

**CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES – September 2, 2025**

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City, Utah.

Members in attendance: John Webster, Jace Burgess, Jennifer Davis, Jim Lunt, Wayne Decker, Tom Jett, Steven Hitz

### Members absent:

Staff in attendance: Kent Fugal-City Engineer, Randall McUne-City Attorney, Donald Boudreau-City Planner, Faith Kenfield-Executive Assistant

### Others in attendance:

ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION	LOCATION/PROJECT	APPLICANT/PRESENTER
-----------------------	------------------	---------------------

- Pledge of Allegiance – the pledge was led by Decker.

## I. REGULAR ITEMS

## 1. Approval of Minutes (August 19, 2025) (Approval)

**Lunt motions to approve the minutes from the August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting; Decker seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.**

2. PUBLIC HEARING General Plan Amendment from Low Residential to CC (Recommendation)	Approx 3000 North Canyon Ranch Drive	GO Civil Engineering
3. PUBLIC HEARING Zone Change from MPD to CC (Recommendation)	Approx 3000 North Canyon Ranch Drive	GO Civil Engineering

**Dallas Buckner:** This is out on the north interchange for Fiddler's Canyon, the Nichols. We are looking at doing a zone change. I believe it's currently MPD. It's 39 acres. The general plan has kind of buffered approach out there. The first buffer off the north interchange is Central Commercial, and then the rear, probably two-thirds, is single-family residential. I think this looks like the general plan layer is turned on. I don't think it's normal zoning, but that's what we're requesting zone change to it's all one contiguous parcel. Like I said about a third of it is already general plan for central commercial, but we're trying to do the entire parcel as central commercial. That's why there's zone change and then there's a general plan request so the general plan request. The general plan request is changing from R-1 to CC.

Webster: Thank you, Dallas. Questions?

Decker: I have got process just a bit. Where are we talking about again?

Dallas: We are on the same road as Second East once it gets built out. Our parcels of Second East are right there. Terribles is on the corner of our parcels right here.

Decker: You want to change that from that from R-1 to commercial?

Dallas: The general plan has a buffered approach, and I can't remember if this is 300 feet or 500 feet. They have the red representing central commercial on the general plan, and then beyond the red they have is R1. Our parcel is 39 acres, and it's kind of rectangular. We're trying to change the whole parcel to commercial, but a portion of it, the east two-thirds, is shown as.

Decker: Well, that clarifies much better. Thank you.

Dallas: The fronts are already planned for central commercial, and then the back is R-1. We're asking that the whole parcel be changed to central commercial.

Lunt: What about your neighbors, north and south? Have they been contacted with your desire.

Dallas: We've been in discussions with SITLA. This is SITLA, and then CV. All these parcels along this road are larger parcels that are going to front on commercial. They're going to have some kind of commercial component, if not come in for similar type requests. We've been in active discussions with SITLA because we, to develop this property. You can kind of see this road in between the shading there. The road's built to about here or along 2nd East, and then it's asphalted all the way down to there. Then it's dirt road here, so we'll have to extend this. We've been in talks with SITLA as far as trying to work out maybe a joint venture on a road extension. We've had some discussions with staff about that. Then obviously a part of this and noticing is a mailing packet, so everyone within 300 feet got notified by mail also. I believe this parcel is Seavey, and then this is Nichols, and then this is SITLA. C.V. and Nichols, this is way before my time, but I believe we did this together. Everyone's aware of the commercial out there.

Lunt: I believe that road from 2nd East on will be 100-foot road.

Dallas: When it was dedicated and when all of Auto Mall was done back in the early 2000s, it was all done as a 75. The city's bumped it up to 100 now.

Lunt: The entrance in past the Terrible's and to Second East, is the 60 or the smaller.

Dallas: With the development on this, we plan on having to dedicate additional frontage to get from the 75-foot that's existing to the 100.

Burgess: I hope we keep an Auto Mall drive forever, even if no auto ever is built there.

Davis: City, what do you guys think? Don, do you have thoughts on this? Have you looked at this?

Don: I think it's interesting. Dallas, as far as I know, there's no proposed use. Is it just totally up in the air? We have no idea.

Dallas: We don't have a proposed use. We've talked about doing some road dedications there, but oftentimes with commercial. It's more of a build it and they will come type thing. We would look at putting a road down there and then having the ability to do parcels based on whatever size of commercial comes in. Whether it's a 1-acre site, a 5-acre site, a 10-acre site. We don't have a specific someone on the hook that says we want to put a Chick-fil-A or whatever in there.

Don: A couple of things to consider. In 2022, when we did this, for when we amended the general plan, that red area that Dallas described. It was a buffer zone was placed there. We saw that it would be appropriate to have commercial on that side of the street. Not just have residences come up there and abut that. I think you could argue that those zones are a little bit in flux, but I don't think it was anticipated that it would go all the way back to the hillside, right? A couple of concerns. Certainly, and Kent, you can jump in here any time, but traffic and circulation is going to be an issue up here. We've got essentially, even with the one master plan that we show on the map. We've essentially got one way in and out of

here. Depending on the type of commercial you may get, it could potentially be less impactful than a bunch of single-family homes. Problem is, we just don't know. We don't know what's going to come our way. With staff, we were talking about, we may want to ensure that we do get some north-south connections out of this property. Some of our engineering standards in that regard are somewhat lacking to make sure we can get proper circulation or another way out of Dodge, so to speak on this parcel. The other things to consider, and I don't know where exactly where the hillside starts out there Dallas. I know the jail was going to go there at some point. That's still a depression there, right?

