

CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – December 2, 2025

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, December 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, Donald Boudreau – City Planner, Amber Ray – Planner
Faith Kenfield – Executive Assistant

Others in attendance: Tyler Melling, Dallas Buckner

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

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

I. REGULAR ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes (dated November 25, 2025) (Approval)

Hitz motions to approve the minutes from the September 16th meeting; Davis seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

2. PUBLIC HEARING
Annexation Petition
(Recommendation) 3000 North 400 West GO Civil Engineering/
Brindley

Dallas Buckner: GO Civil. This is an annexation off of 3000 North. The blue that you see on there is the current city boundary. Then the red is what we're looking to annex. My client has two parcels right there. We're within the city's declaration boundary. The intersecting road is Northfield. I forgot what Northfield's number is, 400 West. That's pretty much it. It's a simple one.

Decker: Where is this.

Dallas: It's 3000 North and Northfield Road.

Jett: Up by the school garage.

Dallas: North of the school garage.

Lunt: He is planning to do what with this.

Dallas: We're planning to come through a zone change as this keeps progressing. We can stack the timeline a little bit. It's general plan for... Residential estates. I believe we're planning to do a zone change to commercial, to industrial, to light industrial, but it's at the extent of the airport zones.

Jett: They can't build residential.

Dallas: This field right here is what we're annexation, and then this is what's in the city. Everything north of 3000 for a small portion is zoned for residential estates, but this zone. I think it only allows one unit per five acres.

Jett: Is that because no utilities or something?

Dallas: No, it's because of the airport zones.

Jett: In that zone.

Dallas: Because that's the instrument zone. Well, the instrument zone and then. I forget what the zones are.

Dallas: There's the traffic or the approach zone, right?

Don: Yes, the approach zone would allow, to Dallas's point, one unit per five acres. That's basically due to aircraft operations.

Dallas: That's in this little triangle right here. Then the instrument zone, does it have the same requirements.

Don: If I recall correctly, there would be no housing in that area. It would be limited to commercial industrial type uses.

Jett: I'm going to ask you. Do we have any say in those, or is that just you want an airport, that's what you're going to do.

Don: Currently, that's the ordinance that we have. To be frank with you, I thought a lot of this was dictated by the FAA. It looks to be that we do have a little bit more say in what goes on. I know Read at the county is potentially working on some changes that he'd like the city to entertain, but there would still be restrictions. The idea is obviously there's nuisances associated with the airport. We want the airport to be able to be successful and operate freely without a lot of complaints. Then the other issue is, just a danger to the folks on the ground and the airplanes above.

Kent: With some of the discussions that we're in with the county and our airport director, and we've got one of our council members who's also been involved in those discussions with us. I anticipate that there will be some type of revision to these airport overlay zones that will be coming to you for your input and consideration.

Jett: Good. Thank you.

Lunt: I have a question for the good chairman. Was the school district still planning to move your bus garage? Somewhere out in that.

Webster: Yes. It'll just be where the school warehouse is now. Just two blocks west.

Lunt: We're just going to consolidate everything.

Dallas: As you zoom in, you can see the parcel areas. This line right here, everything's southeast of that. This would be eligible for one house per five acres, and our total area is 18. This is maybe five acres and some change. Then beyond that, there would be no residential allowance.

Lunt: That wouldn't make sense.

Dallas: That's why we're planning to come through probably in the coming weeks and start through Sketch and then Planning Commission as the annexation gets a little further along. To zone change both parcels to industrial.

Kent: You're looking at bringing it in initially as annex transition then, and then you'll request the appropriate zone.

Dallas: Does the city allow us to establish a zone with the annexation now.

Don: The way I read the ordinance, it prefers that method.

Dallas: Okay.

Don: You're on city council. tomorrow.

Kent: Probably we'd better just go through with the annexation for now.

Dallas: I know in the past it always had to come in annexation transition. We always did; annexation first and then zone change after. If that's changed then going forward.

Don: We can run them concurrently.

