

¹Proof of irrigation water required

²Maximum permissible irrigated area is 10,000 sf = 1.7825 ERCs (City Ordinance 11-5-2.B)

³City Engineer will calculate outdoor impact fee for commercial and non-single family residential sites based on the proposed landscaped area as shown on the approved site plan. Ratio of 0.25 ac = 713 gpd = 1.7825 ERCs

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE WATER IMPACT FEES

Summary

An impact fee is intended to recover the City's costs of building water system capacity to serve new residential and non-residential development rather than passing these growth-related costs on to existing users through rates. The Utah Impact Fees Act allows only certain costs to be included in an impact fee so that only the fair cost of expansionary projects or existing unused capacity paid for by the City is assessed through an impact fee.

Costs to be Included in the Impact Fee

The impact fees proposed in this analysis are calculated based upon:

- Buy-in to existing, excess capacity;
- New capital infrastructure that will serve new development; and
- Professional and planning expenses related to the construction of system improvements that will serve new development.

The costs that cannot be included in the impact fee are as follows:

- Costs for projects that cure system deficiencies;
- Costs for projects that increase the level of service (LOS) above that which is currently provided;
- Operations and maintenance costs;
- Costs of facilities funded by grants or other funds that the City does not have to repay; and
- Costs of reconstruction of facilities that do not have capacity to serve new growth.

Utah Code Legal Requirements

Utah law requires that communities and special districts prepare an Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) before enacting an impact fee. Utah law also requires that communities/districts give notice of their intent to prepare and adopt an IFA. This IFA follows all legal requirements as outlined below. The City has retained Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare this Impact Fee Analysis in accordance with legal requirements.

Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis

A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFA before preparing the Plan (Utah Code §11-36a-503). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website. The City has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFA by posting notice.

Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code requires that each local political subdivision, before imposing an impact fee, prepare an impact fee analysis. (Utah Code 11-36a-304).

Section 11-36a-304 of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee analysis which is required to:

- (1) An impact fee analysis shall:
 - (a) identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;
 - (b) identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;
 - (c) demonstrate how the anticipated impacts described in Subsections (1)(a) and (b) are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;
 - (d) estimate the proportionate share of:
 - (i) the costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and
 - (ii) the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and
 - (e) identify how the impact fee was calculated.

- (2) In analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, shall identify, if applicable:
- (a) the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;
 - (b) the cost of system improvements for each public facility;
 - (c) other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility, such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;
 - (d) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;
 - (e) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;
 - (f) the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;
 - (g) extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly-developed properties; and
 - (h) the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

Certification of Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code states that an Impact Fee Analysis shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the Impact Fee Analysis. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

CHAPTER 2: IMPACT FROM GROWTH UPON THE CITY'S FACILITIES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a)

Projected Water Demands

Table 3 shows ERC growth projections which will place additional demand on the City's water system. The City's water system currently serves 648 equivalent residential connections (ERCs) in 2025 which will grow to an estimated 712 ERCs by 2032 – an increase of 64 ERCs.

Water Service Area

ERCs within the City are projected to grow as follows:

TABLE 2: GROWTH IN DEMAND

Year	ERCs
2025	648
2026	657
2027	666
2028	675
2029	684
2030	693
2031	703
2032	712
ERC Growth, 2025-2032	64

Source: Honeyville City Culinary Water IFFP, p. 28

Existing and Proposed LOS Analysis

Level of service (LOS) defines the water capital facility demands that a typical Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC) will require and should pay for with impact fees. The IFFP defines the following service levels and states that the City intends to maintain the existing level of service and meet all minimum requirements established in the Utah Administrative Code for water provision service levels.