Dallas: I think that's the flow line of a pretty good channel. Then I think it starts coming up where you see the trees

**Bryce Boyer:** Project B Construction. I'm under contract for all the mixed-use right above this. What you're talking about is that hillside. The line gives us basically our building envelope. Everything up above is a little flatter, and then it drops down to where your parcel starts right in there. Then you mentioned something about having access up through there. One of our preliminary plans shows a road basically cutting through your parcel, and then the next one up into the residential area.

Don: You're purchasing the subject property tonight or the ones to the east?

Bryce: Sorry just the one north east of that. All the Esplin property so we have the commercial and then you have the R-3, the high-density is this yellow zone here. Then the RN is just your regular residential.

Kent: Do you recall where that other road your kind of had tentatively.

Bryce: It basically follows this kind of dirt road that kind of came through here. Then follows the natural curvature of these hills through here. It gave access right above the multi-family and then came into the residential.

Dallas: Is the red shown on their commercial on your project as well?

Bryce: this red right here is just empty space.

Don: When those changes went through, they left that as annex-transition. We've got a big detention pond planned out there. There would be no homes there, that's my recollection.

Decker: Fred Esplin came in about a year ago is that project still in the works.

Bryce: Yes, that's who we're under contract with. We're looking to buy the whole parcel of all the Esplin property and development on that. We've been working with Interstate Rock. Partly why I'm here as well if they're trying to change trying to see what the plan is to bring this canyon ranch drive over.

Because if we're going to start developing the residential, we need access as well and so part of this is joint venture trying to figure out who's bringing that road so that we can start going start getting some houses in over there.

Decker: What are the plans as far as we have one road in one road out now. Are there plans for other egress?

Bryce: That's what I was mentioning is I can show you on my laptop it's not very big. The preliminary plan shows the Canyon Ranch Drive here and then potential access coming up above the R-3 and then into the residential area above it.

Decker: I always just scratch my head just a bit when i hear potential access,

Bryce: Well, and I think it came down to getting permission, right? We must cut through everybody else's land to even do it.

Kent: For them to build their project out will require that they have another access.

Bryce: The other access was by UDOT coming underneath the freeway as well.

Lunt: When Mr. Esplin was here, that was the alternative to get another access point and expand that drainage.

Kent: From the city standpoint, with that second access coming out of the Esplin property up in this area. We need an access that will bypass this intersection right next to Second East. Because that intersection

becomes the choke point. What in my discussions with Dallas and his client, about this parcel in here, the one that's in question tonight. There was discussion about trying to get a north-south road across that property that could be that road that needs to feed up into the Esplin property. That could be extended up there. Then we would want to be working with the SITLA property down in this area. Eventually try to get that tied into, Wedgwood, get that tied into somewhere south of Second East, right? That's the goal of what we want to try to accomplish. So far in our discussions with Dallas and his client, that seems like a good opportunity to get a road across that property as they develop it. I don't know if you'd want to somehow condition this on that or try to have a development agreement accompany this to address that issue. That would be the goal. I think that that works to their benefit as well. To be accommodating that second way out because that's a second way out for the commercial property they're trying to develop, or that they're requesting would be commercial. That's kind of overall what we're looking at with the road infrastructure trying to get some connectivity there.

Lunt: You're second way out is to the south there's nothing second way out to the north as of. I mean that will eventually come but as far as these two gentlemen.

Bryce: As far as I understand we are limited to 80 units until that second access is provided. As soon as we can show that we've broken ground we can push UDOT to do their part and push that underneath the freeway just make it wider so that you can have traffic going through there.

Kent: There's a study that's going on right now that is looking at several issues associated with the traffic flow between Enoch and Cedar. That undercrossing under I-15 that right now is barely enough to drive your car through if you think thin, right? That is part of the study, is looking at whether it would potentially be a project programmed coming out of this study to make some improvements there, or maybe not. At this point, we don't know. It is part of the study to address that. I don't think anyone can obligate UDOT to go in and build that. It is something that UDOT is interested in. They're paying the lion's share of the cost of the study, with the city and Enoch and the county just contributing token amounts. UDOT's paying for most of it. The roadway connections for this area are a significant concern. As we get some of these properties developing on that east side of, Canyon Ranch Drive, that can help us take steps towards getting that connectivity that we need.

Lunt: Without that northern access, this is really a bag of worms, a bottleneck, because everything's going to go in heading north, and then everything's got to exit south. There is no connectivity to the north.

Webster: Did you say you're doing residential to the south and north of the property that we're talking about.

Bryce: No, not the south.

Davis: Just the north. So does this give you grief or heartburn or are you two communicating.

Bryce: We will be after this, yeah.

Davis: Okay.

Dallas: I think if I'm understanding right, this is the parcel we're requesting a zone change. He's got R-3. We are here, and then this is annex-transition or open space. We're asking to pull commercial to here so we wouldn't have a direct impact of having homes right behind there.

Burgess: Which has an actual buffer already.

Randall: Do you know the previous MPD? Because it's only going to be zoned MPD if there is, hopefully, some master plan development, like what we call an RDO now. We were having fun trying to find it. We did not.

Don: I believe one exists.

Dallas: I think it's from the early 2000s when they put in Auto Mall.

Randall: That's what we're trying to track down. As you guys know, right, like, like, the Cordero one and things like that, these old master plan developments, now RDOs, they usually have a time limit on them. That's one of the things we are trying to verify. I honestly can't even find the name of it, let alone where it is.

Dallas: I will have to ask Frank or Steve to see if they know.

Don: It's one variable we want to clear before it goes to city council.

Randall: There may be a development agreement or contract somewhere in there that we can't undo unless we do it properly.

Kent: I would assume that Steve was one of the signatories on that agreement.

Dallas: I think they both probably were, but I'm not even having my files from Arnold. I'm sure it was Bullock Brothers back in the day.

