P&Z Minutes
April 15, 2026

Chairman Johnson opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
Chairman Johnson leads the group in the pledge of allegiance

Motion to approve the agenda made by Kristy Crane, seconded by Sean Bartschi accepted and carried

Jared Skinner lot split
Albert Johnson: Go through items 3 and 4, family lot split
Mitch Poulsen: summary of jared skinner lot split to give to his kids
Albert Johnson: any questions?
Motion to approve presented by Sean Bartschi, seconded by Todd Transtrum, motion carried

Alleman Lot split
Albert Johnsonv: item 4 alleman lot split
Mitch Poulsen: summary on lot split for alleman, 2 acres for daughter has been surveyed, kittycorner to devin skinner subdivision
Bill stock: asked question about 3 parcel numbers being the same
Albert Johnson: information from guest does not change committee feelings on the matter
Motion to approve this as presented by Todd Transtrum, seconded by Devin Boehme

Bret Oxborrow Conditional Use Permit
Albert Johnson: entertain motion to go into public hearing
Motion by Sean Bartschi to go into public hearing for item 2 on gravel pit, motion seconded by Devin Boehme, carried.
Bret oxborrow: we want to get the gravel pit going, dug holes 3 years ago, asked wynn olsen and wynn said it is hard to get a gravel pit. Would like to use the gravel himself as well. Property is useless otherwise. 2 years ago he filled along the road with gravel from this property. Wynn came up with the idea and I wanted the county to get the crusher. I am all for it. I am okay with the county trucks, the county doesn't have too many. I have been cleaning the brush off already with machinery. I've been here 30 years and it hasn't changed, the roads are still bad. Most of the gravel would be used in that area anyway. That's what we are trying for, but if not then I will still do it on my own.
Albert Johnson: addressed one of the guest to come to the mic
John bushman: has a ranch up stauffer canyon, appreciates opportunity, previously sent objections. I have received a copy for the master plan for the gravel pit and wants to point out a few items. Shows lack of professionalism. Site description defines excavations zones with X and is not precise. The only pictures we see are from Google Earth. Bedrock also on the first page

says if present it will be subject to extraction. Shows lack of description again. The master plan does not show where retention ponds will be or how material will be handled. The plan also shows nothing about gravel access pads. No locations on the document have been responsibly signed for. I have other issues because the plan does not have a stamp or certificate of completion by engineering company. The company listed is found in massachusetts not lehi utah as the plans state. Coco Engineering is a CNC shop not a gravel pit or surveying engineering company. I have a concern that the masterplan was not made by an engineer but by AI. I am asking the commission to deny his request for a permit
Albert Johnson: anyone else to testify
Bill Stock: the gravel pit is an industrial use. The conditional use permit requires you to check comprehensive plan. The permits only talk about quarry's. Chapter 6 of land use ordinance section G number 1 says roads. They need to have a study to see if the road can support this or not. They need to do a bond with idaho because of the size. They need a recreation permit and a bond covered in item E and under J it talks about runoff. I don't know if the property has water, but if it does they cannot change the groundwater without an additional permit. If they don't have water then how will they operate. That's per the county ordinance. These conditions have to be met.
Mitch Poulsen: what page on the comprehensive plan
Bill stock: last one was 53. The other one I don';t remember but it was much earlier. Page 53 or 54
Albert Johnson: anyone else?
Sean Bartschi: John is there a coco engineering in lehi and you are from there?
John Bushman: no
Sean Bartschi: Can i ask todd the road guy some questions. Have you made any road improvement plans if this with through.
Todd Boehme: We have been talking, but no plans on improvements. I can see benefit to this, but I also understand that everything has it's opposite. We have shown interest to Bret.
Sean Bartsch: why don't we get gravel from north nounan
Todd Boheme: the gravel there is detrimental to equipment. Multiple canyons would benefit that are close to this location. It would save several miles.
Albert Johnson: As you contemplate this, we have required several gravel pits to make road improvements. Have you looked at this location to see if it is even possible?
Todd Boehme: Again, if there is no gravel pit, then there is no need to invest time and money into looking into this. We have not looked.
Albert Johnson: the problem is if we approve this plan we open the county to potential lawsuits to previous gravel pits that we required to make improvements.
Todd Boehme: I remain neutral, there is no sense in promising anything unless it is approved. Maybe we need to go back to the drawing board.
Albert Johnson: it seems the county would first get on board with a mine plan
Sean Bartschi: The statement says that the primary use would be for the county

