

**Hurricane Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
April 11, 2024**

---

Minutes of the Hurricane City Planning Commission meeting held on April 11, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 147 N. 870 West Hurricane UT, 84737

**Members Present:** Mark Sampson, Paul Farthing, Shelley Goodfellow, Ralph Ballard, Rebecca Bronemann, Michelle Cloud, and Brad Winder.

**Members Excused:** Kelby Iverson

**Staff Present:** Planning Director Gary Cupp, City Planner Fred Resch III, Planning Technician Brienna Spencer, City Engineer Representative Jeremy Pickering, Power Representative Scott Hughes

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

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance led by Michelle Cloud

Prayer and/or thought by invitation by Shelley Goodfellow

Declaration of any conflicts of interest

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

**OLD BUSINESS**

**1. PP24-09: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary plat for Coral Junction Phase 1, a three-lot commercial subdivision located at 201 N Foothills Canyon Dr. MP 16 LLC - Derek Rowley, Applicant. Mike Bradshaw, Agent.**

Mike Bradshaw apologized they weren't here at the last meeting and appreciate the commission continuing them. They've had time to review and respond to staff comments. Their biggest concern is the comment about bringing the parcel to the north in this plat. They are not ready to plat that parcel yet as they are unsure what will happen with the commercial development. Right now, it is planned to be an RV park. Shelly Goodfellow questions making the motion being subject to staff and JUC comments where the applicant does not want to do what is being encouraged and she doesn't think they should have to. She feels it should be noted. Ralph Ballard asked about lots 2 and 3 sizes. Mr. Bradshaw shared that they made both lots equal in size. The site plan for lot 1 has already been approved and still meets the parking standards with this plat. Mr. Ballard is confused by the parking being discussed during the plat process.

*Rebecca Bronemann motioned to approve PP24-09 updated plat with the current changes to lots 2 & 3 with the exception of not adding the parcel to the North. Shelley Goodfellow seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

**NEW BUSINESS**

**1. 2023-PP-09: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of an extension of the preliminary plat approval for Sky Rim, a mixed-use development consisting of 15 single family lots, 129 Townhomes, 372 apartments, and six commercial buildings located at 3000 W State St. Brad Brown, Applicant.**

Fred Resch III shared that they have been working through the process as they work with neighbors about access and utilities. They have requested more time. He showed the commissioners on a map where this property is located. Ralph Ballard asked about the development agreement and how do the state changes affect this? Gary Cupp shared that the agreement is still binding and it doesn't affect it because it was entered into prior to state changes. Rebecca Bronemann asked about the comments of staff not recommending approval. Mr. Cupp explained this is just an extension and the comments don't apply as they were for the original plat application not the extension.

*Shelley Goodfellow motioned to grant the extension for 2023-PP-09. Paul Farthing seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

**Planning Commission Business:**

**1. Discussion on commercial kennel standards**

Fred Resch III shared that most of the changes are being changed in title 5. The Planning Commission doesn't need to make the recommendations. Mark Sampson asked what triggered the changes. Mr. Resch III shared that we are getting rid of the residential kennel license and this will get rid of the paperwork requirements by streamlining their process. Gary Cupp shared that the maximum number of dogs on a residential lot is still going to be four dogs, this will just get rid of the requirement for a second license to get the third and fourth dogs. There are other updates to title 5, but in title 10, the changes are to our use tables of where the kennel licenses are allowed. Mr. Resch III shared that the overall changes will make it clear when the police can do enforcement. Mr. Cupp mentioned that a commercial kennel is conditional use but there are no approval standards so we are adding those conditions of approval standards. Michelle Cloud asked if puppies are had, is there a number limit on that? Mr. Resch III stated that the dog limit only applies to dogs over 6 months. Mrs. Cloud asked why we have a commercial kennel as a conditional use and it isn't just a use? Mr. Cupp stated that commercial kennels are allowed in industrial zones because they are designed for more intense uses. Commercial kennels can have a lot of dogs, a lot of barking, a lot of noise, a lot of animal waste. In commercial zones it's less intensive and could be closer to residential zones so they would like them to be conditional for those reasons. We are adding to our condition's distances in commercial zones from residential zones. Mark Sampson asked if a pet store would need a conditional use permit. Mr. Cupp stated that they wouldn't be a kennel but could be pushing it. Rebecca Bronemann asked for clarification of increasing it from 3 to 4 dogs. Mr. Cupp stated the limit is already 4, but they would no longer need an additional permit for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> dogs. Shelley Goodfellow questioned that when we have a larger property with two accessory dwelling units and when the limit is four and if it is per family, per residence, per parcel? When her brother moved into her basement while building his house, he had two-four dogs and she had her dog and his son had a dog too. Mr. Cupp stated that it is per residential property. Mr. Resch III clarified that title 5 says per residence, which each unit would be classified as a residence. Mrs. Goodfellow thinks it should be clarified and looked at when allowing it per residence. Say you have two accessory units plus the main home, you could have up to twelve dogs on one parcel which is excessive. Mr. Cupp shared that the changes coming before the commission next time will be to title 10 which are the conditions of approval being proposed, the definitions, and the use tables. Mrs. Goodfellow thinks it should be four dogs per parcel, that's it. Mr. Sampson asked if the animal hospitals have kennel licenses? Mr. Resch explained that if the boarding is happening incidentally to the primary use, they don't need one. A kennel license is if that is the primary use. Ralph Ballard made suggestions about possibly adding restrictions that if they have more than x number of dogs that they have to be kept in at night to not disturb neighbors. Brad Winder is curious to know how many violations are causing people to go in and do the process of

