

October 8, 1987

HEARING ON WILLARD GRAVEL PIT

Members Present on Planning Commission:

Richard Kimber - Chairman  
DeVon Breitenbeker  
Jon Thompson  
Kent Newman  
Don Christensen  
Steve Grover

Ex-Officers

Denton Beecher  
Jay Hirschi

Recordings of the Planning Commission Hearings on October 8, 1987 at 7:00 p.m. in the Willard City Hall regarding the request by Darrell Nielsen for a gravel pit in that area. This has been requested by the Willard Mayor, Mr. Thorpe, and a number of other concerned citizens. Instructions of a time limit of two minutes per person has been requested.

Testimony of Clyde Westley  
221 South 100 South

I sent a letter in August explaining conditions and I am concerned about the deer population in the area. Utah State University and I have done an intensive study in this area in the winter of 1984-1985 with an estimation of one deer per every square acre up on the mountain. You will find out that the sage brush is the only thing that the deer can feed on during the winter time. He also pointed out that not all of that area is actually winter range. With the winter range as it is now, if we deplete it, that 160 acres will be 160 deer or probably more because just the fact that the gravel pit would scare them from a distance it will drive more deer across the highway and will cause more problems in the orchards and some of the farmers have already asked for permission from the State to shoot the deer plus the insurance companies spend several thousand dollars a year on car repairs.

Testimony of Craig Tune  
Willard

I have given a couple of pictures to members of the Commission to show what the hillside looked like in 1923 and 1968. It is a drastic change today from then. Willard peak, even I am told, has tons of rock and things for good purposes that help benefit all the citizens, such as Willard Bay, irrigation water and things like that. The pit as proposed now, has no obvious task or anything to

benefit anyone in the community or the State. The plan that has been given to the flood control is that a band-aid to accommodate the gravel pit or is that plan actually better than what is existing there now that nature has created. It has not been stated which is the best flood control, to leave it the way it is or put in the other two pits. This is a free country and every property owner should be able to use the land as he sees fit but we should not inflict another one's rights to exercise his rights to enjoy freedom from dust, noise and the right to help the environment. No commission, not in the form of a bond or anything else should have enough power to control nature's ways to reverse or control any unforeseen plan of the loss of his own surrounds in the community.

#### Testimony of Mike Congley

I am quoting out of a book, Environmental Laws, that is based on law, and it talks in there that dust is a nuisance and because of the nuisance the people have the right to sue people who create dust. In my particular case I came from the hospital a year ago with open heart surgery and dust and pollution smoke and stuff like that caused me a lot of problems. If I have to put up with dust I will have to sell my house at a big loss. The question is, who will pay the loss on the house.

#### Testimony of Mary Lou Codling

I will read from a Real Estate Book and Support Rights. The land owner has the right to the natural land which is provided by surrounding land. The right to support is a natural right inherent in the land itself and it applies to both lateral support from adjacent land and subjacent support from underlying strata. The right to lateral support is absolute and a land owner is strictly liable for any harm caused to adjacent property as a result of excavation from the land. In addition, if a land owner constructs a retaining wall on his property he is required to maintain it in the future. If the wall deteriorates and causes damage to adjoining property the land owner will be liable for the damage. The right to lateral support applies only to the land itself and not to added burdens on the land such as buildings. The right to subjacent support does apply to buildings as well as to land but only to those buildings which were in existence at the time of the subsurface estate. The mineral rights are discovered from the ownership of the surface. Now I ask you if our property is destroyed, someone is going to sue the County Commissioners or are we going to sue Mr. Nielsen?

Testimony of Hydie Beams

I would like to say that what we are doing right now will influence lives of people who will be born in Utah. The decisions we make now will influence people later on. The dust that is caused from this is of interest to people who have asthma or who have had open heart surgery or people who have allergies. I think that putting in the gravel pit would cause us to move.

Testimony of Kate Shuler

In the area there are many people with hay fever and asthma and in our household alone we have five. There will be many people affected by the dust.

Testimony of Fen Shandon  
668 South Main

If people didn't like noise or the dust the truckers would only operate during the mid-day when people were off work but when there are elderly they are home twenty-four hours a day or if people don't work they are home all day. What is a person to do?

Testimony of Earl Harlow  
485 South 200 East

I am a licensed Civil Engineer in the State of California. The complaint that I would like to address is not the health consideration of the dust. We hope that the lack of control in the past by the County be reversed as the situation occurs here and we did end up in the gravel pit. Devaluation of homes is an issue here tonight and the safety aspect. Twenty million tons of material figured mathematically is about one truck per minute in addition to water trucks to prevent dust control. Safety for all is of great concern.