Dallas: I guess for now with the timeline we're on, we're just annexing. We plan to bring it in for industrial.

Webster: City, any concerns? What are your thoughts.

Don: No, I think we've been noticed properly. I believe this one even went to the county for approval.

Dallas: Yes.

Jett: Why is that?

Don: See where it says, the instrument I-A-Z, instrument approach zone there.

Jett: Yes.

Don: That's what the state code would define as a county peninsula, i.e. The county land is creating a peninsula of city land on three sides. We can't create or exacerbate that unless the county approves. This peninsula of city land created a peninsula. The math is a little convoluted in state code, but he's already been to the county to get that approval.

Jett: Okay, thank you. Every day I learn something new.

Decker: I just have a general question for Engineering and City Planning and legal, if possible. When these proposals come up to annex in, what are the pros and cons to annexing little spots here and there as far as cost to the city? Are there assets? Do we get some taxation off that? Or is that negative because we must take care of snow removal and all that stuff? Or does it just kind of X out? What are the pros and cons.

Kent: Well, certainly the more hodgepodge annexations are, the more expensive it is to provide services, right? It's always best if we can grow out in an organized fashion. However, in this case, the roadway along their frontage on 3000 North is already annexed into the city. It came in with the annexation of the property to the south of the roadway. This doesn't change anything with the roadway responsibilities that we would have. We already have those. We have some utilities that are existing, others that are planned, but that's all-in place. We know how this can be served with city utilities. There's not really a concern there.

Decker: Have there been some annexations in the last few years that have gone through that have really burdened the city or not too bad.

Don: Not that I'm aware of. I think Kent hit the point is one of the primary concerns is can we serve this? Can we adequately, especially from a public safety standpoint.

Decker: Sure.

Don: The utilities are there. The state kind of gives us some guidelines by telling us not to create county islands, not to create county peninsulas, unless it makes sense to do so. I don't see any major issues with this proposal.

Kent: We do have the water and sewer both there already. Thank you.

Davis: There are homes right there that we can see, and I know right where that's at. How does that affect homes? Does their opinion matter? We're talking about industrial. Is there a way to, to have it kind of conducive to.

Don: I think that's a good question. We're still quite rural out there. We have master plan for very low density now. With the airport overlay as it's currently written, it certainly restricts that residential capacity out there. With the zone change not following that general plan. I think when they do come in for a zone change, that is open for discussion if they want to go to industrial.

Don: How do we mitigate potential uses? I mean, what are we looking out there? I know they're not going to do a gravel yard, but we're going to talk about these things a little bit. Are we looking at noxious uses right next to residential? I think that's on the table with the general plan proposal.

Dallas: I think there is one thing you want to look at. The way that the city's general plan is laid out based on that airport zone is it puts almost everything in. If we look at the south side of 3000 where those houses are at. That purple is probably I&M-2.

Kent: Basically, it's light manufacturing.

Dallas: Everything, you see all that purple, that's all general planned for industrial. Then our argument for going to industrial is just saying that, hey, even though this is shown as residential estates or low-density residential. The city's ordinance doesn't allow us to build residential there anyways because of the. the airport zones, and so we were more so looking to just extend the purple through our site.

Don: Dallas, do you have any idea what kind of industrial they're looking to do there.

Dallas: I don't.

Don: I think that's key when you're trying to change a general plan. I mean, this is coming later.

Dallas: This property owner, as far as I know from other projects I've done with him, is a storage type. That's what his main business is.

Don: I think there's some going in next door there, if I'm not mistaken, right.

Dallas: On the previous question of does annexing these smaller parcels in and that kind of thing. This property as it currently sits is kind of like locked as not being able to be developed in any capacity.