TABLE 3: EXISTING SERVICE LEVEL

Component	Measurement	DDW Indoor Use Requirement	DDW Irrigation Use Requirement Assuming 0.5 Acres of Irrigation
Sources	Flowrate	800 gpd/ERC for Peak Day Demand	2,850 gpd/ERC for Peak Day Demand
	Volume	146,000 gallons/ERC (0.448 ac-ft/ERC) for Average Yearly Demand (at 400 gpd/ERC)	304,670 gallons/ERC (0.953 ac-ft/ERC) for Average Yearly Demand (at 834 gpd/ERC)
Storage Facilities	Volume	400 gallons/ERC	1,425 gallons/ERC

Component	Measurement	DDW Indoor Use Requirement	DDW Irrigation Use Requirement Assuming 0.5 Acres of Irrigation
Distribution System	Pressure	20 psi during conditions of fireflow, and fire demand experienced during peak day demand 30 psi during peak instantaneous demand 40 psi during peak day demand	
Source: Honeyville Culinary Water IFFP, p. 27			

TABLE 4: FUTURE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Component	Measurement	DDW Indoor Use Requirement	DDW Irrigation Use Requirement Assuming 0.25 Acres of Irrigation
Sources	Flowrate	800 gpd/ERC for Peak Day Demand	1,425 gpd/ERC for Peak Day Demand
	Volume	146,000 gallons/ERC (0.448 ac-ft/ERC) for Average Yearly Demand (at 400 gpd/ERC)	152,498 gallons/ERC (0.468 ac-ft/ERC) for Average Yearly Demand (at 417 gpd/ERC)
Storage Facilities	Volume	400 gallons/ERC	713 gallons/ERC
Distribution System	Pressure	20 psi during conditions of fireflow, and fire demand experienced during peak day demand 30 psi during peak instantaneous demand 40 psi during peak day demand	
Source: Honeyville Culinary Water IFFP, p. 27			

CHAPTER 3: IMPACT ON CAPACITY FROM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)(c)

Excess Capacity

No excess capacity is identified to be included in the impact fee calculations.

CHAPTER 4: SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED FROM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)(c)

The cost of new capital facility construction projects as listed in the IFFP totals \$2,362,500.

TABLE 5: NEW CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

Project ID	Project Location/Scope	Additional ERCs Served	Total Estimated Cost	Replacement/Deficiency	Impact Fee Eligible	Proposed Budget Year
C	North Reservoir Site/new 500,000-gallon water storage reservoir	1,250	\$2,362,500	\$0	\$2,362,500	2032-2036

CHAPTER 5: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

Maximum Legal Water Impact Fee per ERC

The Impact Fees Act requires the Impact Fee Analysis to estimate the proportionate share of the future and actual cost of existing system improvements that benefit new growth that can be recouped through impact fees. The impact fee for existing assets must be based on the actual costs (when excess capacity is available) while the fees for construction of new facilities can be based on reasonable future costs of the system. No costs for existing, excess capacity have been included in this impact fee analysis.

New Construction

Total new improvement costs attributable to new development over the next six years will reach \$120,960 or \$1,890 per ERC.

TABLE 6: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS, NEW IMPROVEMENTS

New Construction	
Total Cost	\$2,362,500
ERCs Served	1,250
Cost per ERC	\$1,890.00
Growth in ERCs, 2025-2032	64
Percent of Total Capacity	5.1%
Cost to New Development, 2025-2032	\$120,960
Cost per ERC	\$1,890.00

Consultant Costs

The Impact Fees Act allows for fees charged to include the reimbursement of consultant costs incurred in the preparation of the IFFP and IFA.

TABLE 7: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – CONSULTANT COSTS

Description	Amount
Jones & Associates	\$9,495
ZPFI	\$6,500
Total Consultant Costs	\$15,995
Growth in ERCs, 2025-2032	64
Cost per ERC	\$249.92

Impact Fee Fund Balance

Based on information provided by the City, there were no unspent funds in the culinary water impact fees fund as of October 2025.

