

IRON COUNTY, UTAH IRON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

July 10, 2025

The Iron County Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting, July 10, 2025 at 5:30 pm, Cedar City Festival Hall – located at 105 North 100 East, Cedar City, Utah.

Members Present

Erick Cox -- Chair
Jared Christensen
Dennis Gray
Roger Thomas
Mark Halterman
Michael Platt

Member Excused

Michelle Tullis

Staff Present

Reed Erickson, Iron County Planner
Terry Palmer, Iron County Building Official
Rich Wilson, Iron County Engineer
Merilee Wilson, Iron County Engineering Dept.

Others Present

Dan Tullis
Cole Ashdown
Bonnie Aston
Jerald Martineau
Stephen Christensen
Stefanie Erickson
David Barron
David Hulet

Representing

Self
Self
Self
Self
Self
Self
Self
Summit

Others Present

Alisha Chan
Kathy Whicker
Fred Whicker
Danny Hulet
Audrey Brittner
Jared Holt
Val Williams

Representing

Self
Self
Self
Summit
Self
Self
Self

1. WELCOME AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Cox opened the meeting at 5:30 pm.
Dennis Gray led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS – Non-Agenda Items

Chair Cox opened time for public comments.

- Marilyn Tullis asked about Rainmaker, a cloud seeding company, and why it is not being done.
- Reed Erickson stated that he thinks it is being done, but he is not sure how much or at what locations. Rainmaker representatives come every year and make a request to the County Commission, but the commissioners have concerns about its effectiveness for the funds required. He recommended Mrs. Tullis contact the County Commission.

Chair Cox closed the public comments.

3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION – “Surface Mining” Sand & Gravel Pit (40.0 Acres)

Located near 321 N 600 E, Summit, UT. (D-0105-0000-0000)

Applicant: Cole Ashdown

Introduction:

Reed Erickson shared the following regarding the CUP.

- CUP's are allowed uses in the zone for the application being submitted so there is the presumption the permit will be granted.
- This property is zoned A-20 and Surface Mining is an allowed use.
- The site is near a State gravel pit and a private gravel pit.
- The location is east of Summit and will be re-addressed to 4200 west, Parowan.
- The staff and the ICPC review the CUP for impacts that can be mitigated.
- Potential impacts include noise, dust, and traffic.
- Recommended mitigations included as conditions in the CUP are: separation distance from residences, property ID markers or fencing, and a dust control plan.
- Cole Ashdown is in attendance to answer questions and was invited to share additional information. He had no additional comments.

Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing. The following comments were made.

- David Barron, Summit resident asked about reclamation once the pit was no longer in use, dust on the dirt road, traffic on Summit's paved Main Street, safety on Main Street, and securing the 40-acre parcel.
- Reed explained that the hole from the pit will be there, and the State, under the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOGM), requires the owner to bond for the property and do a reclamation plan which DOGM will oversee.

- Cole Ashdown shared that he expects the pit to be there for 10-20 years and at some point he expects it to be reclaimed for water retention and/or recharge, that they have applied for a well and should have it within six months, and that the trucks will go through Summit or Parowan depending on where the product is required.
- Reed explained that Summit's Main Street is a county road and anyone can use it.
- Danny Hulet, Summit Culinary Water, shared the water lines are on Main Street, that driving trucks on that road in the winter will push the frost down, and that the roads need to be improved.
- Chair Cox explained the road through Summit was built to handle the traffic and Mr. Hulet could ask the Road Supervisor for the maintenance schedule.
- Wade Davenport shared his concern about the bridge that goes under Main Street near the turn because they have children that have to go around the bridge, which can be dangerous. He'd like law enforcement or something to control traffic.
- Fred Whicker asked about noise and Cole Ashdown responded their hours will be 8am – 5pm normally.
- Chair Cox stated the pit is located as far away from residences as he can get it on his property, and if there are issues, the public can contact the County to address it.
- Val Williams asked why he needed another pit and how drilling another well would affect the area.
- Cole responded that the other 2 pits are not his so he cannot use their product, that the State Water Engineer determines what wells are allowed, and that he will follow the County's and DOGM's requirements.