Albert Johnson: until we have buy in from the county I don't know where we are, that's why we wanted to visit with you. What's okay between me and bret between the back fence changes when you are talking about a whole county.
Mitch: Was the thought to see what planning and zoning doing? Why didn't we get an engineer first?
Todd Boehme: I mean personally, yes
Albert Johnson: there have been conversations with the commissioners, but we have to be even handed. I understand where bret is coming from
Todd Boehme: I will sit down with Bret
Albert Johnson: like shawn said the statement says the primary purpose is for the county
Devin Boehme: We have heard it, now send it back to them.
Albert Johnson: I drove out there and there are some pinch points in that road, it seems there would be some needed right-of-way in order to meet what we have required of others for this. That is probably what needs to happen first.
Bret: We have been in contact with the state and have already paid the fees required. This is the first step we have to do before we talk with anyone else, that came from Department of lands of Idaho. I can't have a dialogue with the road guys without that. That road has been that way for 30 years. It should have been changed long ago. Everyone has put fences right in the right-of-way. Is it our responsibility to fix that?
Sean Bartschi: that's a different question
Bret: Well, Albert wants the roads wider. That is part of the process with the state. I have to have it approved by you first. I have to have this in place before I can talk to the road guys. Mitch has gumbled this together and made it confusing.
Kristy Crane: you're saying we have to approve this without reclamation plan and without water conservation plane?
Bret: that's what the state said
Kristy Crane: we can't approve it without a plan in place
Bret: this has not been fun. This is my first time trying to do anything in this county. I'm just trying to make my life better.
Albert Johnson: just for the record we appreciated Mitch's work and all he does. We have to do due diligence
Bret: Gary from department of lands of idaho called you didn't he Mitch?
Mitch Poulsen: yes
Bret: the master plan got sent to everyone then, including John
Mitch Poulsen: yes i sent it to John
Bret: I have no problem making the road wider, it's not fun, but it does have to be addressed

Motion to close public hearing, Todd Transtrum motion, seconded by Sean Bartschi motion carried.
Albert Johnson: Can we get Ronnie on?

Ronnie: my understanding is that everyone is trying their best. It makes sense that the county could use gravel including others. Not to say this is a bad thing, but I agree that everything needs to be shown in accordance with the conditional use permit. The burden is on the applicant for that. Sounds like there has been miscommunication, but not all of the information is in hand tonight. In my experience gravel pits tend to have the potential to hedge up issues for counties as well. That's the purpose for the additional requirements for conditional use permits. I can't disagree that we don't want to put the cart before the horse. There are a few options, you can grant it, you can grant it on condition, or you can deny it. Denying it requires a one year wait period.
Kristy Crane: Ronnie can we table the decision for a certain number of months?
Ronnie: Yes, that would be appropriate to table the permit. That could be an option that the commission can require of the applicant to bring requirements to future meetings.
Albert Johnson: It was recommended that we probably should table this until info is in front of us.
Sean Bartschi: I have issues with 1 stauffer canyon rd has a lot of alfalfa. The ash or dust costs a lot of money if trucks were running up that road 2 the nounan road is not good. With more weight, what is the county plan for further improvements if we invest in this? That is all beside the point, you got lied to because coco engineering does not exist. We got lied to. Go with your eyes wide open.
Bret: dust prevention would be handy. It needs it. You can't see on the road when anyone comes up or down
Todd transtrum: Who is the action operator for the pit? If the county or Bret had an agreement with an escape clause that would have helped us a lot.
Bret: The state requires us to put it in our name. It can't be directly under the county name
Todd T: having something written down would help it move right now. Something on the side detailing future plans.
Patrick Reese: We have had 2 pits in the last 5 years?
Kristy Crane: we had others apply but got turned down
Patrick Reese: When we did liberty or bills, did we have them improve roads before or after?
Albert: we had an engineering plan first
Kristy Crane: and reclamation and water plan
Albert Johnson: that's what we required of them
Patrick Reese: when they came did we say do this this and this
Mitch Poulsen: they did it in part with a subdivision plan and they had a whole bond with all of it together
Devin: they did a lot with subdivision and gravel pit and road for liberty
Patrick Reese: I just want to make sure we are being consistent
Kristy Crane: the plan doesn't seem engineered
Albert Johnson: keep it in order (don't address guests out of public hearing). I don't want to deny it but I think we should table it until it gets closer to something we are looking for.