Don: I think the only other impact is traffic that is the main concern. Keep in mind as you go closer to those hillsides, and it's a little farther back than I was thinking when I first looked at it. You have potential for 50-foot buildings all the way. That's the height limit in a commercial zone. There's just another variable to chew on. consider it.

Webster: Well, in Central Commercial, what, a couple weeks ago, we had light industrial that we looked at and the neighbors were grumpier about light industrial than Central Commercial. What's the heaviest that can happen in a central commercial district?

Don: We'll talk about this a little more for the next one, but most of the time you could think of hotels, office buildings, retail, things of that nature are certainly all allowed in that central Commercial zone. Things that are more impactful, manufacturing, things of that nature would be prohibited in that zone. You can also do residential in the central commercial zone in two different ways. If you have a piece of geography, if half of that is commercial and blended with half of it being residential, that grade. I think we call it a unified mixed-use project in the ordinance that is permitted. You could have higher residential density there. You can also do high density residential, above the first floor. Kind of what's old is new again. You know, your traditional mixed use with commercials on the first floor, apartments or condos up top, that can be done as well.

Webster: Thank you, Don. Any other questions?

Lunt: I just need to maybe state that my family owns part of that Auto Mall property. I don't know if it affects this, but that road, when it does get in there, will help access our property. If you feel that's a conflict, I'll at least state that you understand that we own two other dealerships, two-thirds of that.

Davis: This is a development agreement request because that's what we have down on the agenda. Is there a proposed development agreement already or is there one in place.

Don: I think, Jennifer, you've got an older agenda. So that DA is gone.

Davis: I don't have the revision.

Randall: We're on the one that's the 3000 North Canyon Ranch Drive general plan and then zone change.

Davis

All right.

Webster: The only heartburn I have is how far east you want to put. It's zoned R1 the people below you, counting on maybe R1, may not want to have central commercial clear to the hill. They may, you kind of create a little bit of an island there if you push too far to the east, although I don't know anybody will do much behind you in terms of housing if it's a blank space. I just don't know how deep we want to push into that.

Lunt: Did you bring up that first slide you had that showed the red stripe. The general plan

Kent: What's on the screen now are the zone districts, right? All this property is the MPD, is the current zone designation, which no longer exists in our code, right? On the general plan, the general plan calls for

central commercial, in that strip, and then low-density residential behind. We've already had some change to that with what was adopted for the Esplin property with the combination of zones that are there that had a development agreement associated with it. That spelled out the need for the second access, talked about maximum number of units, those kinds of things, right? The question is whether there should be something like that on this here to say if we make all this central commercial, are there any constraints that should be on that? Do we want to memorialize that we need to get the road through it that was part of the traffic study for the Esplin property? That it's needed to be able to serve all this area. I guess that's the opportunity, or if you want to consider it right now.

Dallas: Is there another road that's supposed to be parallel to Canyon Ranch that ties into this one.

Kent: We don't have another road in our master plan currently paralleling Canyon Ranch. No, we need one. The traffic study for the Esplin property in this area already showed that there's that need. That traffic study anticipates a second road being built, and you had referred to that. As we look at the properties in here, that needs to be part of the discussion is getting a second road down. We don't want to tie that into Canyon Ranch because that doesn't solve the issue of the bottleneck here. We want to bring it down. The other road that's shown in the master plan, and this came out of that. The master planning effort that that MPD zone was based on was a connection over to the existing development to the southeast. We need that connectivity. We're really at a point where we're out of compliance now with the number of units from a single feed, single road, and there's other lots that were partially developed or stalled. We need another roadway connection. One we're talking about now that would be a north-south road would be supplementary to that.

Dallas: After you connect Wedgewood, the only other north-south to tie into is this, right.

Kent: There is a stub road there that we would expect to have some type of connection to it in the future. That is going through a red-lined, residential neighborhood, we wouldn't want that to be a major road. We want the more of a collector roadway that would come down off the Esplin project and through these other parcels. We would want that to connect into Wedgewood and take the bulk of the traffic that way.

Lunt: There is a dirt road, that is number 160, that road that goes north and south, that is a dirt road that people have used to punch through there. It goes to that gravel pit and a bunch of stuff that's up there. That may be something you want to look at, because it does skirt the hillside.

Kent: I think with this just sweeping curve that was drawn in the master plan, I think that intention would probably be to follow that to some degree for some distance before it peels off and goes back to the west.

Webster: It's hard to know what to do without an actual proposal right there.

Lunt: Can you put the master plan back up? I'm having a little angst with how wide to make that commercial property come up against the hill. We've already got commercial on the side of the road, but just how far to push it back into the cedar trees.

Decker: Plus, the potential 50-foot buildings.

Dallas: Well, we don't reach the cedar trees. I think there is still a pretty good buffer between there.

Lunt: You're starting to get into them close. I know that's a gravel pit right there where your pointer was.

Dallas: There is a giant gravel pit right here. If you look at that, that's probably not usable for commercial. It's probably usable for stormwater.

Decker: It's just that kind of funky rectangle that you want to change, correct.

Dallas: Yes, this is the request, this parcel.

Davis: It does take in part of the gravel pit.

Dallas: Yes, the gravel pit's entirely on this parcel. I think they used that for when they were building Ashdown Forest. I think that this falls off. I think this is the flow line of the existing drainage, and then I think you start going back up the hill into the Esplin.

Lunt: There's kind of a canyon.

Dallas: Yes, I think this is the canyon.

Jett: Dallas, if I can understand. The central commercial will abut against the residential.

Dallas: Well, it'll abut up against this red, which is, I think, shown as annex transition, right? It's not a part of the master plan. It looks like they kind of created pods. Was this an RDO?