applying for a kennel license. His big thing is that he doesn't know what difference it makes when you have one, two, three, or four dogs when you get coyotes coming through and get howling it'll cause the dogs to bark. It doesn't seem how many dogs there are, if they are in violation, they are in violation.

## **2. Discussion on the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Master Plan**

Gary Cupp shared with the commissioners why this is coming before them. This is due to growth in the city. Parks and recreation need to match the pace of growth and we are just trying to get ahead of it. It needs to be adopted by June for financial reasons. Shelley Goodfellow asked if the minor arterial roadways that are 90' right of ways include the paved trails as well? Jeremy Pickering shared that in our roadway design, minor arterial cross sections already have a 10' trails on them with an 8.5' landscape strip with 3 lanes. Some minor arterials have the possibility to be a 5-lane cross section and that is when we would be looking for additional right of way because they have the 5.5' landscape strip and a 5' sidewalk that would switch out the sidewalk for that trail. 5-lane minor arterial roadways are rare and as a general rule the 90' right of way includes the trail. Mrs. Goodfellow asked where the few minor arterial roadways are located. Mr. Pickering shared where those roadways are located based on our recent traffic study. The last time it was assessed was 2019 and the data they base it off of speculated to the year 2040 so that is what is guiding where we have specified 3-lane or 5-lane, but most of them are just 3-lanes. Mrs. Goodfellow asked if smaller master planned roads include the paved trails. Mr. Pickering shared that every major collector is already planned 3-lane and minor collector are planned 2-lane and those won't have the dedicated left turn lane except for when the development is required to have a traffic impact study. Acquiring additional right of ways is case by case and it is usually with developments adjacent to those roadways on whether it is needed or not. Mrs. Goodfellow asked if eminent domain can be expressed for trails? Fred Resch stated that it cannot be expressed on trails not adjacent to a roadway but it can be expressed if the trail is adjacent to one. Paul Farthing thinks trails are an amazing thing, but when they are trying to put trails into existing neighborhoods and express eminent domain for trails nobody wants, but he's not so inclined to take people's property for a trail. It was one thing when they wanted to do 1150 W with the certain width but now the width has grown because they want to add a trail through an existing neighborhood. Mrs. Goodfellow asked if trails ever turn into sidewalks. Mr. Farthing stated that if they ever do 1150 and get to 400 s, the trail is going to disappear anyways unless they want to cut into people's lawns. Mark Sampson asked how we compare to other cities. Mr. Cupp shared that we are behind in terms of trails and connectivity. St. George and Washington are a lot further along. Part of this plan is to get caught up. There are areas of the city you cannot get to except for by car so trails would be a huge benefit. Ralph Ballard mentioned keeping the trails in public view and not in people's backyards so law enforcement isn't harder to do. As we plan those trails, we need to keep that in mind so we don't run into issues farther down the road. There was a lot of back-and-forth discussion about trail locations and possible eminent domain for trails along master planned roadways.

## **3. Possible approval of canceling the previously scheduled May 9th, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.**

*Ralph Ballard motioned that due to the APA conference the May 9, 2024 meeting be cancelled. Rebecca Bronemann seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

*Paul Farthing motioned to adjourn. Ralph Ballard seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

## **Adjournment**