Testimony of Jerry Dean  
123 South 300 East

I have a concern over the safety aspect. The school bus stop is on Main Street which is 200 feet from the driveway for the proposed gravel pit.

Testimony of Rod Mund  
170 West 200 North

I have three points to make. First, the County and Willard City Flood Control District have invested almost a half a million dollars in floor control progress. Who will be responsible for the

additional increase in maintenance cost to maintain those facilities? When will those facilities be created, at the first, and who is going to follow up. Third, we hope that sensitivity areas and zoning should be considered.

Testimony of Mayor Thorpe  
435 West 1050 North

There is a half mile limitation within the boundaries of the City. The City has influence. Municipality should contact county crews when anything is done within the half mile limit. Any building permits issued by County should be reviewed by the City. Municipalities to assume the responsibility of issuing the building permits, not the County. All of this can be taken care between the Willard City and Box Elder County.

Testimony of Donna  
265 South 200 West

The quiet beautiful atmosphere we have in this town is very important to keep. I feel that we should protect and enjoy this beauty. Will the gravel pit deface the mountain?

Testimony of Gail Meacham  
565 South 200 East

We have lived in the area a year and a half and if there had been a gravel pit there we would not have bought here. We looked at a home by Mountain View School and the reason we did not buy there was because of the gravel pit. Our home we now purchased would decrease in value and I think it would be very hard to sell it.

Testimony of LeRoy Darrel  
234 East 100 South

The dust and the dirt and the noise when they were building the Willard Bay was a very frustrating thing to put up with. The temporary road that they were using was black-topped, not just graveled. Therefore, I think the permit should be declined.

Testimony of Jack Wright  
274 East 100 South

I remember the flood of 1936 and how much trouble it caused. The water went around the Dyke. There is no way on earth that they are going to put something back that will take care of that. That mountain is solid rock and I have seen water come down over it.

Donetta Roache  
708 South Main

I live in Salt Lake City but I have a home in Willard which is across the street from proposed gravel pit. There is a lot of danger if trucks can't stop. I drive a big truck and I have watched people come through there and it is an impossibility to stop. It will be an unsupervised intersection. This will endanger the lives of our children. The flood problem is of great concern.

Testimony of Monique Carter  
325 South Main

I have lived here twenty-four of the twenty-five years of my life and I do not want that mountain changed. I want my children to see it just as I have seen it. My property value has gone down because of the proposed gravel pit.

Testimony of Steve Bingham  
100 North 100 West

I am on the Willard City Planning Commission and I want you to know the many hours the Willard City has spent to protect your sensitivity. Does the right of one individual supercede the rights of many in health aspects and general welfare?

Testimony of Shirley Farley  
81 East 200 South

Our family has been in construction for forty-seven years and our living is hauling rocks but we are absolutely opposed to the gravel pit. Gravel pit trucks are not controlled. Gravel pits have a detrimental effect on towns.

Testimony of Rosemary Harlow  
400 South 200 East

Asthma is very difficult to live with and it creates many problems and I have to take medication to keep breathing. Asthma is intensified by dust.

Testimony of Wallace Johansen

I have seen the flood waters come and the ponds didn't hold, muchless the many trucks coming off the mountain. Why put up with the noise and the commotion. I feel that we should have some consideration to keep our beauty.

Robert King Clawson  
175 North 100 West

This will affect me and every other home owner in Willard. It will affect my children and my grandchildrens lives. It will destroy the beauty of Willard forever.

Testimony of Alan Badley  
139 North 200 West

I am chairman of Willard City Planning Commission. I am defending the rights of many and not certain individuals. As you are aware, Willard City has fought this flood gravel pit control issue for some time. Some are for and some against. I am here to defend the rights of many. We have created buffer zones and sensativity zones. These ordinances that we have adopted and spent at least sixteen years finalizing, we are going against the people. It is the will of people in Willard to deny pit development.

Testimony of Kevin Moss

I own land adjoining gravel pit property.. I have lived here ten years and hope the community feels the way I feel and I love it.

Testimony of LeAnn Hunsaker  
1420 North Main

I am the Willard City Recorder. The majority of phone calls are opposed to the gravel pit and only one has been in favor. I cannot understand why the issue comes up so frequently.

Testimony of Linda Ward  
235 South Main

The general welfare of Willard should be considered by those living within.

Testimony of Wayne Priebe

I moved to Willard twenty-four years ago. Most of the people who live in this South East part of town called and asked before they moved in what the conditions were here. People came here to live because they were free from pets and free from dust.