Don: No, this was a DA. If I recall correctly that AT or annex transition piece you're talking about was supposed to remain as open space.

Jett: Is this gentleman with you?

Dallas: No, he is under contract for the Esplin piece.

Jett: Okay, thank you.

Bryce: As far as our concern goes, even if you put a 50-foot building in there. It wouldn't affect the homes they're sitting up on that plateau. I don't think you have any issues there. You've got enough buffers. There I don't see it being a problem. Our biggest concern is just having that potential access because we know that that's going to be a problem.

Webster: Dallas, what are your thoughts about access then because that relies a little bit upon you guys saying oh yeah, we could build a road through our place.

Dallas: Generally, when we talk about development, we would put roads where our development needs them. If there needs to be some other road that parallels that, I will look to see the city's master plan updated to reflect that. As far as getting, connectivity through here, there's several SITLA pieces down here. There's Linford's parcels. There's Dave Smith parcels. There's a lot of land here to get a road put through there and roads. They're dependent on topography, and they're also dependent on whatever design's going in there. I'm not saying that we couldn't have some component of a road through our parcel, but to say that it makes sense to go here and here. Without guidance from the city saying, we have a master plan road on our transportation master plan that says we need it at some distance. I'm not saying it's not possible, but I'd be hesitant to commit to something where maybe it makes sense on ours, maybe it doesn't. How's that for a non-answer?

Don: Yeah, well, I think Dallas explained the conundrum well, right? We know we need a north-south connection through there. Typically, when we change a general plan to this magnitude, we would do some modeling. Now, staff had agreed that that could be done when development occurs. If we need a road through there, and maybe we don't know the exact size yet, we don't know the exact location. We're going to want to work with the developer. But maybe we need some guarantees of that. At a minimum, even if there's not a master plan road there, we want north and south connectivity through these properties and east and west. That could be any property.

Webster: Seems to me like that's the only thing you can do because you don't have a master plan there.

Don: Or we could require that we need to go through a master plan update.

Kent: The traffic study that was done for the Esplin property identified the need for that additional north-south roadway. That did not get translated into an amendment to our transportation master plan. Perhaps it should have, but that's certainly something that is part of a traffic study that was accepted by the city. We know that needs to happen. We would certainly want that to be accommodated through the parcel in question here tonight in some fashion. I don't think the city has a strong preference for what the exact alignment of that would be, but we know that we need that connectivity.

Dallas: Also part of our discussion with staff was whether we model now or later, and in discussions with staff, we were able to push it because with the zone change, that's one, but then with subdivision and others, there's more trigger points that we can look at modeling when we know what's happening on ours. If these guys are also working on theirs, there'll be more data at that point, but the outcome of those models also changes. It dictates whether the utility line needs to be upsized or added or a road needs to be added. At this point we don't have outside of the landowners want to have it be zoned commercial.

Until we know it is going to be eight five-acre parcels or it's going to be 25, 39 one-acre parcels or what it's just it's hard to say what a road's going to look like. The city has made it clear that at the subdivision or preliminary plat level we will have to have modeling done for our development. Generally, the consultants the city uses have other projects plugged in. By the time we add ours in with this Esplin property, and then what's happening kind of globally in this area with the UDOT. We might have more answers in the future.

Randall: Right. The only thing that's difficult about that, well, two things. One, when we're at the zoning and general plan change, we have better tools. This can be a political decision where you're looking at bigger pictures, the whole surrounding area. Once you've changed the zone, then we're only looking at the impact of his own property. It makes it much, much harder to make regional-based decisions that affect your property, your property, and the other 16 around it. Know that. Once there's a zone change, we lose a tool. It is sometimes that's why we did it with Esplin one of making sure they did some of the things first and doing a development agreement that only lets you get to 80 units before you look at the next level. Then getting up to whatever it is, 700 before another trigger kicks in. We had various triggers built into that agreement, knowing that once you start upsizing beyond what the general plan was originally designed for, we may not be ready. There was only one transportation and sewer was another. We're concerned that our lines are not up to the task as they currently are. It'd be great if we had that all a master plan it might not help your client build anything because it can be on the master plan it doesn't mean we upgrade it for 20 years. Depending on what comes in depends on where the money sits. Those always come in so it is helpful just at a minimum to know now what can happen to get your property to work with the other neighboring properties. One of the biggest fears I always must be honest about is we get a lot of these it has two meanings, and I don't mind both meanings these shell buildings. Shell properties that come in we don't know what's coming in because you don't know what's coming in. It's next to impossible to plan. We're trying to change this on the general plan but without any information to tell you what we need that's a bit scary. Oftentimes what that means and I don't sit there during most of the meetings for the master plan meetings. They're assuming I don't want to say the worst but they're assuming near the highest densities and making sure that our master plan is built out to do that. You may not know what's coming, but we've got a plan for the worst because if your clients suddenly bring in, my dream, Costco. We're going to need a lot more transportation routes out there than we currently have. If we just zone change it and then hope and pray it's not something too awesome, that's bad planning.

Dallas: Therein lies the problem or the challenge with doing modeling at this point with commercial, and this is the discussions that we've had with staff. If you put storage units in there and office buildings, the demand on utilities could be nothing. If you put six hotels in Chick-fil-A and Tag & Go, then it could be. The discussion is when we get to the subdivision point where we're talking about carving this up into lots. It would make more sense to model at that time, because then we'll at least have a model idea of lot sizes. My fear with the initial request from staff to model is that there's any reliability in doing the modeling now. To just say, hey here's some random assumption for what commercial on average is and maybe we get close and then we come back with a subdivision in three or eighteen months whatever. We have more clarity well those ones aren't good anymore we have got to re-model it anyway.

