

Erda Planning Commission Minutes

10/28/2025 – 7:00 pm

Erda City Office-Fire Station

Call to Order

1. Roll Call

- a. Planning Commissioners: Kathleen Mallis, Michael Jensen, Nancy Martin, Chase Bawden, Mark Gull, Russ Brimley
- b. Jennifer Poole-City Recorder, Jessilyn Stagg-Dept Clerk, Via Zoom-Rachelle Custer-City Planner
- c. Absent and Excused :Mike Higgins

2. Pledge and Prayer

- a. Nancy led the Pledge of Allegiance
- b. Russell led the prayer

3. Approve Minutes from 10-14-25

- a. Michael motioned to approve the meeting minutes from 10-14-25, Nancy seconded the motion
- b. Voting was unanimous to approve the minutes from 10-14-25
- c. **Minutes from 10-14-25 Approved**

4. Public Comment (3 minute limit per comment)

- a. Brooks Pitt- I wanted to make a comment on the auto shop part. I don't think they should be in the neighborhood. You should zone other places commercial or light industrial. I just don't think they belong in RR-1. It changes the character of the neighborhood.
- b. Bryan- I want to comment on auto, it has nothing to do with the Devores at all. It has to do with my personal neighbors. I have a wrecking yard. I came here last week and it was packed. I went home and listened. I agree with Mike last week that we need someone enforcing the rules that is not a councilman. We need someone who can do this that isn't volunteering their time. I love Scott, but he's a busy man and doing his best. I know you've talked about codes but how are these going to be enforced? Who

is going to enforce them? We are understaffed and this doesn't happen until it gets bad.

c. Russell-Closed Public Comment

5. Proposed Text Amendment Jennie DeVore is requesting a code text amendment to allow for automotive repair as a home based business in the RR-1 zoning district.

- a. Nancy- Where we don't have an automotive on RR-1 would we add this to RR-5 as well?
- b. Russ- We can add that as well to the RR-5.
- c. Nancy- I think the percentages would need to be changed in an RR-1 to fit the size of the lot, or it won't work. My thoughts on this would be to not allow it in a subdivision. But to have this use it has to be on a collector road, it would not be so noisy as you have the road noise anyway. People are worried about the garage. I don't see you using your primary garage to have a business out of it.
- d. Michael- If I hear you Nancy, you wouldn't support this unless it was in an accessory dwelling, behind a 6ft fence.
- e. Nancy- I think it would need to be a shop with no dwelling in it.
- f. Michael- If you are saying nothing in a garage in a primary residence, it really is an accessory garage. And limiting the amount of vehicles they are allowed to have at a time. The comment that was made this evening that maybe we are putting the cart before the horse. That until we have a real enforcement officer maybe we don't do this.
- g. Mark- We can make that as part of the recommendation, that we don't approve this until we have better checks and balances on this.
- h. Kathleen- As part of the business license renewal process aren't there inspections required?
- i. Jennifer- Yes, there is a fire inspection that is required. But he looks for his regulations being met, not the city's.
- j. Michael- Also we have some homes that are in RR-1 that are only 1/2acre lots.
- k. Chase- I missed were hours of operations discussed?
- l. Mark- I think we were following city code, and additional regulations on the CUP.
- m. Nancy- I would like these to not be in subdivisions, and only on collector roads.
- n. Michael- In new subdivisions if they have HOA's they can regulate this. Let me ask Bryan a question. If we had a regulation officer that could help us keep those codes that we've discussed would you have a problem with this?
- o. Bryan- No, not at all.
- p. Mark- I think that some of these ideas make sense. I understand why having it on a collector road would make sense. But I don't want to make it so others can't use their property as we've discussed. But I think all of the conditions could be made when the applicant comes before us for the

conditional use permit. I just don't want to limit others on a 1 acre lot who could do this.

