

**Hurricane Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
August 28, 2025**

Minutes of the Hurricane City Planning Commission meeting held on August 28, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 147 N. 870 West Hurricane UT, 84737

**Members Present:** Mark Sampson, Shelley Goodfellow, Ralph Ballard, Paul Farthing, Michelle Smith, and Amy Werrett.

**Members Excused:** Kelby Iverson and Brad Winder

**Staff Present:** City Planner Fred Resch III, Planning Technician Brienna Spencer, and City Engineer Representative Jeremy Pickering.

**6:00 p.m. - Call to Order**

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance led by Michelle Smith

Prayer and/or thought by invitation given by Mark Sampson

*Paul Farthing motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Ralph Ballard seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

Declaration of any conflicts of interest - none were declared.

**Public Hearings**

**1. A Zone Change Amendment request located at 184 N State Street from R1-10, residential one unit per 10,000 square feet, to RM-3, multi-family 15 units per acre. Parcel number H-178.**

No comments.

**2. A Land Use Code Amendment request to Title 10, Chapters 3, 7, & 37 regarding accessory buildings in the front yards.**

Amy Heaton – Resident at 1049 S 180 W, which is a flag lot, stated that she would like to build an ADU in her front yard. She requested that the city consider removing the setback requirement for ADUs on flag lots. She explained that her property is fully enclosed by a block wall, with approximately 40 feet of space in front of her home and 20 feet in the back.

No further comments

**OLD BUSINESS**

**1. LUCA25-06: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Land Use Code Amendment request to Title 10, Chapters 3, 7 & 37, regarding accessory building in front yards.**

Fred Resch III shared that additional changes were made at the commission's request, including adding conditional use standards for ADUs in front yards. He also noted that staff addressed contradictory definitions, and after legal review, it was suggested that the item be tabled to make broader updates. Specifically, the definition of guesthouse/casita may no longer be necessary. Shelley Goodfellow asked how front setbacks are determined on flag lots and if they are necessary. Fred explained that from a zoning standpoint, front setbacks are primarily to ensure distance from streets for potential road expansion. He added that if the commission wishes, staff can propose amendments to clarify setbacks for flag lots. Mrs. Goodfellow commented that this issue will arise frequently, and if the setback requirements don't make sense, they shouldn't be enforced as-is. While she supports some setbacks, she felt the current 25-foot requirement is excessive. She also asked about the minimum 100-foot setback mentioned in the staff report. Mr. Resch clarified that the staff report wasn't updated and that the ordinance requires accessory buildings to meet the same setback standards as the primary residence. Mrs. Goodfellow asked if the definition allows for two ADUs on agricultural lots. Mr. Resch confirmed that Chapter 7 outlines the standards for having two ADUs. Amy Werrett asked about design requirements, and Mr. Resch explained that ADUs on lots 0.5 acres or smaller must be architecturally consistent with the primary residence, while larger agricultural lots do not have this restriction. Ralph Ballard raised concerns about fire turnaround space on flag lots, and Mr. Resch stated that all flag lots require a site plan approved by the JUC, which includes fire department review for turnaround space. Mr. Ballard emphasized that ADUs should not be built within designated fire turnaround areas.

*Shelley Goodfellow motioned to table LUCA25-06. Paul Farthing seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

Mark Sampson asked about the variance request mentioned by the commenter that was previously denied. Fred Resch explained that state law outlines five criteria for approving a variance, and the most common reason for denial is that the hardship or issue prompting the request cannot be self-imposed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. ZC25-10: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Zone Change Amendment request located at 235 N 1580 W, from RA-1, residential agriculture one unit per acre, to R1-10, single family residential one unit per 10,000 sqft. George Love, Applicant. Tim Scott, Agent.**

Tim Scott shared that George Love owns the property in question and is requesting a zone change to allow a lot line adjustment with the neighboring property owner, Scott Hughes. Mr. Hughes intends to purchase the portion of land, and the proposed lot line would follow the existing block wall that already divides the two properties. This adjustment would not create a new lot but would enlarge Mr. Hughes' property. Ralph Ballard asked what was preventing the adjustment. Fred Resch III explained that the RA zone requires a minimum of one acre per lot and dividing the property would result in one parcel being smaller than allowed, making it noncompliant with city requirements. Mr. Ballard asked if a third lot could be created with this zone change. Mr. Scott responded that it would be difficult to achieve, given the lot sizes. Mr. Ballard stated he had no issue with making one lot smaller and the other larger but felt creating an additional lot would be unfair to surrounding neighbors. Amy Werrett commented that the goal is not to eliminate agricultural zoning, but this property does not appear to be actively used for agriculture. Mr. Ballard noted that over time, these types of changes can reduce available agricultural land. Shelley Goodfellow stated that the request meets the four requirements for a zone change and the intent is simply to adjust property boundaries between neighbors, maintaining overall open space. She added that the requested zoning is consistent with adjacent properties. Michelle Smith asked about engineering comments. Mr. Resch explained that if the zone change were used to further subdivide the property, road improvements would be required, but for a simple lot line adjustment, they would not. Mr. Scott added that further subdivision would not be practical.