Lunt: Kent, do you have any idea from the freeway to this proposed road and, then this buffer that we have? How much footage is in that any idea how that seems like an awful lot of commercial already there. Especially when you are on both sides of the road.

Kent: You're talking about this width across here.

Lunt: We've got the Auto Mall property, and I understand that well. Then we've got this proposed road going in. Then on the east side of the proposed road, we have a buffer built into the road. That's 1,345.88 feet.

Kent: Roughly a quarter of a mile.

Lunt: A quarter of a mile. In my mind, that sounds like quite a bit, but I don't develop.

Randall: Keep in mind some of these, too, is that, and again, your recommend board, but the council hopefully will listen to some of your advice on this. I'm thinking of Plum Creek or Cedar 106 and their whole, where's Mike, constant changing of the master plan or the agreed upon road in the development agreement. You can put some agreements into a development agreement that doesn't specify exactly where the road's supposed to go but says that there needs to be some north-south access. You could even set some form of minimum width of that right-of-way if you wished. Something that could at least alleviate some of our concerns of the unknown. Now, in the end, you could still end up with a Chick-fil-A and a Costco, and now you're just naming all my dreams. Maybe the 55-foot right-of-way doesn't come close to meeting, but it's better than what we have now, which is no commitment. We have zero commitment for any other right-of-way through there that would provide more than Dallas' clients themselves. To a certain extent, a right-of-way would help your clients because you've now got more commercial frontage on roadways, but it may not be enough for what everybody else needs. That's why I say sometimes at this stage, the city has a little bit more authority to look into regional effects. Once that zone change happens, if it's not in the master plan, we can't require it.

Webster: Yeah, it seems like cart before the horse.

Randall: Maybe a catch-22 if you want to look at it from your point of view.

Kent: Just going from memory of the traffic study that was done for the Esplin piece, the roadway we're talking about needing to have down through here would probably need to be a major collector. I would assume 66-foot in our current standards.

Webster: Well, let's do this for a moment at least. This is a public hearing for items two and three.

### *Open Public Hearing*

**Anne Clark:** I do have a great concern over our only. When we keep talking about high-density housing. That's the only solution we have for affordable housing. I have a problem with it, and I have a problem with it getting too close to the hills and the 50-foot buildings. Because just drive down the street wherever we have a 50-foot building, and you can't see out. I'm not kidding. It's just challenging when you're looking at all this stuff for the future. How does visualizing, and how is it going to look in the end? Are we just turning our city into a bunch of high, tall buildings that we can't see the mountains or anything anymore? It changes our whole way of being. I understand they/we need growth and stuff, but whenever we're changing, especially when we can't say what's going to happen. Zone changing is very tricky to me when you can't guarantee what's going to happen. Because let's be honest the Cordero property and all of that. Now, that was how many years ago, 25 years ago, and that was for sure that we were going to hold that, and now that's just blown all up. It's just been a big problem for people. I would think carefully because what you guys decide. I always want to say about Cedar City is we need a vision. Because what I think we have now is a bunch of individual developments. The general plan is supposed to be a vision of how it's overall going to look, but soon we keep changing it, and then we just have all these individual little developments. Then in the end we don't have a beautiful community. We just have a bunch of hodgepodes where the buildings are so high you can't see the mountains anymore. Thank you.

Webster: Thank you, Ann. You and I come from an era, though, when hodgepodge was a thing. Any other questions? Dallas, any comments.

Dallas: No, I just was going to say that with this already having a residential component to it. This could all end up being one. I don't want to speak for, I think this is CV property or Twin Oaks, but you could

see that if this goes, this makes sense to me. I don't know if a quarter mile is huge for commercial off an interstate freeway, but I could see this all being a commercial park. If there's some north-south road that goes through there, there'll probably be multiple roads, not necessarily a full collector that parallels it. If there needs to be one, there could be one. I think that where this is already spoken for, and this is, open space and there's not existing residential, I don't really see the harm in going to central commercial.

Jett: Dallas, you might not know this question, but is this an immediate project for that Chick-fil-A you promised? No, is this an immediate type of project or can we, if this board would say no, is this going to create hardship right now or is this kind of a long-term master plan? So, the city can work with us on a development agreement to not tell you where the roads are going to go, but the broad statements that Randall said that you guys will agree to provide an east-west or north-south road.

Dallas: As far as the timeline on it, the developers indicated to me that they're in discussions with SITLA. We sat down with Kent and showed, not a north-south road, but an east-west road, between us and SITLA as a possibility. There's a lot of things that must happen for two parties to agree to develop. They were comfortable enough to bring that to the city to have the discussion with Kent. I think there's an immediate need to try to get a road dedication put through, not necessarily the north-south collector we're talking about, but to get roads put in to try to spur something along out here.

Jett: I know you like spending Tuesday evenings with us. If this was two more weeks until the city could come up. I'm just trying to figure out what we're trying to accomplish here.

Dallas: The challenge that we have, though, Tom, is that with it being currently zoned MPD, we can't do anything. We've got to zone change it. to have some kind of direction, whether it's in conformance with the general plan, out of conformance, completely different, all commercial. We need some kind of zoning designation that meets the current zones.

Jett: I have no problem changing the zone to vote in favor of this. I'm just trying to figure it out. In the past with the city, I haven't seen that with your firm, but some have told us frog and end up being a chicken, and we didn't know what quite we're going to end up with.

Dallas: At this point, I haven't even had discussions with the developer as far as what's going in here, but as Don said, commercial is the widest net.

Jett: That's what belongs there.

Dallas: In my opinion that's what belongs there.

Jett: It was going to be Auto Mall at one time.

Dallas: That's kind of where I was going with all this SITLA property and SITLA has a lot of different types of projects.