Because as soon as we go in and try to pull a permit with the county. They're going to say you're adjacent to the city. You've got to go talk to the city and make sure you don't want to annex. They don't want you to annex, and then we come to the city, and the city says you're within the city's annexation declaration boundary. Even if there were, there's no imminent plans to do any development. It's more so, hey, if you want to do something here, the city's going to make you annex. Annexation takes six months-ish or longer. Then you've got to come through and zone change, and that takes a couple months. This is just forward thinking saying, hey, if I ever get a wild hare to develop here. I might as well have my ducks in a row and have it annexed and zoned.

Don: I certainly know, and I haven't read this in a while, and I don't want to question you, Dallas, but if they do a subdivision here. I think that's when the county pushes you to annex into the city. I'm not convinced that's the case on a building permit, but I could be mistaken.

Dallas: Yes, and you might be right, but to have a long, skinny 18 acre like that and not do some kind of subdivision when you have sewer and water at the front door is a little unusual. The main reason I wanted to just flip this on was just to show Jennifer that those houses are in future light industrial. Whether they know it or not.

Davis: Right, I just have to protect the homeowners. With the general plan right now is for a residential acre.

Dallas: Low density, which generally translates to residential estates.

Davis: Right, and the master plan.

Dallas: Then the city's ordinance says low density residential is fine and good, but you're in the airport zone. In the airport zone, you can only go as dense as one unit per five acres.

Jett: I'm going to ask a silly question, and I love dialogue. Is any of what they're going to potentially do with this germane to annexation or not annexation.

Don: I'm sorry, Tom, what was the question.

Jett: What the potential use of this property, could we factor that into our decision for annexation or non-annexation.

Don: You can consider factors in our annexation policy plan. It certainly talks about being able to serve the property. What is the character of the proposal? You can look at these things. It does meet the criteria, I think, to be annexed. I think maybe the zone change would be a different discussion.

Jett: That was more for future knowledge, if we could use that as part of our.

Don: It does say you should consider certain factors. I don't have them off the top of my head. You can bring it up, Ken, if you'd like. But there's kind of a laundry list we can look at.

Jett: I think it's important to know, to have some ideas. In the future, there might be some that are a little more controversial or something.

Lunt: I don't think people know that that's in that airport zone. Are going to want to buy five acres and build a ranch with your acreage. That's three lots, four lots, whatever. I just can't imagine people with that kind of foresight and money wanting to build a five-acre ranch underneath an airport unless they're in love with airplanes.

Dallas: Right, and then 3,000 also is a 75-foot master-planned road and right off the north exit. As things keep developing, that's going to be busy.

Lunt: I think you're looking forward.

Don: I think what you may see from the county, and Kent, tell me if I'm off base, is a proposal for higher density in these residential areas than the one per five. We're still not looking at townhomes or apartments. Again, that's a proposal.

Dallas: The other factor with this is just that 3000 North does have water and sewer in it, but the sewer is generally not very deep. It might be, but 3000 North is built up several feet, and then all the land falls off to the north. It's not, like this property would not be a great candidate for development. Because you can't sewer more than probably the front third of that. I wouldn't think without putting some kind of lift private. Which is another argument for more of an industrial where you don't have.

Decker: That's good to know.

Kent: Just kind of a FYI, this same zone that takes up most of the property they're talking about annexing, that's the airport overlay zone that we're in at the Diamante Industrial Subdivision on the south side of Highway 56. That ends up being a good use for property within that overlay.

Webster: Any other questions from the council.

Davis: Well, is it okay to talk about just annexing it but not changing the zoning currently.

Dallas: Our application is just for zone, for annexation.

Davis: It's just for annexation right now. You're just saying what you would like to do in the future.

Dallas: Correct, and we plan to come through with a zone change application.

Lunt: That way your neighbors and everybody out there, these homeowners, would come at that time and be able to put it.

Kent: As this has been advertised and as it is on your agenda, it really is just annexation. It would default to the annex transition, and then they'll need to request a zone in the future.

Davis: It would just be nice. I know you're thinking highest and best use, and I get it. I'm just hopeful that the homes that are in that area are rural. Not that everything remains rural, it doesn't, but if there's a way that we can look at a light industrial type of thing, you know, like you're talking about. Rather than a gravel pit or rather than something that's going to be noisy and annoying.