Shawn: I would deny it. You got fed a scam, would you play with it. In the county's interest we shouldn't
Patrick Reese: I want a phone number for the engineer. I just don't know if it was engineered or not. Is there a number we can call
Shawn: no.
Patrick Reese: Let's talk about it, have we tried to call coco?
Mitch Poulsen: I read in the manual the conditions should be fulfilled before it is approved and we can have our own engineer to look at it.
Ronnie: I would agree with Mitch
Albert Johnson: The question is do we hear it again later or do we deny it?
Todd Transtrum: could someone come get all the documentation for the last gravel pit?
Mitch Poulsen: yes
Albert Johnson: we have a precedence for gravel pits
Patrick Reese: I agree I just wanted to make a point of problems
Kelly: my only holdup with denial is that is does require a full year
Devin: How long do you table it then?
Mitch Poulsen: department of lands permits takes minimum 2 months
Todd Transtrum: Are the requirements for conditional use permits listed in
Mitch Poulsen: in my conversation with the engineer it does need to be done by an engineer
Todd Transtrum: if i was gonna put my name on it I would stamp it
Mitch Poulsen: the commission tonight is in charge of the conditional use permits
Patrick Reese: If we approve it do they still have to go to the commissioners?
Mitch Poulsen: only if like a neighbor appealed
Kristy Crane: we have had problems approving conditional things that never gets put up to code
Mitch Poulsen: that makes it more difficult for administrators to track
Todd Transtrum: approval upon condition would require someone to look at it
Mitch Poulsen: the engineer would have to review it, and submit it to the appropriate departments as well
Ronnie: You would want very specific conditions if you approved it conditionally. Then you would want it to come back to P&Z and public hearing based on additional steps taken.
Shawn: motion to deny
Devin: second
Vote: 5 ayes, 1 Nay
MOTION DENIED
Mitch Poulsen: Do we have to be more specific in denial reasons?
Ronnie: that is best practice, there is a right to appeal to the commissioners
Albert Johnson: mitch has notes behind the reasons for denial
Mitch Poulsen: I will work on that with Ronnie

Albert Johnson: We will put it on the agenda because we are going to approve the denial documents worked up by mitch and ronnie. Small amounts of gravel can be used for personal use.

Changes to subdivision ordinance

Albert Johnson: we have proposed changes to subdivision land use
Kristy Crane: the subdivision of 3 lots or more has a lot of stuff, does this include family lots
Mitch Poulsen: family lots have kind of been exempt
Todd Transtrum: Is that 2 building lots and another one or 3 building lots?
Mitch Poulsen: the remaining lot has to be labeled open space, non residential
Kristy Crane: so on 3 lots we have to put in a fire suppression system
Mitch Poulsen: this isn't my ordinance
Kristy Crane: where are we drawing the line
Devin Boehme: the biggest thing its gonna do is stop 9 lot subdivisions all over the county
Kristy Crane: Does the 3 unbuildable lots mean you need all the requirements for a regular subdivision?
Sean Bartschi: That's not how I viewed it.
Todd Transtrum: you've gotta have the 60 acres to get the density requirements
Mitch Poulsen: I'm gonna do an example of this. As I was crafting this I was trying to take all these thoughts into consideration.
Albert Johnson: all of these 9 lot subdivisions have been rundown now
Sean Bartschi: In my mind i was thinking the subdivider would have to own the open space.
Todd Transtrum: the open space piece wouldn't be able to be split ever.
Sean Bartschi: How do you guys feel about 20 acres?
Albert Johnson: If we do that would everyone break off 20's. The requirement says 3 or more lots needed for fire suppression.
Sean Bartschi: could you get 4 off of 40 if you break it?
Todd Transtrum: no it would always have to be part of the subdivision and couldn't be split more later
Sean Bartschi: what if todd had a 40 that someone else wanted, what if he split it down to 20 then put 2 houses on the 20. Then he could have 4 on the 40
Todd Transtrum: what if they build multiple houses on one lot
Mitch Poulsen: like up fish haven canyon, most people can't afford it, but in the ag zone its required at 20 acres.
Sean Bartschi: so you have to have 60 to even get to fire suppression
Kristy Crane: Is it grandfathered in for people who have original parcels like this?
Mitch Poulsen: That is up to you guys, but there are a lot of parcels that are much smaller than the ag lots now.
Todd Transtrum: my concern is that it takes a minute to get your head wrapped around and I think the general public would have problems grasping that.