Testimony of Richard Braegger  
71 South 100 West

I am in favor of the gravel pit for three reasons. There isn't anyone who has a house or a highway in front of their street who doesn't have gravel in it. It has got to come from somewhere and we run out of places to get it from. I happen to know the people who believe that if you own property you should be able to do what you want to with it. If we want to stop this, then why in the world don't you get together and buy him out. Then you will be done with it.

Testimony of Dale Holmes  
555 East 200 South

Mr. Nielson should have done his homework before buying his property. Mr. Nielson didn't find out what the values of the citizens in this community were before he purchased the property. The constitution protects the rights of freedom of the individuals of joy. We can never restore what has been taken out.

Testimony of Lavine Hemsley  
325 North Main

I believe that everyone has the right to own property and to use that property to the best advantage as long as it doesn't jeopardize anyone else. I live right across the road from the drive that goes to the C & D pit now. We hear the trucks flying and howling from daybreak to sunset. The noise and the dust pollution are really bad and we have agencies all over the United States that say you cannot pollute. But my concern is the lives of the children because of these heavy trucks and the possibility of mechanical failure and problems with the road and we have had children killed on this highway. The school district has gone to a lot of trouble to provide extra bus service to keep our children safe and yet we consider enormous trucks to run day-in and day-out and even on weekends.

Testimony of Herbert Pedderson  
185 East 600 South

I am one of the neighbors who lives closest to the proposed gravel pit. I would like to point out that the courts of the United States have in many instances forced airports, dairies, and so forth to even move or go out of business because of the environment that they caused the citizens. I know of a case here in Utah that was forced to sell out his dairy farm. I would like to point out that the dust here in Willard is not being controlled. There are thousands of tons of dirt that are taken out of those pits. The State of Utah does not monitor those pits and I suspect that it will be the same with the Nielson pit if put in. Before coming to live here in 1980, I subscribed to the local paper and knew about the gravel pit

issue. We bought our house after the newspaper reported that the gravel pit issue was dead and that there would be no more gravel pits. Had we known that this condition would exist again we would not have bought here because we do not like the noisy, dusty conditions.

Testimony of Don Wright  
230 South 300 East

I am one of the old timers here in Willard, I have lived here thirty-three years of my life. I spend a lot of time in the mountains here in Willard. The scar on the mountain that was created by building Willard Bay can never be replaced. If those gravel pits are restored like the one up Willard canyon...there is a tree or two but it looks as bad as the other five gravel pits here in this area and they look bad. I think we should put an end to this issue once and for all.

Testimony of Steve Shipley  
172 North 100 West

I have only lived here in Willard one year and I want for myself what all of these other people here in Willard have enjoyed. I am a Biologist, having graduated from Utah State. Each fossil takes a thousand years to develop and restoration is a joke. There is no such thing as restoration of a gravel pit.

Testimony of Ann Oakley  
69 West 200 North

I now live in Perry and I moved because of the dust in Willard which did not help my hay fever. I have heard a lot about the dangers of trucks and I want to give you a specific. In the last eighteen months I have traveled to and from school in Ogden and I have nearly been run over three times. The one time it was only through the grace of God that I am alive. He came barreling down the mountain side and nearly ran me over. I want to know who is going to take responsibility for these fatalities.

Testimony of Carma  
437 South Main

I was born here in Willard seventy-six years ago and this a beautiful place and I have slowly watched Willards beauty go down the drain because of mountain being defaced. Shall we keep destroying or shall we preserve it?

Testimony of Iva Archibald  
75 North Main

I was born and raised here in Willard and I have taught school for thirty-six years here. It is a beautiful place to live and I look out at the beautiful mountain everyday. I have lived through two different floods and know how they can destroy.

Testimony of Mary Perry  
184 South Main

I think that the mountains here are the most beautiful in the whole world. I also think that there comes a time when a fellow needs a friend. I don't believe that Darrell Nielson is as bad as people try to make out that he is. I know that the gravel pits are not the most beautiful things in the world but as long as people have to have topping, highways and these different things, there is going to have to be gravel. There are many other trucks going up and down this highway as well as trucks from the gravel pit.

Testimony of Jack Ormond

I am in construction and have lived in Willard for the past twenty five years. We need gravel for septic tanks, etc. If Brigham City gets shut off, where are we going to get gravel from.

Testimony of Fred Barker  
901 North Main

I served on the Willard City Planning Commission and I do appreciate all the good that Don Chase did for us. I don't see any advantage to the gravel pit. I think the majority of the people don't want it.

Testimony of Cleone Barker

Why is the gravel pit now allowed to stay? They are not improving Willard any, they are not giving money to Willard and if the gentlemen is going to do what he said he would, they haven't improved it any and I don't like to see the mountain torn up but I would rather that, than what we have up there now. Is there any way we can stop what is up there now? Willard is growing and we have to do something to improve it.