Summary of Gross Fee

The maximum indoor impact fee per ERC (5/8" x 3/4") is \$2,139.92. One ERC equates to average indoor use of 400 gpd. However, most development will require more than one ERC and will also need to pay an impact fee for outdoor water. In addition, outdoor use equates to 713 gpd or 1.7825 ERCs for a total of 2.7825 ERCs per residential unit.

TABLE 8: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS — MAXIMUM COST PER ERC

SUMMARY	
New Construction	\$1,890.00
Consultant Costs	\$249.92
Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$0.00
Maximum Fee per ERC - indoor	\$2,139.92
Maximum Fee per ERC - outdoor	\$3,814.41
Maximum Fee per ERC — indoor + outdoor	\$5,954.33

Credits Against Impact Fees

No credits need to be made against the maximum impact fee calculated in Table 9. No culinary water bonds are outstanding and the IFFP does not identify any projects or portion of new projects that benefits existing development.

Maximum Impact Fees by Meter Size

Single-family and multi-family residential fees will be charged on a per door basis based on a 5/8" x 3/4" meter (one ERC for indoor use) and 1.7825 ERCs for outdoor use.

Nonresidential impact fees are calculated based on meter size and flow rates as shown in the following table.

TABLE 9: CULINARY WATER MAXIMUM IMPACT FEES BY METER SIZE

Meter Size (inches)	Maximum Flow Rate (gpm)	Meter Ratio	INDOOR ONLY ¹	OUTDOOR FEE	INDOOR + OUTDOOR, RESIDENTIAL ONLY ^{2,3}
			Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee
5/8 x 3/4 (std)	20	1	\$2,139.92	\$3,814.41	\$5,954.33
1	50	2.5	\$5,349.80	\$9,536.03	\$14,885.83
1.5	150	7.5	\$16,049.41	\$28,608.08	\$44,657.49

			INDOOR ONLY ¹	OUTDOOR FEE	INDOOR + OUTDOOR, RESIDENTIAL ONLY ^{2,3}
Meter Size (inches)	Maximum Flow Rate (gpm)	Meter Ratio	Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee	Maximum Impact Fee
2	250	12.5	\$26,749.02	\$47,680.13	see note 3
3	500	25	\$53,498.05	\$95,360.27	see note 3
4	1000	50	\$106,996.09	\$190,720.54	see note 3
6	1600	80	\$171,193.75	\$305,152.86	see note 3
8	to be determined by City Engineer				

¹Proof of irrigation water required

²Maximum permissible irrigated area is 10,000 sf = 1.7825 ERCs (City Ordinance 11-5-2.B)

³City Engineer will calculate outdoor impact fee for commercial and non-single family residential sites based on the proposed landscaped area as shown on the approved site plan. Ratio of 0.25 ac = 713 gpd = 1.7825 ERCs

CERTIFICATION

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies that the attached impact fee analysis:

1. includes only the cost of public facilities that are:
 - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
 - b. actually incurred; or
 - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
2. does not include:
 - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities; or
 - b. cost for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
3. offset costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and
4. complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

10-22-10: Fences and walls

- A. Height of Fences and Walls: In Zones R1, R2, RR, and A-5-A, No fence, hedge, wall or other similar structure shall be erected to a height which exceeds the following:

Formatted: Highlight

1. In a required front or street side yard: Five-Four feet (54').
2. In a required interior side or rear yard: Seven feet (7').
3. In a yard bordering the front yard of an adjoining lot: Four feet (4').

- B. Retaining Walls: When a retaining wall protects a cut below natural grade and is located on a line separating lots, such retaining wall may be topped by a fence, wall, or hedge of the same height as found in paragraph A, measured from the finished grade on the uphill side of the wall.

that would otherwise be permitted at such location if no retaining wall existed.

- C. Fences in Front or Side Yards: No opaque fence or wall or other similar structure exceeding forty-eight inches (48") in height shall be erected within a required front yard.

Formatted: Highlight

- D. Swimming Pools: Swimming pools of permanent construction not enclosed within a building shall be set back at least five feet (5') from all property lines and shall be completely surrounded by a fence or wall having a lockable self-closing gate and a height of at least six feet (6') which conforms to building code requirements.

