

Sevier County Planning & Zoning Commission
March 11, 2015

Minutes of the Sevier County Planning Commission meeting held on the eleventh day of March 2015 in the Commission Chambers of the Sevier County Administration Building, 250 North Main, Richfield, Utah. Those present included: Evelyn Nielsen, Mike Miles, Ralph Brown, Brenda Malmgren and Caryl Christensen.

Kelly Alvey and John Worley were excused.

Others present included: Zoning Administrator Larry Hanson, Deputy Clerk/Auditor Barbara Crowther, and others listed on the attached roll.

Minutes for February 11th Planning Commission meeting approved:

After review, Caryl Christensen moved to approve the minutes of the February 11th Planning Commission Meeting, second Mike Miles, unanimous.

Zoning Administrator Update:

Zoning Administrator Larry Hanson told the Planning Commission that a Conditional Use Permit has been issued for the Trans-western Petroleum oil and gas drilling project. Mr. Hanson then gave information to the Commissioners for training to be held at the end of March in South Jordan. He reminded them that the County would pay for registration fees, travel, hotel, and meals if they would like to go. Discussion then followed concerning the proposed rail project, who is behind the latest push for rail, that Bowie who purchased SUFCO mine is interested in the project, that they are in the planning and development stages of the project at this time, and that there would need to be other companies with products to be transported by rail for the project to be a success. Bowie has indicated that they would like to use the rail line to get the coal to the coast, then ship the coal overseas. Further discussion followed concerning whether or not the project is feasible at this time.

Utley Family Farms Subdivision approved :

The Planning Commission then met with Ted Madden and Erick Utley to consider the Utley Family Farms Minor Subdivision. Mr. Madden and Mr. Utley presented their idea for a one-lot subdivision on property that the Utley family owns. Discussion followed concerning the size of the lot, that the subdivision will be in the RA zone, that it is located in the annexation area for Richfield City, whether or not they will be drilling a new well for the new home, that the lot is situated on a County Road, that the road ends at the fence line of the property, that there is an easement to the County for any future development of a road in that area, whether or not the County road is maintained, what they plan to do for fire protection of the home, what has been expected in the past for fire protection on one lot subdivisions, that they will be required to have the power disconnect be on the well so that the power to the home could be shut off and the well would still work, whether or not there will need to be a second ingress/egress to the property, whether or not a basement will be built, that the basement will be only half underground, that the property is not in the flood zone, that there is a high water table at that area, that the lot is higher than the surrounding property surrounding, that the ditch in front of the home is a wastewater ditch that doesn't deliver to anyone else, whether or not there are drainage tiles in the area, that they will only go down 30 inches for the footings, and whether the water will be in the same name as the property. Zoning Administrator Hanson said he has a map of the drainage tiles in the valley. After discussion, Ralph Brown moved to accept the Utley Family Farm one lot subdivision with the stipulation that they check where the irrigation tiles are, and that the water and land be in the same name before building begins, second Brenda Malmgren, unanimous.

Review of Proposed Rules for Non-Public Water Systems:

The Planning Commission then discussed the rules proposed by the Central Utah Health Department for non-public water systems. Discussion followed concerning who would be responsible for ensure the rules are followed, that the main difference between the County requirements and the proposed requirements is the grouting or non-grouting of the well, that non-grouted wells would need a 200 foot clearance because of the state protection zone requirement, the reason why non-grouted needed a larger protection area, that the protection area may pose a problem for 5 acre lots, that cost was generally the deciding factor on whether or not to grout, and that grout is susceptible to temperature. Further discussion followed concerning whether or not there are acceptable alternate methods instead of just grouting, and whether or not this changes the testing requirements for the water from wells.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.