Testimony of Tally Beams  
40 South 200 East

There are tons and tons of gravel from the West Mountains. Why do we take them from out of the middle of Willard?

Testimony of Karen Mecham  
565 South 200 East

Why should Willard have to have so many gravel pits? The hours that the truckers would work are during the day so we will have to listen to the noise. I would guess that sixty percent of the people of Willard are home during the day. There are the elderly, homemakers, and small children.

Testimony of Bryce Allred

Unless weight restrictions on trucks are controlled, there is no way to control trucks.

Testimony of Donna Weaver

I have lived in Willard all my life and I feel that the majority should rule. It always has and it always will.

Chairman Richard Kimber declared the hearing closed and adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

agreement with the county. A municipality which has provided municipal services to the unincorporated island or peninsula pursuant to contract with the county for more than one year, may unilaterally annex the territory, provided the annexation is: (1) made pursuant to a policy declaration; (2) not overturned by the boundary commission; and (3) not defeated by a petition protesting the annexation signed by a majority of real property owners and the owners of more than one-third of the real property value. Islands may be created, after a public hearing, where only portions of a peninsula are annexed.

2.412. ADJUSTMENTS OF BOUNDARIES. Municipalities which have a common boundary may adjust or exchange territory. To adjust boundaries: (1) a policy declaration must exist; (2) there must be no protests filed within five days following the public hearing; and (3) the governing body must adopt (after five days) a resolution or ordinance of annexation, the provisions of which must be substantially the same for each municipality, except that one municipality relinquishes and the other annexes the same described territory. 10-2-421.

2.413. RIGHT TO ANNEX URBANIZING TERRITORY. The annexation law contains some advantages for municipalities. First, the new law purports to allow municipalities to control "urban development" within one-half mile of a municipality located in unincorporated territory which the municipality proposes for annexation in its policy declaration.

Essentially, no urban development can occur in unincorporated territory within one-half mile of a municipality if the municipality is willing

and able to annex the territory. If the municipality is willing, but the developer is unable to annex for reasons unrelated to his own best efforts e.g., there are property owners located between the developer and the municipality who will not join in the petition for annexation, the developer need not annex.

The policy declarations of the law appear to create presumptions that "urban development" should occur within municipalities.

The law superimposes a planning process for annexations which did not exist under the former law and which should result in better annexations. All affected entities now have input into the annexation process.

One-half Mile Extra Territorial Jurisdiction

The annexation law provides that urban development shall not be approved or permitted within one-half mile of a municipality in the unincorporated territory which the municipality has proposed for municipal expansion in its policy declaration, if a municipality is willing to annex the territory proposed for such development under the standards and requirements set forth in the law; but a property owner developing or improving property within the one-half mile area must notify the municipality in writing of the desire and identify with particularity all legal and factual barriers preventing an annexation to the municipality. After 12 consecutive months from the filing with the municipality of the notice and after a good faith and diligent effort by the property owner to annex, the property owner may develop as otherwise permitted by law. Urban development beyond one-half mile of a muni-

city may be restricted or an impact statement required when agreed to in an interlocal agreement, under the provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Act. 10-2-418. The court held in 15 h Adv. Rep.--(1985), that municipalities could annex urban developments where the territory would be entitled to disconnect under the disconnection law. 10-2-501 et. seq. The court appears to hold that municipalities may not annex urban development where (1) the city cannot provide municipal services, (or the developer has no need for municipal services), and (2) the annexation appears to be primarily for revenue purposes.

Municipalities will have considerable problems enforcing the one-half mile jurisdiction. Municipalities should contact the county commissioner and discuss the problem of development. Municipalities should assume responsibility for issuing building permits in the area and encourage the county to require as a condition of issuing a county building permit within one-half mile of the municipality, that the municipality be notified and waive its right to require annexation.

If all else fails, a municipality could file an action in court to restrain the county from issuing or the developer from developing "urban development" within one-half mile of the municipality unless the developer has filed a notice of his or her desire to annex and has been unable to do so for more than one year.

2.414. COMPOSITION OF BOUNDARY COMMISSION. The annexation law provides for the creation of a local boundary commission "prior to or at the time necessary" to adjudicate boundary disputes. The boundary commission is composed of two mem-

bers selected by the board of county commissioners and two elected municipal officers selected by the "municipal selection committee." The municipal selection committee is composed of the mayors of the municipalities in the county. A majority of the mayors constitute a quorum. The two county representatives and the two municipal officials are directed to appoint three members to represent the general public. The municipal officers must be from different municipalities. 10-2-404.