Commented [DS1]: Contradicts A.1 - recommend deleting

Formatted: Highlight

- E. Visual Obstructions: To avoid creating a visual obstruction and promote public safety, a fence, wall, sign, or other similar structure or landscaping located in a required front yard shall meet the following requirements:

1. Driveways: No opaque fence, wall, sign, or other similar structure, or landscaping which exceeds two feet (2') in height shall be placed within a triangular area formed by a driveway line, the street property right of way line, and a line connecting them at points twelve feet (12') along the driveway line and twelve feet (12') along the street property-right of way line, except for a reasonable number of trees pruned high enough to permit unobstructed vision for drivers of motor-passenger vehicles.
2. City Street: No fence, hedge, wall, sign, landscaping or other structure which exceeds two feet (2') in height which obstructs clear view shall be placed on any corner lot within a triangular area formed by the street property-right of way lines and a line connecting them at points forty feet (40') from the intersection of the street right of way lines, except a reasonable number of trees pruned high enough to permit unobstructed vision to automobile-passenger vehicles drivers.
3. State Highways 38 and 240: No fence, hedge, wall, sign, landscaping or other structure which exceeds two feet (2') in height shall be placed on any corner lot at the intersection of State Highways 38 and 240 and a city street within the triangular area defined as the sight triangle pursuant to AASHTO Green book, as amended by UDOT Road Design Manual.

(Adopted by Ord. 2007-02 on 7/11/2007)

Formatted: Highlight

HONEYVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING SCHEDULE & OPENING CEREMONIES
FOR 2026

MEETING DATE:

OPENING CEREMONIES:

January 28th

Staci Zilles-Nelson

February 25th

TBD

March 25th

Kelli Shaw

April 22nd

Laurie Hunsaker

May 27th

Anna Dammer

June 24th

Jacob Jaques

July 22nd

TBD

August 26th

Staci Zilles-Nelson

September 23rd

TBD

October 28th

Kelli Shaw

November 18th

Laurie Hunsaker

December 16th

Anna Dammer

**The DRAFT Minutes of
Honeyville City Planning Commission
November 19, 2025, Regular Meeting**

Laurie Hunsaker called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Present were Chair Laurie Hunsaker. Commission Members Staci Zilles-Nelson, Bob Kosbab, Kelli Shaw and Jacob Jaques. Anna Dammer was excused from this meeting.

Employees present: Brittany Chlarson, Clerk/Recorder
 Wendy Lindauer, Deputy Clerk
 Kenny Funk, Zoning Administrator

There were approximately 6 members of the public present.

Laurie Hunsaker offered the Invocation and led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Conflict of Interest, if any: None noted.

Public Comment Period:

Harold Wise: Who lives on 5800 N. stated concerns with people shooting in the gravel pit near his home. He says it is very unsafe and wanted to know if the city has any ordinances in place.

Public Hearing – Proposal of Agriculture Protection Area – Hunsaker

A. **Open Public Hearing:** Opened at 7:05 p.m.

JACOB JAQUES motioned to Open the Public Hearing for the Proposal of Agriculture Protection Area – Hunsaker at 7:05 p.m. STACI ZILLES-NELSON seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Carolyn Eddy asked questions regarding her land but did not express any issue with the proposed APA application.

B. **Close Public Hearing:** Closed at 7:12 p.m.

JACOB JAQUES motioned to Close the Public Hearing for the Proposal of Agriculture Protection Area – Hunsaker at 7:12 p.m. KELLI SHAW seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

C. Action Item: Motion to Recommend Approval of Proposal of Agricultural Protection Area – Hunsaker:

STACI ZILLES-NELSON motioned to Recommend Approval of Proposal of Agricultural Protection Area – Hunsaker. JACOB JAQUES seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Public Hearing – Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 10:

A. Open Public Hearing: Opened at 7:13 p.m.

BOB KOSBAB motioned to Open the Public Hearing for Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 10 at 7:13 p.m. JACOB JAQUES seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Kenny Funk Honeyville City's zoning administrator explained that a committee has been going through Title 10 and making the required changes. David Hougaard stated that most of the changes are due to State requirements.