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission & Staff Discussion:

The staff discussed the following:

- The road department manages the maintenance schedule based on road use and the roads may or may not be maintained every single year.
- Summit's Main Street is part of Old Hwy 91, is a 125-foot ROW, and is built well. Wide roads invite speed. Speed limits do not discourage speed, but narrowing a road does.
- The County is in the process of getting funding for additional signage, which tracks speed and what time of day people speed, which may help officers know where to be. The State does not allow a sign to issue tickets.
- Traffic counts may be done before the pit is in operation and after to determine traffic impacts, but the studies rarely require a change in the road or speeds.
- The County's noise ordinance states no operations after 10pm, but the trucks will run primarily between 8am and 5pm.
- The pit may be run at night, but if that is determined to be a nuisance, the County can make changes to the hours.
- The CUP, item #2, covers that the business must comply with federal, state, and county laws regarding speed.
- This smaller pit will not have the impacts that a larger pit would. The roads from the pit are public and everyone has the right to use them.

Chair Cox reviewed Section 17.28.050 Review and Findings.

Planning Commission Action – (Approve, Approve with modifications, Deny or Continue):

Motion: Roger Thomas made a motion to grant the Conditional Use Permit for the 40-acre property identified in agenda item #3, having found the application to be in compliance with the requirements of the Iron County Land Management Code, specifically Section 17.28.050.

Second: Seconded by Mike Platt.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Mark Halterman, aye, Michael Platt, aye)

4. ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION – “R-½ & R-5 to RA-20” (52.25 Acres)

Located near 3200 N 2625 W, Cedar City, UT (D-0624-0001-0000; D-0624-0000-0000; D-0621-0001-0019; D-0621-0001-0001-02; & D-0621-0001-0001-01) WITHIN THE S½ SW¼ SECTION 21, T35S, R11W

Applicant: Legrand Webster

Introduction:

Reed Erickson shared the following regarding the Zone Change Application:

- This was reviewed at last month's meeting regarding the Agriculture Protection Area.
- The area is behind Fife Town (West) off of 3200 N and 2300 W.
- The total zone change is 52.25 acres (49.15 are R-5 and the rest are R-1/2) and they are requesting all be changed to RA-20.
- The smaller parcels would be considered pre-existing, non-conforming lots so they would still be eligible for building permits.
- The County Commission did approve the Agriculture Protection Area presented at last month's meeting.
- After the County Commission approval, this zone change was added to this agenda, advertised, and adjacent property owners were sent notices.
- The property qualifies for agriculture protections and is not considered a spot zone according to County policy, since it is larger than 40 acres.

Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing.

No comments were made.

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission & Staff Discussion:

The staff reviewed the following:

- The evaluation considerations when rezoning property included consistency with the general plan; that it is in a Tier II area, that it is consistent with the minimum 40-acre requirement when it is not adjacent to other property, water is available through the CICWCD and wells, and there is a well for the houses.
- The map showing where the acres were located and the zones.

Planning Commission Action – Recommend to County Comm (Approve, Approve with modifications, Deny or Continue):

Motion: Mark Halterman made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that the Zone Change from R-1/2 & R-5 to RA-20 for the 52.25 acres of property identified under agenda item #4.

Second: Seconded by Jared Christensen.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Mark Halterman, aye, Michael Platt, aye)

5. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – “Tier III to Tier IV and Tier IV to Tier III” (Summit & Newcastle areas)

Located in the Tier III areas of Summit and Newcastle

Applicant: Iron County

Introduction:

Reed Erickson shared the following regarding the General Plan Amendment for Tiers in Summit and Newcastle.