2.415. TERMS. The terms of the boundary commission are four years and staggered so that one term of the county or municipal members expires each year. 10-2-404.

2.416. ALTERNATES. Alternate members of the county or municipal selection committee are to be designated to replace a county designee or municipal officer in the event of a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest means "a personal conflict of interest" and not a dispute involving the municipal officer's municipality. If the conflict of interest prohibited means a conflict involving the political jurisdiction represented by the county or municipal member, county officials would always be disqualified when the county protested an annexation. 10-2-404.

2.417. POWERS OF BOUNDARY COMMISSION. The local boundary commission of each county has power over an annexation only when there is a written protest made within five days following the notice of intended annexation; it has no powers absent a timely protest. The boundary commission has authority on application:

...to complete a proposed  
...within one year after commission approval  
...is deemed an abandonment of the action  
...mission shall have expiration of the year, the  
...shall have authorized an extension of  
...for completion. Inability to complete an action  
...use of the order or decree of a court of comp-  
...jurisdiction temporarily enjoining or restrai-  
...the action shall not be deemed failure of com-  
...on and the one year period shall not include the  
...any such order or decree is in effect.

**1979**  
**10-2-414. Policy declaration - Contents -**

**Warning - Notice - Amendment - Costs of**  
**separation.**  
Before annexing unincorporated territory having  
more than five acres, a municipality shall, on its  
initiative, on recommendation of its planning  
commission, or in response to an initiated petition  
requesting comments from county government,  
affected entities within the area and the local  
governing body, adopt a policy declaration  
regarding to annexation. Such policy declaration  
shall include:

A map or legal description of the unincorporated  
territory into which the municipality anticipat-  
es expansion of its boundaries. Where  
feasible and practicable areas projected for municipi-  
al expansion shall be drawn along the boundary  
of existing sewer, water, improvement, or  
service districts or of other existing taxing  
jurisdictions to: (a) eliminate islands and peninsulas  
in unincorporated territory; (b) facilitate the consoli-  
dation of overlapping functions of local govern-  
ment; (c) promote service delivery efficiencies; and  
encourage the equitable distribution of commu-  
nity resources and obligations; and  
a statement of the specific criteria pursuant to  
which a municipality will favor or not favor a peti-  
tion for annexation. Such statement shall include  
and address the annexation standards set forth in  
this chapter, the character of the community, the  
character of municipal services in developed and devel-  
oping unincorporated areas, the plans and timet-  
ing for the municipality for extension of municipal  
services, how the services will be financed, an esti-  
mate of the tax consequences to residents in both  
the old territory of the municipality, and the  
consequences of all affected entities.

The adopting the policy declaration the govern-  
ing body shall hold a public hearing thereon. At  
least 20 days prior to any hearing, notice of the time  
and place of such hearing and the location where  
the policy declaration is available for review  
shall be published in a newspaper of general circu-  
lation in the area proposed for expansion except that  
where there are 25 or fewer residents or property  
owners within the affected territory, mailed notice  
shall be given to each affected resident or owner. In  
addition, at least 20 days prior to the hearing,  
notice and a full copy of the proposal shall  
be given to the governing body of each affected  
entity and to the local boundary commission. The  
policy declaration, including maps, may be amended  
at any time by the governing body after at  
least 20 days' notice and public hearing. When a

**recorder.**  
(1) The members of the governing body  
of a municipality may adopt a resolution or ordinance  
annexing by two-thirds vote if:  
(a) the annexation proposed in the policy  
declaration, in the judgment of the municipality,  
meets the standards set forth in this chapter; and  
(b) no protest has been filed by written notice  
from an affected entity within five days follow-  
ing the public hearing.

**10-2-415. Policy declaration - Contents -**

**Warning - Notice - Amendment - Costs of**  
**separation.**  
Before annexing unincorporated territory having  
more than five acres, a municipality shall, on its  
initiative, on recommendation of its planning  
commission, or in response to an initiated petition  
requesting comments from county government,  
affected entities within the area and the local  
governing body, adopt a policy declaration  
regarding to annexation. Such policy declaration  
shall include:

A map or legal description of the unincorporated  
territory into which the municipality anticipat-  
es expansion of its boundaries. Where  
feasible and practicable areas projected for municipi-  
al expansion shall be drawn along the boundary  
of existing sewer, water, improvement, or  
service districts or of other existing taxing  
jurisdictions to: (a) eliminate islands and peninsulas  
in unincorporated territory; (b) facilitate the consoli-  
dation of overlapping functions of local govern-  
ment; (c) promote service delivery efficiencies; and  
encourage the equitable distribution of commu-  
nity resources and obligations; and  
a statement of the specific criteria pursuant to  
which a municipality will favor or not favor a peti-  
tion for annexation. Such statement shall include  
and address the annexation standards set forth in  
this chapter, the character of the community, the  
character of municipal services in developed and devel-  
oping unincorporated areas, the plans and timet-  
ing for the municipality for extension of municipal  
services, how the services will be financed, an esti-  
mate of the tax consequences to residents in both  
the old territory of the municipality, and the  
consequences of all affected entities.