B. Close Public Hearing: Closed at 7:15 p.m.

JACOB JAQUES motioned to Close the Public Hearing for Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 10 at 7:15 p.m. KELLI SHAW seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

C. Action Item: Motion to Recommend Approval of Proposed Text Amendments to Title 10:

JACOB JAQUES motioned to Recommend Approval of the Proposed Text Amendments to Title 10 as presented. BOB KOSBAB seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Public Hearing – Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 11:

A. Open Public Hearing: Opened at 7:16 p.m.

STACI ZILLES-NELSON motioned to Open the Public Hearing for Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 11 at 7:16 p.m. KELLI SHAW seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Kenny Funk explained that this amendment was to change the DRC committee.

B. Close Public Hearing: Closed at 7:18 p.m.

STACI ZILLES-NELSON motioned to Close the Public Hearing for Proposal of Text Amendment to Title 11 at 7:18 p.m. **JACOB JAQUES** seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED** with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

C. Action Item: Motion to Recommend Approval of Proposed Text Amendments to Title 11:

KELLI SHAW motioned to Recommend Approval of the Proposed Text Amendments to Title 11 as presented. **JACOB JAQUES** seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED** with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

City Council Meeting Report – Chair Laurie Hunsaker:

A. Report: Laurie H

- **Election:** Codey Illum has been elected as the new City Council member.
- **APA Ordinance:** This Ordinance was passed by the City Council.
- **Attorney:** Colt Mund has resigned as Honeyville City's attorney to take on his new duties as Willards Judge. Interviews for a new attorney have been scheduled.
- **City Council December Meeting:** Decembers meeting has been moved from the 10th to the 3rd.

Zoning Administrator/DRC Report – Kenny Funk:

A. DRC: Kenny F

- **Shannon Boundary Adjustment:** This request has several issues including no frontage.
- **Boundary Adjustment:** An adjustment was presented for a subdivision on Highway 38.
- **Billboards:** A request has been made for a billboard, but the code is very vague.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- A. Discharge of Firearm Ordinance:** Laurie H presented a draft Ordinance regarding shooting within city limits. In this draft she referenced Utah state code. There had been discussion about allowing the discharge of firearms in agricultural zones, however it appears this would not work in the A-5A zone. **Bob K** mentioned that the presented ordinance addresses hunting, but not recreational shooting. There was further discussion about distance away from residents' homes. **David H** suggested removing the section that only addresses hunting. **Kenny F** suggested stating what is required for those shooting on property that is not owned by them.

- B. **Billboards:** The code for billboards is very vague. Kelli S volunteered to research other city's codes to see what they have on record.
- C. **Fence Ordinance & Permit** – It was decided to table this item until next month.

ACTION ITEMS:

- A. **Approval of Minutes: 10/22/25**

JACOB JAQUES motioned to approve the Minutes of 10/22/25 as presented. KELLI SHAW seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Agenda Items for Next Month:

- Discharge of Firearms (Discussion)
- Fence Ordinance & Permit (Discussion)
- Billboards (Discussion)
- Chair & Vice Chair (Action Item)
- 2026 Schedule (Action Item)

KELLI SHAW motioned to adjourn at 7:55 p.m. JACOB JAQUES seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED with Staci Zilles-Nelson for, Bob Kosbab for, Kelli Shaw for and Jacob Jaques for.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

The foregoing minutes were taken and typed by Brittiny Chlarson.

I certify these minutes to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

ATTEST:

DATE APPROVED: _____

Brittiny Chlarson – Clerk/Recorder

Laurie Hunsaker - Chair