



---

## **PLANNING & ZONING MEETING**

Public Meeting of Thursday June 18, 2026 7:00 PM  
Mendon City Hall, 15 North Main Street, Mendon, UT 84325

### **MINUTES**

**Commission members present:** Keilani Ludlow, Megan Brown, Valarie Theurer, Melissa Porter, Dana Myers

**Commission members excused:** Kelly Barrett, Millie Smith P&Z Secretary

**City Council members present:**

Also present from Mendon City: Mayor Ed Buist, Stephanie Miller, City Clerk, Councilmember Amy Garbe joined by phone

**Public members present:** Diane Buist

**Presiding:** Keilani Ludlow, Chair

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Miller

---

**7:00 PM:** Keilani calls meeting to order

Pledge of Allegiance – Valarie Theurer

Invocation – Keilani Ludlow

**Acceptance of Minutes:** May 21, 2026

Motion to accept minutes: Melissa Porter

Second: Valarie Theurer

All in favor.

**Agenda:**

#### **Topic 7 - Change in Code Discussion/Vote (7:04 PM)**

It was discussed to change the wording in the code from Board of Adjustments to Land Use Appeal Authority. It was decided to research more before any decisions are made and to have an attorney with knowledge of code look at it further. No changes or votes were made.

#### **Topic 7: Residential / Commercial Definition (7:36)**

##### **Main Topics Discussed**

##### **1. Agricultural Zoning Gaps (A1, A2, A3)**

The city code identifies three agricultural zoning categories: A1, A2, and A3.

---



Only A1 appears to have clear regulations.

There is uncertainty about what is permitted on A2 and A3 properties, especially regarding residential construction.

A recent inquiry from a prospective land buyer highlighted this gap.

## **2. Whether Agricultural Land Can Have a House**

Participants generally agreed that agricultural parcels should be allowed one residence.

Existing code appears to allow a house on smaller agricultural parcels (under 5 acres), but it is unclear for larger parcels.

Discussion centered on formally clarifying that A1, A2, and A3 each permit one residence.

## **3. Rules for Larger Agricultural Parcels**

The group discussed creating standards for:

5–10 acre parcels  
10+ acre parcels

Potential approach:

One residence per parcel.

Agricultural uses tied to parcel size.

Limits on certain commercial-style agricultural activities.

## **4. Agricultural Commercial Uses**

Discussion about allowing agricultural-related businesses such as:

Farm stands

Seasonal produce sales

Similar low-impact agricultural enterprises

Desire to create a list of permitted agricultural-commercial activities.

---



---

Activities not explicitly listed would need to be evaluated based on similarity to approved uses.

## **5. Subdivision Concerns**

Questions arose about:

How agricultural land can be subdivided.

Whether subdivision could disrupt neighboring agricultural operations.

Frontage requirements and minimum parcel sizes.

Existing subdivision procedures already exist, but participants discussed whether they are appropriate.

## **6. Road Frontage Requirements**

Concern was raised that agricultural lots require 330 feet of road frontage.

Several members questioned whether this standard makes sense and suggested comparing it to other municipalities.

## **7. Setback Requirements**

Current agricultural regulations require buildings to be 40 feet from the right-of-way.

Members questioned why barns and agricultural structures must be set back so far, since farmers often prefer them closer to roads for operational efficiency.

Additional research into other communities' standards was requested.

## **8. Future Commercial Development**

Discussion focused on how agricultural land might transition to commercial use in the future.

Concerns included:

Large commercial developments near residential neighborhoods.

Need for buffering between commercial and residential areas.

Long-term planning along highway corridors.

## **9. Airbnb / ADU Discussion**

---



---

Brief discussion about:

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

Whether ADUs could become short-term rentals.

Existing limits and permitting requirements for Airbnb-type uses.

## **10. Making the Code More Defensible**

Participants reviewed zoning code language that may be legally difficult to defend.

Examples included provisions based on subjective standards such as:  
Approval depending on whether a majority of residents object.

The goal is to replace subjective language with objective, measurable standards.

## **11. Administrative Cleanup**

The board approved a motion allowing references in city code to "Planning and Zoning" to be updated to "ALUA" where those duties have already been reassigned.

This was intended as a housekeeping change rather than a policy change.

No major zoning changes were adopted during this portion of the meeting. The discussion was largely exploratory, with members identifying gaps in agricultural zoning regulations and assigning themselves follow-up work to:

Clarify residential rights on agricultural parcels

Review frontage and setback requirements.

Define agriculture-commercial uses.

Improve the legal defensibility of zoning code language.

Plan for future agricultural-to-commercial transitions.

Motion to change wording of references to duties from P&Z to ALUA: Valarie Theurer  
Second: Melissa Porter  
All in Favor

**Topic 8 - Citizen participation: (8:02 PM)** - No public comment was given

---



---

## **Topic 9 – Other Business: (8:03)**

### **Planning & Zoning Membership Discussion**

- Discussion about replacing a departing Planning & Zoning member.
- A potential new member, **Logan Brown**, has been identified and is interested in serving.
- The mayor has also been considering another candidate.

### **General Plan Review**

- The group discussed the timeline for reviewing and adopting the city's General Plan.
- A joint public work meeting between Planning & Zoning and City Council is needed before adoption.
- The purpose of the meeting will be to:
  - Review major changes and highlights in the General Plan.
  - Allow City Council members to provide feedback before final revisions.
  - Avoid duplicate review work and unnecessary costs.

### **Proposed Work Meeting**

- Tentatively scheduled for **August 6, 6:30 PM**

The meeting must be public because a quorum of City Council members is expected to attend.

- Public attendance will be allowed, though public comment is not anticipated as part of the work session.

### **Preparation for the Work Meeting**

- Council members should review the draft plan before attending.
- Discussion should focus on significant changes and issues rather than reviewing the document line-by-line.
- Updated sections from Aaron need to be reviewed by commission members before the meeting.

### **Adoption Timeline**

- The General Plan must be completed and adopted by **November**.
- There will be no City Council meeting in December, making November the deadline.

### **Legal Considerations**

---



- 
- Discussion about ensuring the General Plan is written in a legally defensible manner.
  - Members noted that General Plans can be referenced in litigation involving municipal decisions.
  - The consensus was to use clear, defensible language while recognizing that legal challenges are always possible.

Motion to adjourn: Megan Brown  
Second: Dana Myers  
All in favor.

Adjourned **(8:10 PM)**

\* \* \* \* \*