Dallas: Yeah, and that's the plan is just to basically, just because of the restrictions with the airport zone. Where everything's south of 3000 is already for light industrial, that's where we intend to come in for I&M-1.

Lunt: I would encourage you to maybe if these homeowners are outside the minimum requirement for notification. As a courtesy, go out to those homeowners that are.

Don: Yeah, any of those residents that are in the county would have received a notice.

Lunt: Okay.

Don: Once you get to the zone change, we can look at the general plan for guidance as an example. It does say in the I&M-1 we should consider buffering residential uses that are next door. Certainly, storage is a very benign use. As we'll talk about in just a little bit, the I and M1 zone is quite an open zone now. It could potentially allow for a lot of uses that a residential property would consider noxious.

Webster: Which sounds like it's a presentation for future days, is that right?

Don: I think that would be appropriate.

Webster: Does that work for you?

Davis: Yes. What, to do with the zone change.

Webster: Well, we'll just consider changing the zone change future and anything you wanted to attach to that, maybe that might be the time for it.

Davis: Yes, absolutely.

Open Public Hearing

Tyler Melling: Again, this is where my family's farm has been forever. It's just a little west of there. The airport really restricts just everything you can do. I guess it's the government's position that it's better that people die in an airplane crash if they're at work but not asleep in their beds. It's kind of weird. Industrial uses are fine, just not residential, whatever. No, the other issue that you run into is even if they didn't want to subdivide but wanted to build in the county, there's a dollar figure. I can't remember what it is. It's in the half million, three-quarter million range. If you're doing that much in capital improvements, you have to get the city's concept before the county will let you get a permit, even without subdividing. If you're within the city's declaration boundary, your hands are really tied. People build out there because it's rural. I don't think they paid attention to that they're in the middle of a master planned medium-density area or whether they're in the middle of a floodplain or anything else. Also, like Dallas said, the sewer is a major concern out there, too. Everything north of 3000 has to have a private lift station or extend all the way to Three Peaks Elementary with their sewer line. That isn't going to happen. Unless the city wants to buy the property, it needs to be in industrial use.

Close Public Hearing

Jett motions for a Positive Recommendation for the Annexation for 3000 North 400 West; Lunt seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

II. DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY

3. Ordinance Text Amendment

Ordinance 26-III-21 Pertaining to
Use Tables

Already at the inclination.

Don Boudreau: All right, thank you Chair, and members of the commission. This has been around the block a couple times. I think last time we talked about this, we had some folks from the audience that were doing a survey of sorts. We decided to punt this down the road until we got some feedback. I've reached out to those folks. They said they were going to get us some findings from their surveys, and I haven't heard anything. Here we are.

Burgess: Did they get some findings from the survey?