The adopting the policy declaration the govern-  
ing body shall hold a public hearing thereon. At  
least 20 days prior to any hearing, notice of the time  
and place of such hearing and the location where  
the policy declaration is available for review  
shall be published in a newspaper of general circu-  
lation in the area proposed for expansion except that  
where there are 25 or fewer residents or property  
owners within the affected territory, mailed notice  
shall be given to each affected resident or owner. In  
addition, at least 20 days prior to the hearing,  
notice and a full copy of the proposal shall  
be given to the governing body of each affected  
entity and to the local boundary commission. The  
policy declaration, including maps, may be amended  
at any time by the governing body after at  
least 20 days' notice and public hearing. When a

islands within the boundaries of the municipa-  
lity except that existing islands or peninsulas within  
a municipality may be annexed in portions, leaving  
islands, if a public hearing is held and the governing  
body of the municipality adopts a resolution to the  
effect that the creation or leaving of an island is in  
the interest of the municipality; and  
(e) If the territory proposed for annexation in-  
cludes urban development, the annexation of which  
could displace municipal-type services presently  
being provided by an affected entity applying for  
boundary commission review, the actual taxes and  
other revenue which would be lost by the affected  
entity through annexation shall not significantly  
exceed the affected entity's actual delivery costs of  
services assumed by the municipality. In computing  
the tax and revenue loss and service delivery year pre-  
sented in the figures for the applicable budget year pre-  
ceding the day on which the petition for annexation  
is filed shall be used.

**10-2-416. Policy declaration - Contents -**

**Warning - Notice - Amendment - Costs of**  
**separation.**  
Before annexing unincorporated territory having  
more than five acres, a municipality shall, on its  
initiative, on recommendation of its planning  
commission, or in response to an initiated petition  
requesting comments from county government,  
affected entities within the area and the local  
governing body, adopt a policy declaration  
regarding to annexation. Such policy declaration  
shall include:

A map or legal description of the unincorporated  
territory into which the municipality anticipat-  
es expansion of its boundaries. Where  
feasible and practicable areas projected for municipi-  
al expansion shall be drawn along the boundary  
of existing sewer, water, improvement, or  
service districts or of other existing taxing  
jurisdictions to: (a) eliminate islands and peninsulas  
in unincorporated territory; (b) facilitate the consoli-  
dation of overlapping functions of local govern-  
ment; (c) promote service delivery efficiencies; and  
encourage the equitable distribution of commu-  
nity resources and obligations; and  
a statement of the specific criteria pursuant to  
which a municipality will favor or not favor a peti-  
tion for annexation. Such statement shall include  
and address the annexation standards set forth in  
this chapter, the character of the community, the  
character of municipal services in developed and devel-  
oping unincorporated areas, the plans and timet-  
ing for the municipality for extension of municipal  
services, how the services will be financed, an esti-  
mate of the tax consequences to residents in both  
the old territory of the municipality, and the  
consequences of all affected entities.

The adopting the policy declaration the govern-  
ing body shall hold a public hearing thereon. At  
least 20 days prior to any hearing, notice of the time  
and place of such hearing and the location where  
the policy declaration is available for review  
shall be published in a newspaper of general circu-  
lation in the area proposed for expansion except that  
where there are 25 or fewer residents or property  
owners within the affected territory, mailed notice  
shall be given to each affected resident or owner. In  
addition, at least 20 days prior to the hearing,  
notice and a full copy of the proposal shall  
be given to the governing body of each affected  
entity and to the local boundary commission. The  
policy declaration, including maps, may be amended  
at any time by the governing body after at  
least 20 days' notice and public hearing. When a

10-2-420. Municipal services by adjoining  
municipality - Protest.  
Where islands or peninsulas of urbanized territory  
exist within or contiguous to the boundaries of an  
existing municipality and require the delivery of  
municipal-type services under circumstances which  
are detrimental to full service efficiency, such areas  
may be serviced by an adjoining municipality  
through agreement with county or service district  
authorities. Any municipality servicing such an area  
under the provisions of this section for more than  
one year, may, upon the initiative of its governing  
body and without receipt of a petition therefor,  
extend its corporate limits to include such territory;  
however, any such annexation must be preceded by  
a municipal policy declaration as provided in  
chapter and shall be defeated if a majority  
owners of real property and the owners of  
one-third in value of the real property, as shown  
by the latest assessment rolls, of the area file a  
written protest to such annexation not later than the  
day preceding the public hearing.