- This topic has been discussed in the ICPC meetings for several months. As advertised, this item will have a public hearing.
- These General Plan and Zoning Amendments are being recommended so they will match the current County ordinances and recommendations from septic tank density studies.
- Historically, the County has done the following:
 - 1980--Zoning was determined around each municipality.
 - 1995--Tiers I through IV were established.
 - 2000--Subdivision regulations were revamped.
 - Various Years--Municipalities annexation policies have changed.
 - 2005--CICWCD and the Cedar Valley Septic Density study recommendations were applied county-wide.
 - 2005--Ordinance 205 refined tier regulations.
 - 2023--Septic Tank Density Study completed for the Summit & Newcastle Tier III areas.
- Confusion exists for property owners with zoning versus overlays and development regulations.
- Now is the time to do some good planning for tiering and zoning.
- The Septic Tank Density Study gave recommendations for allowed septic systems based on the mass balance approach and allowable nitrate levels, which were included in the staff discussions for tiering. A summary of the study results for Summit and Newcastle are:
 - Summit:
 - The current average nitrate level is 2.51 milligrams per liter.
 - The acceptable contamination level will be 3.5 milligrams per liter.
 - The allowable number of septic systems is 240. There are currently 84 septic systems so 156 more could be added.
 - There are 289 existing lots, so it becomes a first come first serve policy until other sewer treatment is provided.
 - Newcastle:
 - The current average nitrate level is 1.64 milligrams per liter.
 - The acceptable contamination level will be 3.5 milligrams per liter.
 - The allowable number of septic systems is 220. There are currently 105 septic systems so 115 more could be added.
 - There are 364 existing lots, so it becomes a first come first serve policy until other sewer treatment is provided.
- Maps for both Summit and Newcastle were presented showing the existing tiering verses the proposed tiering changes.
- Any parcel outside of Tier II cannot be subdivided less than 20 acres.
- Part of the recommendation from the septic studies is for the County to consider a sewer district to plan for central sewer in some areas. If sewer could be provided, then densities could increase if that is the desire for the community and the county. The numbers used today are based only on using basic septic systems, not central sewer.

Roger Thomas shared that the County also adjusted the new tiering areas to conform to property lines to make their properties more usable.

Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing. The following comments were made:

- David Baron stated that Summit does not have much water and asked what the answer for a sewer system would be.
- Reed explained that the long-term solution would be to develop more water with wells, etc. and to make plans to have a central sewer system.
- David asked and Reed clarified that Summit could continue as they are now and would be allowed another 156 septsics.
- David asked and Reed clarified existing lots are grandfathered in and could be served by septic.
- Reed explained that grants, other funding, and some property owner contributions would be needed for future infrastructure, but there are no plans for that yet.
- Steven Christensen asked if the southwest corner of the Newcastle area could be squared-up along the west side.

- Stefanie Erickson asked and Reed explained that the study did look at groundwater and how long it would take to reach the aquifer noting the information can be found online at the Utah Geological Survey website.
- Stefanie asked and Reed clarified that there is water in Newcastle; it is just being used for different things such as agricultural water. The use could be converted if they own the water rights, but there is enough water available to be developed that could accommodate some growth within the Tier III boundary.
- Stefanie shared that her well north of Newcastle has a nitrate level of .243, but the study area average is 1.6.
- Reed stated that her well could come from a different aquifer area and the tests were done only in the study area.
- Rich Wilson shared that the study was done within the purple area on the map, which helped them to figure out if and how tiering needed to be changed.
- Chair Cox shared that one of the motivations to do the study and make these changes is due to the closed wells in Enoch that contaminated the water supply. The County wanted to do something now so that would not happen in other areas.
- Jerald Martineau asked and Reed explained that a portion of Summit's Tier III is being proposed to change to Tier IV in the northeast section.

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission & Staff Discussion:

No discussion needed.

Planning Commission Action – Recommend to County Comm (Approve, Approve with modifications, Deny or Continue):

Motion: Mike Platt made a motion to recommend to the County Commission that the tier change from Tier III to Tier IV and Tier IV to Tier III for the Summit and Newcastle areas identified in agenda item #5 be approved.

Second: Seconded by Mark Halterman.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Mark Halterman, aye; Michael Platt, aye)

Amended Motion: Mike Platt made a motion to amend the previous motion to include adjusting the southwest corner of the Newcastle area to include the Christensen parcel into the Tier III boundary change.

Second: Seconded by Dennis Gray.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michael Platt, aye)

Note: Roger Thomas was absent for a short time during this agenda item and Mark Halterman had to leave early, so neither voted.

6. ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION – “Summit & Newcastle Tier III Areas”

Newcastle: “C, R-½, R-1, & A-20 to R-5; C & A-20 to RA-20; and R-½ to R-1”

Summit: “R-½, & A-20 to R-5; and C, R-½, & A-20 to RA-20”

Applicant: Iron County

Introduction:

Reed Erickson shared the following regarding the Summit and Newcastle Zone changes in the Tier III areas:

- There will be a public hearing for both the proposed tier changes and the zoning changes at the July 28th County Commission Meeting.
- The changes to Summit and Newcastle are as follows: (maps of the changes were displayed)
 - Summit:
 - The current zoning in the Tier III area in Summit is R-1/2 and Commercial.
 - The proposed changes would create only R-5 and Commercial and Commercial would be reduced significantly. Commercial on the west of the new Tier III boundary would change to RA-20.
 - RA-20 is Rural Agricultural 20 Acres and allows for most agriculture uses and the more Intensive Agriculture uses like dairies, pig farms, gravel pits, etc. are not best next to residential areas and the RA-20 zones serves to provide a better buffer to reduce those potential conflicts.
 - Newcastle:
 - The proposed changes for the Tier III area include a buffer on the outside to be RA-20 on the larger lots and closer in changing the R-1/2 to R-5.
 - The Newcastle Townsite has mostly ¾-acre lots, so that won't change from the current R-1 zone even though an owner would still need 10-acres to subdivide and develop a new lot.
 - Primary zoning differences between R-1, R-2, R-1/2, and R-5 relate to setbacks and uses.
 - These changes do not hamper the owner's opportunities for typical residential uses of their land.

Roger clarified that the change to R-5 is being made to comply with the septic density study because subdividing lower than 10-acres does not allow for a septic system. These changes will help clarify for potential buyers or current property owners what is allowed.

Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing. The following comments were made:

- Steve Christensen asked and Reed clarified that the County is working with Southwest Utah Public Health related to adding a specialized septic system, if it reduces the nitrate level by 50%, it could reduce the land area required by 50%.
- Stefanie Erickson asked if the areas east and south would be allowed to be grandfathered in.
- Reed explained that any existing use is a pre-existing, non-conforming lot and owners are allowed to continue the use. He also noted that the lots that will be rezoned to R-5 will allow for more animal units that R-1 and R-1/2 allow.

- Stefanie shared concerns about future subdivisions coming in and complaining about the agriculture area.
- Rich Wilson stated the agriculture areas could apply to become an agricultural protection area which would reduce the ability of neighbor's complains to have effect.

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission & Staff Discussion:

The staff and ICPC discussed the following:

- The changes discussed to amend the Tier III area in Newcastle will only include the parcels that are represented on the maps at the meeting today.
- A commercial greenhouse is not allowed in R-5, but is allowed in RA-20 with a CUP.
- Current use, such as a feed yard, is allowed as a current use until it voluntarily goes away.
- The number of allowed septs was counted in the study so there are still 115 allowed septs in the study area, which will be used on a first come first serve basis.

Planning Commission Action – Recommend to County Comm (Approve, Approve with modifications, Deny or Continue):

Motion: Roger Thomas made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that the zone changes listed in agenda item #6 be approved contingent upon the approval of the tier changes from the previous agenda item.

Second: Seconded by Dennis Gray.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michael Platt, aye; Roger Thomas, aye)

Reed reminded everyone that there will be another public hearing on July 28th at the County Commission meeting for both tiering and zoning.

7. COUNTY CODE AMENDMENTS – Ordinance 2025-6 “Setbacks in the Commercial Zoning District, Soil Suitability for Subdivisions and Leasing Space not a subdivision”

Applicant: Iron County

Introduction:

Reed Erickson shared the following regarding the three amendments in Ordinance 2025-6:

- **Change #1** - Proposed Reduction of Setbacks in the Commercial Zoning
Amend Section 17.16.040 to add:
(12) Reduce setback to go from 25 feet to 10 feet when one or more of the following occurs.
 - a. *the rear lot or parcel line is the common property line of a public road right-of-way (city, county, state, or federal), or*
 - b. *the rear lot or parcel line is the common property line of an established railroad right-of-way, and*
 - c. *the placement of a building or structure in the rear yard on the subject lot or parcel is at least 25 feet from another building or structure on an adjacent lot or parcel.*