Jett: It was going to be the jail, and it was going to be multiple.

Dallas: This parcel was going to be the jail portion.

Jett: We already we know that it's prime for commercial. I'm willing to make a positive recommendation for the zone change for this project.

Davis: My concern is just unintended consequences you know just like these guys have expressed from the city just that if we just give a blanket. Say, hey you know you guys are great, you're going to do wonderful things. We don't know what that is, and you don't know what that is. I do have some heartburn with just hey, go for it without a plan and without um you know a way because they could turn it and sell it, and then the next you know the next person has just been given um a ticket a free ticket to do whatever.

Jett: You're in real estate, you know the developers must first figure out what zones they must work with, and they could sell in a year from now. Next month or in 10 years this can be divided into completely different configurations than it currently is.

Lunt: Dallas, could you go forward with your plans if this piece of property matched the general plan as on the map right there with that commercial, on both sides of that new road.

Dallas: We could proceed if we match.

Lunt: If you just match what's there. I'm just having heartburn with the number of commercials you want to push up towards the hill.

Burgess: The hill has a natural divide between any residential that could happen. It doesn't make any sense to sliver in residential areas behind all these big buildings.

Dallas: That's already baked into the as Esplin planned.

Burgess: Right. To me, I get that you have more tools at this stage, but holding property locked. So, they can't decide what they can even do with it just because we don't have a plan and because we don't have anything else. Like Dallas said, they're going to go through when it comes time to do subdivisions and everything like that, but they can still push all that in even if they sell it to somebody else, even if the worst of our fears happen. To me, the only thing is, does it make sense for residential to go behind that or is it a big deal? Does it make sense for commercials to go all the way back? To me, the natural barrier alone, not only just that whole area, if you ask anybody in town already thinks that whole area is commercials, it seems like a no-brainer to me. I would move to let him proceed and the developer proceed with their next steps. Then if they come back to try to get Subdivision or the next kind of step, then we can fight it out with them then. I just don't believe in holding it over so that we don't even know what we want.

Davis: That's not what I'm saying is to hold them out, but what if we did it? How much heartburn would it give you, or the developers that own this property. If we did ask for a development agreement to accommodate a second road, north and south.

Jett: The city council is more than welcome to ask for a development agreement. He can't get to the city council. Unless we give him an up or a down.

Don: You could condition it.

Davis: We can make a positive recommendation with a development agreement.

Jett: We don't know what. The same heartburn I had a couple weeks ago when we talked about the people out there in Buena Vista. We said, well, let's do this and they said, well, with what? All they walked out of here was with words. There's nothing concrete that we're.

Davis: We're just a recommendation board.

Jett: I get it.

Davis: There's nothing concrete that happens here anyway. We just give suggestions.

Jett: What development agreement do we say? Just say they will play nice.

Don: Chair, may I give a suggestion.

Webster: Yes, Don.

Don: Here's my thought and just hear me out. I understand that there's some back and forth where the commercials zone will be, right? When we put that on the map, obviously it's a general plan. Sometimes we treat it like it's a zoning map, but in my mind, it's not. In my mind at the time, we figured, let's see what's happening. This gives the general plan at least some guidance that this is what we expect here in the future, right? I think from staff's perspective, if the commission is inclined to change the whole parcel and with some of the unknown. We could have some broad language that does not necessarily pin them in a corner, but that we have some guarantee that we will have a north-south connection. Where that line is going to be exactly, we don't know that is in conformance with the traffic studies that we have already had. We know we have carmageddon coming to that intersection at some point. When this area starts to develop with commercial and residential. My thought is you could have some broad language

that prior to development, subdividing or with the subdivision that we have a north-south connection with enough capacity to feed this area. That's my thought.

Webster: Well, I think we'd at least need that because otherwise you end up. If I'm the developer and we change the zone tonight, I'd just drop a plan tomorrow. Then when the city wanted to do something, well, wait a minute, I was going to do this on this property. It didn't include what you have in mind city for a north-south thing. I agree with Jason. I don't want to handcuff somebody, but to stipulate something that is at least broad enough that it's not a problem. Covers the city's concern.

Kent: As we talk about the other master plans, just to kind of try to tie that one up, or not the other master plans, excuse me, the other modeling that we would typically require at a zone change and general plan change, I think that, you know, for water, for sewer, for storm drainage, having those modeled when their uses come into clearer focus makes a lot of sense. To do the detailed transportation modeling at that time makes a lot of sense. My only concern at this stage with the general plan and zoning is that we have that street connectivity. We already know from a traffic study already done that we need a north-south roadway down through there coming out of the Esplin piece connecting to something other than the intersection by Second East. We already know that. I would like to see something with this that ties us to that, and whether that be via a development agreement, via a master-planned road being adopted, or whatever it may be, we need something. That's my only thought. I would love to see the Planning Commission be on record as that part of the recommendation is that we get something that helps us to get that roadway.

Jett: I have no problem putting that into the motion that they agree to work with the city on a north-south connectivity road. To me a development agreement is great, but it's kind of hard to vote on one that's so nebulous and invisible that none of us know. We're not really committing to anything. We're just giving the city council the idea that this was an issue, that there needs to be some kind of agreement someplace that we'd like to get rezone. We'd also like to say, hey, play nice and work so this thing is all one piece and flows all together.

Kent: On the development agreement, we're going to be talking a little bit here about the Cedar 106 project, right? The development agreement for that came through Planning Commission and went through city council, talked about some connectivity between those parcels, connectivity to the property to the north. That's really all we're talking about is in some general terms, and I think it could just be part of your motion just for you as a body to go on record saying, we acknowledge that we need this rezone. Roadway connection that we already know there's that need for and so that needs to you know we want to condition this recommendation on that.