Mitch Poulsen: This density thing doesn't have to be, if they want to section off 20 acres then no problem.
Sean Bartschi: what we want is better subdivisions that are up to standard
Kristy Crane: remember we did overlay zone and it didn't fix it
Devin Boehme: can we get rid of overlay zone
Sean Bartschi: but we still allow family lot splits of 4, that is serving our county
Todd Transtrum: lets say i own 40 acres and i want a loan but the bank won't, how do we address that concern
Sean Bartschi: I did that on my house. I had to survey off a piece of land and take a 40 off my moms and survey it down to 7.
Todd Transtrum: Do our rules allow that?
Sean Bartschi: yes
Kristy Crane: We couldn't use the family lot split for our place because we bought it from somewhere else. I don't mind getting rid of overlay but i just want to make sure its' possible for others
Sean Bartschi: Doesn't it say you can split it down to 2 acre lot then use the rest as ag
Kristy Crane: Why don't we do it for a few years and see how it goes?
Albert: so you could put 3 houses on a 60
Todd Transtrum: So you think that would make a bunch of 20 acre parcels?
Albert Johnson: I think the developers might
Kristy Crane: we have 5 acre lots just waiting to be lot and i think 20 acres would be hard to sell too
Sean Bartschi: somehow we've gotta drive our business into the cities.
Albert Johnson: the cities have to provide services, we don't
Patrick Reese: montpelier doesn't want it to go, people in montpelier don't
Sean Bartschi: quality of life changes with growth
Albert Johnson: is this going to do the job or not?
Kristy Crane: I want it added is to say "buildable" lots on the changes in section L
Patrick Reese: so is the requirements 3 and not 4?
Todd Transtrum: it feels like maybe it should be 4
Patrick Reese: anything but a lot split is gonna be a subdivision. Is it 4 lots or more or 3?'
Mitch Poulsen: we still need to get this scheduled for hearing
Devin: as long as it doesn't mess with family lot split
Kristy Crane: do we have to word this to fit that?
Mitch Poulsen: current rules don't apply to family lot splits already
Todd Transtrum: if we did away with overlay zone we could see what public outcry we got. I fear people wont' understand it.
Mitch Poulsen: we can piece meal this instead of lumping it all together
Albert Johnson: I think we can repeal the overlay zone at the same time, if we do away with overlay does that remove the requirements for county roads?

Kristy Crane: if we make the requirement of the 60 acre example i don't think we should require them to have a county road
Mitch Poulsen: when someone wants to do a 3 lot subdivision they are just required to have a private road example. I think we should require some kind of access with emergency vehicle turn around. We have a provision that says you can't access directly off a county road.
Todd Transtrum: it is kind of contradictory because we are saying they have to have a county access but they can't
Mitch Poulsen: we should limit the amount of those we have
Albert Johnson: 3 or more should have to meet the higher standard access
Kristy Crane: we should be consistent with the road and the lot split requirements
Albert Johnson: are we good with fire requirements
Mitch Poulsen: that's why we are starting at 10 lots for fire suppression
Patrick Reese: i think it should be 10 lots still
Mitch Poulsen: i think mark is wanting to change it to have fire limits throughout the county
Albert Johnson: I think we need to rework some of this language and requirements
Kristy Crane: i think we are good on everything but fire
Sean Bartschi: we can use the fire requirements to help control subdivisions. Let's make sure the family lot split is protected. If we have high requirements for subdivisions are we helping families move here?
Todd Transtrum: let's repeal overlay then revisit this
Kristy Crane: i'm against getting rid of overlay without another plan
Todd Transtrum: we need to protect those who just need a place to live
Kristy Crane: or farmers who split off a small piece to live on. What if we just move small subdivisions to be 3 lots instead of 9. Lets change the road standards to match the 3 lot model.
Mitch Poulsen: I can make some changes and let you know.
Kristy Crane: I'm not opposed to reasonable fire suppression in subdivisions
Albert Johnson: a general statement should be sufficient.
Motion to approve minutes from last month by Devin, Kristi second, carried

Minutes accepted on : April 15, 2026 by: Albert Johnson
Date Albert Johnson, Chair