*Shelley Goodfellow motioned a recommendation of approval of ZC25-10 subject to staff and JUC comments. Ralph Ballard seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

**2. ZC25-12: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Zone Change Amendment request located at 184 N State Street from R1-10, residential one unit per 10,000 square feet, to RM-3, multi-family 15 units per acre. White Glove Construction-Kevin Hanson, Applicant.**

Kevin Hanson shared that his family has owned this property for 75–80 years. He explained that its location on State Street makes it less desirable for resale as a single-unit property but more viable as a multifamily development, which would also align with the general plan. Mark Sampson asked for clarification between RM-3 and RM-2 zoning. Fred Resch III explained that RM-2 allows for 10 units per acre, while RM-3 allows for 15 units per acre. Given the property size, the difference in total units may not be significant. Mr. Sampson then asked about the proposed type of housing. Mr. Hanson stated they are considering either 12 townhomes with a fire turnaround or up to 16 units to maximize the property's use. Shelley Goodfellow expressed concern that RM-3 could be too dense but noted that the request meets the four criteria for a zone change. She felt comfortable with RM-3 as long as it is not built out to the maximum 18 units allowed. Paul Farthing agreed with RM-2 but felt RM-3 would be too dense, warning that a full 18-unit buildout could require three-story structures, which may not fit the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Hanson noted that the neighboring development property elevation is already approximately 15 feet taller than this property. Michelle Smith asked about traffic circulation, specifically whether vehicles exiting onto 200 West would be able to cross the median or would be limited to turning right and making a U-turn. Mr. Hanson stated they had explored commercial use for the site, but limited ingress and egress make commercial development impractical. Ralph Ballard agreed with concerns over density, adding that the city is also trying to preserve highway commercial areas. Mr. Farthing emphasized that market demand will drive property value regardless of unit count. Mr. Hanson concluded by expressing his commitment to creating a development that is as attractive or better than the neighboring property to the south, aiming to make the site desirable for residents.

*Paul Farthing motioned to approve an RM-2 being more conducive and meeting the four criteria. Ralph Ballard seconded the motion.*

*Paul Farthing withdrew his motion*

*Shelley Goodfellow motioned to reopen the public hearing. Amy Werrett seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

Renee Thompson, who owns the property directly east of the proposed development, stated that she is not opposed to the project but she believes the number of units should be reduced. She expressed concerns about the area already feeling crowded, noting that there are currently 10 townhomes nearby and children often play in the street. She shared that one family in the area owns five vehicles, and the section of the street proposed for extension is frequently used for parking, including a trailer that is regularly parked there. She emphasized her desire to limit the development to fewer units and to prohibit three-story buildings, citing a lack of privacy as an existing issue. She also raised traffic concerns, asking whether vehicles exiting onto 200 North would be restricted to turning right and then making a U-turn or if they would reroute down 300 North. Additionally, she urged consideration of increased parking to accommodate the likely overflow onto surrounding streets.

Dory Tharp, who lives nearby, expressed concern about increased traffic on State Street and 200 North, noting that vehicles making U-turns at 300 North would likely slow traffic. She also shared safety concerns, explaining that she enjoys walking in the evenings but there are no sidewalks or streetlights in the area. Dory stated that she would prefer the development to be less dense.

*Paul Farthing motioned to close the public hearing. Ralph Ballard seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

Ralph Ballard suggested conducting a traffic study on SR-9 to explore ways to slow traffic, noting that when SR-9 was designed, it was modeled after St. George Boulevard, which doesn't suit the area. He asked about the widths of 200 North and 300 North. Jeremy Pickering responded that 200 North is a 66-foot roadway, while most of 300 North has been vacated. Mr. Ballard noted that 240 East was originally intended to connect developments, which could help address traffic issues for vehicles turning right onto SR-9 from 200 North.

*Paul Farthing motioned to approve ZC25-12 with the change of RM-3 to RM-2 based on the findings that the RM-3 is not compatible with the surrounding properties and the RM-3 will have an adverse affect on the area opposed to the RM-2. Shelley Goodfellow seconded the motion.*

Ralph Ballard asked if there was any way to move the buildings to the north and adjust the property on the south end to facilitate a turnaround, noting that traffic is one of the major concerns discussed and that having a turnaround on 200 N would be a significant benefit to the City by allowing vehicles to safely reverse direction on State Street. He asked if there was any legal way to make that happen if the developer was agreeable. Dayton Hall explained that if a zone change is granted, the development must comply with the standards of that zone, but conditions related to traffic flow improvements could be addressed through a development agreement. Kevin Hanson noted that the design already includes a modification at the corner of 200 N to allow for parking along the side of the road. He added that they would like to preserve the existing pecan trees and could tighten HOA parking restrictions if needed.

*Roll call on the motion. All ayes. Motion carries.*

### **Planning Commission Business:**

#### **1. Discussion on parking standards**

Fred Resch III shared a presentation, which is attached at the end of these minutes. Michelle Smith asked about the width of parking spaces. Mark Sampson inquired who typically performs parking and traffic studies. Mr. Resch responded that these are usually conducted by the project's engineer. Ralph Ballard noted the parking situation at the Eagles' old building and emphasized the need to be thoughtful when considering parking requirements.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

#### **1. August 8, 2024**

#### **2. November 11, 2024**

Minutes are actually November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

#### **3. May 22, 2025**

Amy Werrett hasn't worked at Valley Academy but worked with the applicant. Line 22

#### **4. August 14, 2025**

Kelby Iverson was absent only, minutes show he was present as well. Michelle Smith abstained from voting on the D&G item.

*Amy Werrett motioned to approve the minutes for August 8, 2024, November 14, 2024, May 22, 2025, and August 14, 2025 as amended. Shelley Goodfellow seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

*Paul Farthing motioned to adjourn the meeting. Michelle Smith seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

**Adjournment at 7:32PM**