- q. Nancy- I do think we need to have a commercial fee, I don't think it's right that those businesses only pay a residential tax and no commercial tax. I think they should have to pay a percentage of commercial tax.
- r. Mike- We have a lot of parts covered. Where we are lacking is lighting. Body work, there is going to be a need to do welding. Occasionally there will need to be welding done.
- s. Chase- I am a proponent of personal property rights. I don't want eye sores. Is 4 cars going to be enough? What if they are all behind a fence? But really none of this matters if we don't have code enforcement.
- t. Mark- I agree with what you are saying and that can be a part of the recommendation. But in the end that's not part of our purview.
- u. Michael- I like limiting the amount of employees. If you have more than that, more traffic and it's no longer a home business.
- v. Mark- Also do we want to limit what types of items can be worked on?
- w. Nancy- Read the current recommendations from the staff report. This says 2 waiting for repairs and 2 waiting to be picked up. This doesn't limit the amount of vehicles in the shop being actively worked on.
- x. Michael- I read some of the emails and one mentioned the general plan- and the definition of the RR-1 areas. The primary purpose is to maintain residential purposes. Not solely but the primary purpose. I bring this up to ask the question: do we want to limit what we can do with our 1 acre properties? I get the idea that if the mixed uses are done appropriately it can be a good thing. But we see out here in Erda a lot of enterprises going on that don't fit in keeping the residential purpose. The question is, are each of us comfortable with this being next to us? I think we can do this but it would need a paid code enforcement officer who can be unbiased.
- y. Mark- I have a couple of additional comments on what was given to us from Rachelle. A and B look good. On C I'd like to add that those vehicles need to be registered.
- z. Chase- So how many vehicles would it take to make a living on the property?
- aa. Michael- Should we say 10? Also it has to be behind a completely surrounded by a sight obscuring fence.
- bb. Mark- I'm making these notes for Rachelle to add to this then bring back to us.
- cc. Michael- I'd say no outside storage, And no more than 15% of the lot for work purposes. I think we are covering hours of operation and no vehicles over 10k GVW. I'd add no welding, metal fabrication , or body repair shops.
- dd. Mark- I'm saying I'd like to see all of this incorporated and then make this into a motion. I think Rachelle can use this and get it back to us.
- ee. Nancy- I'd like to see this in writing first. I think we need to have her write it up so we are in agreement as to what it's supposed to be.

ff. Michael- I propose we table this text amendment until the next meeting,
Mark seconded the motion

gg. Voting was unanimous to table this item until the next meeting.

hh. Item Tabled

ii. Mark- As we don't have a scheduled meeting in November we meet on
the third Tuesday Nov 18th.

jj. Commissioners agree to hold a meeting on Nov 18th.

6. **Proposed General Plan Amendment** Walters Ranch is requesting a general
plan land use element amendment for parcels 01-452-0-0003, 01-452-0-0008,
01-419-0-0006, 01-419-0-0042, 01-409-0-0003 from employment to medium
intensity residential to allow for a rezone to rural residential one acre lots

a. Russ- In the last meeting it was brought up about having other land
owners go into this so there wasn't an island.

b. Bryan- We did contact one of the owners and they stated that they are not
interested in changing. So we didn't contact the others. Staff
recommended that we leave a 16 acre section as MD. We are looking to
keep some of it MD and the road access and then do the RR-1.

c. Michael- If we are all in favor of 1 acre lots in Erda, then let's change the
plan to be medium residential.

d. Mark- I do see the recommendation of not making that area an island. I
am in a similar situation where if that's what the resident wants then let's
help make that happen.

e. Mike- I think you've covered it mostly.

f. Michael- Here would be my question. To do what I said would be to
propose a general plan amendment changing parcels 1,2,3,4,5 from
Employment to medium residential. So they can rezone it. So all
Rachelle's suggestion is to add those little pieces into the medium
residential.

g. Michael- Motioned to recommend to amend the general plan land use
element listed 014520008, 0141900006, 01419410042, 014090003 from
employment to medium intensity residential, Mark seconded the motion

**h. ROLL CALL VOTE: Chase-Yes, Mark-Yes, Russ-Yes, Nancy-Yes,
Michael-Yes, Kathleen-Yes, Mike-Yes**

**i. Favorable recommendation to the city council for this general plan
amendment.**

7. Comments from Commissioners

- a. Michael- Chairman will you get with either Clyde or Craig on how we could proceed on how we can make a recommendation for auto shops on 1 acre lots but needing a paid enforcement officer.

8. Adjournment

- a. Mark moved to adjourn the meeting, Russ seconded the motion
- b. Voting was unanimous to adjourn the meeting
- c. **Meeting adjourned**

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, Individuals needing special accommodations should contact Mark Gull @ 801-707-4355

Note: these minutes represent a summary of the meeting and are not intended to be verbatim.

Prepared by: Jennifer Poole, Erda City Recorder

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Planning Commission this 18th day of November, 2025.

ERDA

Nancy A. Martin

Nancy Martin, Planning Commission Vice-Chair

ATTEST:

Jennifer Poole
Jennifer Poole, City Recorder