**10-2-421. Boundary adjustments - Policy**

**declaration - Resolution or ordinance of**  
**annexation or disconnection.**  
(1) The governing bodies of two or more munici-  
palities having common boundaries may adjust their  
common boundaries.  
(2) Whenever a change in boundaries is contem-  
plated, the governing bodies of the affected munici-  
palities shall each prepare a policy declaration as  
required in this chapter.

(3) If: (a) the boundary adjustment proposed in  
the municipal policy declarations, in the judgment  
of the municipalities, meets the standards set forth  
in this chapter; and (b) no protest has been filed  
within five days following the public hearing, the  
members of the governing body of the annexing  
municipality or municipalities may adopt a resolu-  
tion or ordinance of annexation in accordance with  
the terms of the policy declaration adopted by the  
governing body, and the territory shall then and  
there be annexed, and the members of the governing  
body of the municipality from which the territory is  
being disconnected may adopt a resolution or ordi-  
nance of disconnection in accordance with terms of  
the policy declaration adopted by the governing  
body, and the territory shall then and there be dis-  
connected.

**10-2-422. Bonds not affected by boundary**  
**adjustments - Payment of property taxes.**  
Boundary adjustments made under authority  
of this chapter shall not jeopardize or endanger any  
general obligation or revenue bond and any bond-  
holder shall have the right to require the payment of  
property taxes from any area annexed to another  
municipality where such property was included in  
the assessed valuation of the municipality issuing the  
bond at the time the bond was issued.

**10-2-423. Annexation deemed conclusive.**  
Whenever the residents of any territory annexed  
to any municipality pay property taxes levied by the  
municipality for one or more years following the  
annexation and no residents of the territory contest  
the annexation in a court of proper jurisdiction

Planning Commission  
Hearing

Oct 8 - 1987

Those Present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
Ray E. Moore	325 EAST 100 No. WILLARD
James E. Wells	301 East 125 North Willard.
Bernaine Poze	Press Rep. Newspaper
Dawnie Harding	91 So Main Willard
Mark Connelly	505 S 200E Willard UT
MargLou Connelly	505 S 20E Willard
Francine Dowdley	234 E 1 <sup>st</sup> So. Willard
Ly Roy McDougle	234 E 1 <sup>st</sup> So Willard UT
Herbert N. Pedersen	185 E. 600 South Willard
Kate Skuler	525 S. 200E Willard
Gaye Meacham	565 S. 200 E Willard
Karen Meacham	565 S. 200 E. Willard
Jill Leonard	103 E 100 S Willard
Jim Sawyer	Ogden Standard
Robert Myers	775 So Main Willard
Kevin Kross	785 So Main Willard
Arnold Wells	1244 N Main Willard
Roger Wells	395 N. 200 West Willard
Dale Holmes	55 E. 2 <sup>nd</sup> So. Willard
Darrell Stucki	130 So. 1 <sup>st</sup> E. Willard
Debra Barker	901 N. Main Willard
Freel Bayler	961 N. Main Willard
Don Baker	960 N. Main Willard
Sherry Zundel	145 N 2nd N Willard
Zora Thorne	135 West 100 Willard

Rod Munn 1700 CN Willard, UT 84340  
 Bryan Schuler 135 N 100 W Willard UT 84340  
 Janet Riley 180 E. 600 S. Willard UT 84340  
 Jenny Beames 980 S. 200 E. Willard UT 84340  
 Ken Ormond 150 No Main Willard UT  
 Bryan Baylor 46 N 1st East Willard UT  
 Evelyn Tackett 231 So. 100 E. Willard, Ut.  
 CARMA MIDDAGHT 43750 MAIN ST WILLARD UT.  
 Shirley Perry 18480 main St Willard, ut.  
 Mary Perry 18450 main St. Willard, ut  
 Dorree Babson Nelson 940 E. 800 S - pipe  
 Glen Woodgett Willard  
 Bonnie Woodgett Willard  
 BILL PRESCOTT 228 South First East; Willard, UTAH 84340  
 Sharon Prescott " " " " " " "  
 Marion Stokes 48520 West Willard UT 84340  
 Janet Sturges Wells 447 1st E Willard UT 84340  
 Kris Zundel 450 S. main, Willard, U. 84340  
 Rachel Beames 480 S. 200 E, Willard, Ut. 84340  
 Heidi Beames 480 S. 200 E. Willard U.  
 Lisa Reed 120 S. 200 E. Willard, UT. 84340  
 Cleo Braegger 71 S. 1st W Willard UT  
 Rachel Prager 71 S 1st W WILLARD UT  
 Channu Baker 55 S 100 W " "  
 Debbie Biosogger 90 W 100 S " "  
 Rod Braegger " " " "  
 Don Wright 23050 3rd East Willard, Utah  
 Rosemary Harder 485 So. 200 E. Willard, Utah  
 Randy Braegger 175 So. 100 W. Willard, UT 84340  
 Leona Widdisa 345 W CENTER. Willard. UT. 84340  
 Roy R. Torjeson 151 N 1st W Willard Utah 84340