Dallas: As far as just a general condition of having a north/south road.

Jett: You would agree to work with the city if necessary for a north/south.

Dallas: My mind's more just a process question of if we take this to council, then are we coming back through and then doing a development agreement with that general language?

Randall: Possibly but here's the technical state statute. If the development agreement does not allow you to do something you otherwise would not be allowed to do. In this case if they do a zone change you wouldn't be doing anything beyond what a zone already allows. We wouldn't have to come through a public hearing back here. Yes, our ordinance I believe still requires it to come to Planning Commission for one hearing. It just wouldn't have to be a public hearing, necessarily, but that doesn't matter much to you. We'd have to come back in detail what any of those events are, if that's what the council wants.

Tom, you had a motion on the table. Are you amending that, then, to at least make a recommendation.

Jett: I want this to go through. We need to consider changing ordinance, so this doesn't have to come back in the future. For these types of situations, it doesn't have to be redundant.

Randall: Well, your difficulty is you never, we've had plenty of zone changes with the city that have come through. We haven't asked for any type of development agreement on it. The difficulty is when we hit these areas that, with all the changes coming through, our master plans are just not up to it. It's that simple. Other areas, the master plan's up to it, just the current infrastructure's not, and that's a different question. Again, one thing I would ask you to amend, you said zone change. This has both a zone change and a general plan change. If you can include both of those together, that'll speed up what is already not sped up.

*Close Public Hearing*

**Jett motions for a Positive Recommendation for a zone change and a general plan change on this particular item and ask that in the motion that part of it would be to that the developer will work on a north-south corridor or connectivity road, for this project to be determined in the future amicably by city and the developer. Hitz seconds; Decker Nay, Lunt Nay, Burgess Yay, Davis Yay,**

4. PUBLIC HEARING

General Plan Amendment from 1110 South Main Street Cedar 106 / Platt&Platt  
Highway Regional Commercial to CC  
(Recommendation)

5. PUBLIC HEARING

Zone Change from 1110 South Main Street Cedar 106 / Platt&Platt  
Highway Service (HS) to CC

**Mike Platt:** Hopefully this one's not as difficult. We want to do a general plan of zone change for this parcel right here. I'll be frank with you; the developer wants to build a veterinary clinic. It's not allowed on highway services. It made sense, highway service, back in the day when we had the old interchange right there, but we're a mile or so north of that, and so we won't.

Decker: Where are we with that.

Mike: There's South Main. I think it's 860 South. There's Cedar Knolls. This is an apartment complex. Tag and go. Tag and go is right there. The new bank's going right there. They want to build a veterinary clinic.

Jett: That's the credit union's up next to it.

Mike: Yes.

Mike: That's all they want to do. Can't do it in highway service, but we want to get it zoned to Central Commercial, I believe.

Jett: Does this require public hearing.

Davis: Yes, it does.

Webster: Commissioner, any questions before we go to the public hearing?

Decker: Yes, what's a veterinary clinic? When I think of veterinary clinic, I'm thinking pigs and cows and horses and all kinds of stuff. What am I missing here? Yeah. On Main Street? Okay, is there a place to put the animals on Main Street? It might be for small animals. Is there quite a bit of space there?

Davis: Yes, there is. How large is the property?

Mike: I'd have to click on the parcel. I don't know off the top of my head.

Davis: It's .67.

Jett: My friend here is concerned about cows and zebras running the field. I get it but I have critters referring to.

Decker: Don't put words in my mouth if you're referring to me.

Jett: The veterinarians traditionally go out to the field to attend big stock.

Mike: I've seen the building, I mean we do have a site layout. I'm assuming they're going to be obviously for smaller animal's dog cats. Russell can correct me if I'm wrong. Based on the site plan there's not a place to house horses or cows, right there's just an animal doctor and keep them inside.

Lunt: Do you know off your site plan? Right now, they're on the road behind Tag N Go ties into the credit union property.

Mike: Yes, they will keep that open. They could not get in from Main Street. That would be their access, and I believe there's an easement that's in place. That allows them to do that. Okay, but they're not getting anything from UDOT.

Decker: Thanks for clarifying.

Webster: Who is the vet at 5600 and 4000 or about that area. If you didn't know that that was a vet clinic by the sign outside, you'd never guess that's what it is. This looks like a nice building.

#### *Open Public Hearing*

#### *Close Public Hearing*

Jett: I'll make a statement before I make a motion. This Planning Commission, we need to change something to where we meet once a month for public and then once a month for, and then the other two weeks, the other half, go through and change ordinances. We don't have to change the zones because it bothers me changing zones that are master planned. We have ordinances that you can go through. It said you can't have a radio shop on this street, but you can have a TV repair shop. We have these ordinances filled with such old terms and things that were never thought of at one time. I'd like to see us get together and go through the ordinances and change language. In this situation change the zone to accommodate one individual. Let's change ordinance to open it up to more businesses. Not be so restrictive.

### **Jett motions for a Positive Recommendation for the Zone Change at 110 South Main from Highway Service Regional Commercial to Central Commercial; Davis seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.**

## 6. PUBLIC HEARING

Road Vacation  
(Recommendation)

900 North 3700 West

Cedar 106 / Platt&Platt

**Mike Platt:** This goes back to our Cedar 106 development agreement we brought through a month or so ago. This just shows us abandoning this road if that makes sense. Now 800 North is built and that's the master plan road and per the development agreement we are going to provide north-south access points. I believe one's about right here, one's about here and one's about here. That when we develop, we know how all the zones are going to interact we'll put interior streets. It's just a second piece of the puzzle.

Webster: Any questions?

Open Public Hearing  
Close Public Hearing

Kent: Could I make one quick suggestion on your motion?