Discussion: Item c above was determined as not necessary so it will not be included. Items a and b will be included as item a and/or b.
- **Change #2** – Proposed Changes to Soil Suitability Testing
Amend Section 16.20.070 - Soil Suitability (Minor Subdivisions)
Added second paragraph to target specific areas as follows...
“A geotechnical report may be simplified and tailored to evaluate only the specific areas of a proposed subdivision where public improvements (e.g. roads, water, sewer, drainage, etc.) are required. If a minor subdivision does not require certain public infrastructure/improvements, the soils suitability report may address geologic hazards, general soils maps, and general site conditions only (without potholing or soil testing). The deferred testing requirements are justified in recognition that later geotechnical testing will be required for building permits.”
Discussion: The word certain means that not all improvements need to be tested; this means only certain ones. This allows the County to choose from the options.
Amend Section 16.22.060 - Suitability of the Area for a Road Dedication Subdivision
Added second paragraph to address testing when subdivided...
“A geotechnical report may be simplified and tailored to evaluate only the specific areas of a proposed subdivision where public improvements (e.g. roads, water, sewer, drainage, etc.) are required. If a road dedication subdivision does not require certain public improvements (public infrastructure) at the time of the subdivision, or are deferred until development occurs, the soils suitability report may address geologic hazards, information from general soils maps, and general site conditions only (without potholing or soil testing). These deferred testing requirements are justified in recognition that later geotechnical testing will be required for building permits, or infrastructure development when further subdivided.”
- **Change #3** – Proposed addition to Ordinance 2025-6 regarding multiple spaces on a single parcel not in a subdivision.
Add Section 16.04.065 – Leasing or renting multiple spaces on a single lot or parcel
“Any person, organization, corporation, or other entity (lessor) who leases, rents, or develops any portion of a building, legal lot or parcel to multiple tenants or leasees may do so without creating a subdivision, as defined in Section 16.04.060, if the lease or rental agreement clearly specifies that the area of the lot, parcel or building being rented or leased is a portion or part of a single legal, lot, or parcel, and not an ownership division or subdivision of said building, lot or parcel.”

Discussion: This proposed change is due to a conflict within State and County codes. The new language will clarify the ordinance and provide people the opportunity to rent or lease without subdividing and still remain compliant with County ordinance and Utah code.

Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing.

No comments were made.

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission & Staff Discussion:

No discussion needed.

Planning Commission Action – Recommend to County Comm (Approve, Approve with modifications, Deny or Continue):

Motion: Jared Christensen made a motion to recommend to the County Commission the amendments to County code identified in

Ordinance 2025-6 for the sections identified in agenda item #7, with the removal of item 12c regarding 25-foot setbacks, be approved.

Second: Seconded by Mike Platt.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michael Platt, aye; Roger Thomas, aye)

8. COUNTY SUBDIVISION CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN STANDARDS, AMENDMENT – “Flood pond sizing”

Introduction and Discussion Only:

Reed Erickson explained that Rich Wilson, County Engineer, asked for this item to be on the agenda due to recent concerns for the way retention ponds are sized within subdivisions.

The following comments were made:

- Rich Wilson shared:
 - This topic is being discussed to gather input at this meeting and then again at the September ICPC meeting.
 - The retention pond built in 2021/2022 in the Rancho Bonita Phase 2 subdivision was recently filled after 2 days of rain.
 - The pond is not serving the need for the two subdivision phases nor the overflow from the Webster Ditch, which comes across Midvalley Road and ends up in the pond.
 - The current design standards say what is required in each subdivision, but does not take into account other contributors upstream.
 - To solve this issue, he is negotiating with Painted Desert to buy lot 41 to add another retention pond to handle the water.
 - One issue to consider when building a retention pond is the pond's perc rate and determining if the tests are taken at the right depth.
 - The hand-out titled Retention Pond Storage and Orifice Calculations is an example of a spreadsheet that calculates size, and storage capacity:
 - The allowable runoff is the infiltration rate of the pond. The infiltration rate is the perc rate.
 - The spreadsheet sets the rate at .78, but would need to be adjusted if there is zero perc rate because that would mean the water would have to evaporate.
 - The spreadsheet doesn't reflect the different types of storms so he is concerned about using the numbers due to the different types of storms. For example: puddles often still remain around 3-4 days after a storm. Shorter storms are often heavy, and the recent storm in May was two days of steady rain.
- Mike Platt stated:
 - that the Rancho Bonita pond was built to a 25-year storm, which is too small, but a 100-year pond is too big.
 - the .78 number on the spreadsheet is for a 25-year storm. The 100-year is .75 and trickles down.
 - he is constantly explaining to people, retention vs detention. Even when others review the information, they don't know the difference.
 - there should be a map of neighboring properties draining that comes into each subdivision.
 - the city should take care of the water within their boundaries and stop pushing water into the county.
- Jared Christensen shared that in farming, when a pond is sealed, and then the seal rips, you can't use it anymore.
- Reed stated that there won't be a lot of silt in the ponds since the water is coming off hard surfaces within the subdivisions.
- Rich explained that some subdivisions have no detention or retention ponds and feed into the next subdivision or the adjoining county road. A retention basin needs to be part of all subdivision plans.
- Roger Thomas noted that all of the county ditches are terminating at random spots so there is a need to re-engage with creating a plan to move water around the valley and resurrect ditches.
- Rich shared that the staff is currently writing an RFP for a Capital Improvement Plan that will include drainage. The historic drainage areas are Quichapa, Iron Springs, and Rush Lake, but the channels have been narrowing and have resulted in some unintended consequences.
- Dennis Gray asked and Rich explained that the Rancho Bonita pond would be the County's responsibility if it fails because the County owns it, but normally the developer would be responsible until it is turned over to another party.
- Rich shared he would like to see the ponds maintained by the County but that means finding funds, resources, and employees.
- Dennis Gray noted that the subject owner or project owner needs to have some ownership of maintenance.

- Rich stated that is what the Capital Facilities Plan will help identify so funds will be allocated, and the County should help insure the ponds are maintained.
- Mike shared that he thinks the County is taking the right approach. Cedar City has decided they will only take over retention pond maintenance if the development is more than 160 lots.
- Reed asked the ICPC members to think about how water moves within and between subdivisions and through channels to try to come up with some solutions. One solution may be to share ownership such as 80% built by the subdivider and 20% by the County, which is similar to how sewer lines are paid for based on potential growth.
- Rich stated that pond size may change when digging it based on the soils. A pond could possibly be put on a “windowing” system, which is columned with manholes, or where the channels are utilized. These types of “credits” could be given to help determine the size.
- Reed noted that not doing curb and gutter in a subdivision also reduces the obligation of a retention pond.
- Roger noted that if building occurs in the channel, the channel doesn’t have the same capacity it once had.
- Reed clarified that most irrigation ditches are no longer usable as drainage ditches and irrigation companies are concerned about maintaining them for drainage and that they are often used for irrigation when flood capacity is needed.
- Roger shared that he likes the idea of additional soils testing to reduce the footprint of retention or detention. Each subdivision or area in the County has to control their water, but it needs to be reviewed due to the different soils throughout the County.
- Mike recommends that the County take the necessary time to get the drainage plan right.
- Roger would like the County to help identify who is responsible for water when building occurs upstream.
- Chair Cox stated the County is missing an opportunity to assess impact fees and would like to see them added.
- Rich shared the impact fees cannot be collected until the County has a Capital Facilities Plan. He’d like the County to get more of the water that cannot be consumed at the rate this it is, so the County needs a channel.
- Chair Cox noted that many people build without knowledge of where water floods and how it flows.
- Reed asked the ICPC members to think about the issue and to plan to continue the discussion in September.

No action required.

9. MINUTES... consider approval of minutes for the June 5, 2025 meeting.

Motion: Jared Christensen made a motion to approve the June 5th meeting minutes.

Second: Seconded by Erick Cox.

Motion Passed: (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michael Platt, aye; Roger Thomas, aye)

10. STAFF REPORTS...

A. Building Department – None

B. County Attorney – None

C. Planner & Services Coordinator

- Reed Erickson shared that the RFP for the Capital Improvement Plan is ready to send out and asked the staff and ICPC to let him know if they have thoughts about the RFP or the Capital Improvement Plan.

11. ADJOURN

Chair Cox adjourned the meeting at 8pm.

Minutes Approved August 7, 2025 by the Iron County Planning Commission



8/7/25