Lois Jace	256 N 100 W Willard Ut
Alvin Wells	195 E Center-Willard city.
Goyce Hedde	1600 E Center Willard Ut -
Shirleen Farley	181 E 2 <sup>nd</sup> So. Willard
TOLLISON A BEAMES	480 So 2 <sup>nd</sup> EAST
Jack McHard	Brigham City
Verlo Hunsaker	1420 N. Main Willard
Lelaine Hunsaker	1420 N Main Willard
Derek & Ann Oakley	3440 So Hwy 89, Perry
Charlene D & John Rees	335 So. Main Willard
Linda Ward	235 S. Main Willard
Glenn Widdison	345 W. Center Willard
Maurine Widdison	345 W. Center Willard
Wallace Lemmert	868 SO MAIN WILLARD
Bert Lemmert	868 SO Main "
And Knobel	950 So main Willard
Monie Westley	221 E 1 <sup>st</sup> W Willard
Clyde Westley	" " "
DIXIE HANSEN	950 MAIN Willard
Tonya Jowles	69 N. 100 E. Willard
LaSean Bingham	46 N 1 <sup>st</sup> E Willard
Andrea Shipley	172 N 100 W WILLARD
Steven Shipley	172 N 100 W WILLARD
Orville Gray	Brigham, ut
Francis W + Nadel Witt	3890 So Hwy 89 Brigham (Utah)
Rhea Butler	275 SO 100 E
Car Billings	2900 S. 1000 Perry Willard Property owner

Barth Butler	255 So 100 E	Willard
Jane Youngert	171 So-main	Willard
Mavis McKinnon	250 E Center	Willard
Douglas L. McKinnon	250 E. Center	Willard
Helen Priebe	399 So Main	Hillard
Monique Reyes	325 So Main	Hillard
A Wayne Priebe	399 So main	Willard
Eldon Natta	95 N Main	Willard
Don Shandrew	180 So 1st East 658 So main	Willard
Dawnella Roche	708 So Main	Willard
Clare Tucker	679 S. Main	Hillard
Ruth Harding	106 So. Main	Willard
Lew Harding	106 So main	Willard
Wallace E. Johnson	525 So main	Willard
Jack E. Wright	274 E 1st So.	Willard
Edith McChery	95 No. 200 West	Willard
Frank Ray	60 S 2nd W	Willard
Shirley Clauson	95 No. 1st W.	Willard
Robert Kirk Clauson	" " " "	"
John Edwards	55 So. 2nd West	"
Earl Van Faber	485 So 200 E	"
Irene Checketts	85 W 200 S	"
Ellen Hawley	125 S 1st W	"
Bernice Braegget	180 S. 100 W	"
Isabelle McNeely	355 So main	Willard
Robert W Marsing	30 So 100 West	Willard
Don Marsing	30 So 100 West	Willard

Marlene Kap	150 S 100 W	Willard, Ut	84340
Cheryl Braegger	175 S. 100 W.	Willard, Ut	84340
Lynn Ball	724 S Main	Willard, ut	84340
Norma Ball	724 S. main	willard ut.	84340
Ira Archibald	75 N Main	Willard Ut	84340
Ira Archibald	75 N Main	Willard, Ut	84340
Ronnie Stone	135 W 105 N	Willard, ut	84340
Steve Brigham	105 N 1 <sup>st</sup> W	Willard ut	84340
Alans Baddley	139 N 200 W	Willard Utah	84340
CRAIG WEAVER	255 S. 200 E	Willard UTAH	84340
Donna Weaver	255 S. 200 E	Willard Utah	84340
Kimball H. Horn	325 N MAIN	willard ut	84340
Larlee Nensley	325 No Main	Willard	84340
Rob Bishop	74 N. 3 <sup>rd</sup> E	Brigham	84302