Davis: Yes.

Kent: This vacation needs to be accompanied by, correct me if I'm wrong Mike. We need to change the parcel layout here. Can you want to address that?

Mike: We met with the developer today and I brought this up in City Council because I want to be transparent as possible. It's going to change the zonings, and I must come back for a zone change we're not changing the density and we're not changing any of that stuff. Other than the way the zones and the new parcels will lay out because this road is going to be gone. That's going to come through probably the next two to four weeks when we meet with the owner today. We're starting to work on some layout for the different zones, so we can kind of see how everything comes together so.

Kent: The bottom line is that some of the lots, as they currently exist, lose their frontage with the vacation. I just wanted to see if you would be willing to condition the recommendation for the vacation on the lot line adjustments occurring that are needed to resolve that issue. Does that make sense?

Mike: I'm not opposed to that because it must happen. It must happen sooner or later. Like I said, this is a three-or four-part story, let's call it. We're only on Act 2 right now.

Decker: Nice catch.

Don: All right, so Mike, I think we need the lot line adjustment, the zone, and this vacation. It seems like they should all just come through together.

Mike: Yes, I brought this up a month or so ago. I'm more than happy to table everything and then have one vote at the end. I don't care. I just want to be as transparent as possible. Hey, this is what's going on, it makes sense. The dominoes are just. Falling as they're falling right now.

Don: Then 850. I'm sorry, 800 is in the works as well, right?

Mike: Yes, as soon as I get a few signatures from the utility companies and a couple of the adjacent landowners. That will be up to the city's office. Because Amber Industrial Phase 2 dedicated this street. It's already constructed. It's not moving. Just waiting on a few paperwork's. We have a commercial subdivision coming through right here for this parcel already. I believe it's right here. Things are coming, but it all depends on a bunch of moving parts.

Randall: If you at least make the understanding, even if it's not part of it, is this contingent upon all these pieces coming together? Because some of these parts will fail without the other parts going through.

Mike: It doesn't need to come through at one time or recorded or whatever you want to say at one time.

Randall: Yes, if each one is contingent upon the other pieces, we'll never get one in that is dependent on something else.

**Davis motions for a positive recommendation for the road vacation on 900 North 3700 West conditioned upon the lot line adjustments occurring as discussed. Lunt Seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.**

Randall: Yes. Again, we're on the recommendation level of this, and so the council gave a much shorter version. In the previous stage, and so I'm totally fine with the more legalese verbose one you gave. That was good.

Webster: One last thing. I don't want to leave Tom's thought just hanging out there in terms of everybody scoring the city ordinances and finding out. How does that look to you, though? You described it just a little, but I don't know whether I have the time or the energy to read through all the ordinances and pick out the ones that I think are misplaced.

Amber Ray: Along with that, I think it would also be helpful, if you say, okay, this section we would like changed to this or to remove that part. Instead of just let's change that because then that leaves it kind of

up to Don and I to be like, all right. How are we going to change this? Then let's go talk to Randall, and he'll tell us.

Don: I kind of see it, and I don't want to speak for you Tom. There are maybe some things that the commission thinks is antiquated. Use tables, I think there's workshop to be done there, to Tom's point.

Jett: That's all I'm suggesting.

Don: I spared you a PowerPoint on the see versus the HS zone tonight. I didn't want to get that far into the weeds. If there's some suggestions, Tom, you mentioned maybe trying to parse out what really belongs in an I&M-1 zone and what belongs in an I&M-2. I think that's a good one. If we can get some guidance from the commission, maybe come back with some thoughts and some ideas. Amber and I are happy to sit down. Maybe we, I don't know if I'm being silly, have a little committee potentially. I don't know if that's legal or not, but I don't know. I think the tables could be used by some workshops.

Jett: Well, I've been following this for a lot of years. It's called the Planning Zone, and most of it that I've witnessed for the last 20 years has been put out fire after fire, and not much planning. The only way we're going to stop putting out fire is to do some long-term planning and go through, and it's arduous. My time is as valuable as anybody else's up here, but I took this role because I said I want to do the job and clean it up. Streamline it and serve the next commissions in the future. The citizens that are coming up, they're not all befuddled and confused about this doesn't make sense.

Webster: I think that makes sense. Kent, did you have something?

Kent: I was just going to say, Tom, part of your suggestion a minute ago was, you know, do we dedicate one meeting to regular business and another meeting to planning issues? The only concern I have with that is that when we look at the process people need to go through to try to get something accomplished coming through the city. We're looking at, okay, how do these stack up with all the meetings? They're usually surprised when they see how long it takes to get through the process. I think we probably don't want to limit ourselves to only one opportunity a month for people to come in and get their business taken care of. I think that I will certainly reserve some time on the agenda for these kinds of discussions, I think it is an excellent idea. Any direction that you either together as a body in one of these meetings or even if you individually want to contact us and say, hey, this is an issue that I'm concerned about. Can we look at such and such? You know, that helps give staff some direction on something that we can look at, pull some ideas together and come in and workshop session that with you, right? I think that would be helpful and I think that's a great thing for this body to do. That would better fulfill the mission of this body if we did have those kinds of conversations.

Webster: Well said. I think that'd be good. I think we ought to think about it. Yeah, but workshop session some of the things for half an hour or something on nights, that's probably good. My suggestion then to the Planning Commission would look at some of the stuff and let's start feeding the city with some of the things that you care about. I know you've done it, Tom. I do appreciate that. You've brought things before us before, maybe we can workshop session.

Don: I think maybe at the next PC meeting we'll just put an agenda item, planning commission discussion, use tables, something like that.

Webster: I like that. All right. Dinner time, everybody. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

*Faith Kenfield*  
Faith Kenfield, Executive Assistant