Don: I don't know. I haven't seen them. Before we go into this, I thought we might just take a quick look at the general plan and I'll try to be brief and not read all this verbatim, Kent could you go to the next slide. The general plan is full of goals and objectives. If you look at this first goal land use goal 9 1.7 it talks about regulating setbacks landscaping art appropriate lighting signs and other design amenities that complement and enhance the streetscape and design of new development through the zoning ordinance. When we go through these the general plan is in his name it's general. What implements these things that we worked a couple years on back in 2022 is the zoning ordinance. That's where the rubber meets the road so to speak. Next slide Kent, it talks about cultural and aesthetic enrichments or hallmarks of Cedar City. It says, these factors combine to produce a community identity that is often the envy of cities throughout Utah. When we were going through the general plan, I believe it was the chamber, they had done a survey that was called Vision 2050. It says they are not part of their many findings in this. This is just a snippet, but not the least of these was that Cedar City should focus on maintaining and improving community aesthetics in order to enhance its festival city and brand. Reestablish its reputation as the gateway to the parks. Next slide, Kent. It talks about identifying architectural and other visual qualities that will contribute to the understanding of the city's unique identity. It talks about identifying unique architectural design, natural features, land use activity, and other characteristics that are desirable for preservation. It certainly is one of these areas mentioned in the downtown core. It talks about in Goal 5.2 that we should develop design guidelines and development standards and ordinances as appropriate to protect the qualities within these areas that are valued by the citizens. Lastly, Goal here, 05.2.3, says allow for the consideration of alternative design and building materials where appropriate. That's kind of right where we're at. It's talking about the visual quality of the city is important, but we also shouldn't be too restrictive in what we're asking for. We're trying to find that balance here, I think. Next slide. It talks about area-specific opportunities, continuing the momentum of facade improvements, infill development, street trees, and high design standards. Then it specifically mentions a long historic Main Street, 200 North, and the Center Street corridors. Next slide. When going through those quickly, I'm kind of repeating myself, they're general. What do we have in the zoning ordinance currently that tries to implement these overarching goals and policies? In Section 26.4.16, the ordinance starts to break down building materials and what is required specifically along Main Street and 200 North. It uses these terms preferred building materials, preferred accent materials, and discouraged. Which doesn't give us a whole lot of guidance because it doesn't say required. It is required along Main Street and 200 North. If we replace preferred with required, these are the areas that we're focusing on. It talks about quarried stone, cultured stone, and full brick veneer. Composite lap siding, i.e. hardy plank. I don't care about having brand names in the zoning ordinance. I don't think they need to be there. Architectural concrete, colored CMU, and it goes on for accent materials. It talks about precast concrete, stucco or EIFS, and then it indicates only if the quality of the design merits such consideration. That is difficult for staff to deal with that kind of language.

Hitz: I have a question. How old is this ordinance.

Don: It's been around as long as I have.

Hitz: There's a chance that you contractors have better ways to afford some of these building materials that would still make it very appealing for what we're looking for.

Don: That's where we're trying to head. That's the whole point of the discussion. Prohibited materials, plane gray, flat CMU wall, brick tiles. I'm not convinced I know what a brick tile is. If anybody else does, let me know. Metal walls and wood or glass. Use this more than a functional purpose or as an accent material. There's some subjectivity in this ordinance as well that without a design review board or something along those lines, it is difficult for staff to enforce subjectivity. Next slide, Kent. I think if you look at the way the ordinance is written now. I think it's certainly pushing you towards more traditional materials. Again, these are just my opinions. I think the two buildings you see in front of you is what it's pushing builders to produce on Main Street and 200 North. You see the brick, you see the concrete accents, and the limited use of stucco. That bottom building would certainly be cultured stone, I imagine. I think that is the goal. Next slide, Kent. I think these are the types of things that the ordinance is saying we don't want to see on Main Street and 200 North. A corrugated metal building, I think that's great in an industrial zone. Mirrored glass buildings, there's another metal building, probably that one in the right-hand corner of your screen is probably what I might consider the overuse of stucco. That's what the ordinance is telling us we're trying to avoid on these streets.

Jett: May I ask, what is the concern with stucco? You used the term overuse. What is ours?

Don: I don't profess to be an architect, Tom. I think if you look at that building where it's completely stuck...

Jett: Just in California, everything is stuck.

Don: It's pushing you to use some rock, some stone, and place some visual interest in that building. A lot of cities will push much farther than we do as far as having offset plains and purchase and other types of materials. All we're doing is talking about the materials. I don't see that there's anything wrong with stucco. We're talking about the aesthetic impact of these structures.

Jett: Do we want, as a government, do we want to get that deep into people's architectural choices?

Don: Well, I think I've given you what the general plan says. I don't want to get into a political discussion.

Jett: This is more of a generalized question. This isn't directed toward you. It's directed toward the overall conversation. How deep do we want to get into one's personal business when it comes to what they consider architecturally pleasing.

Don: I think I answered that question.

Hitz: Well, architecturally pleasing is very subjective, but I think you've got to get into it deep enough to preserve the intent of what you want it to look like as a city.

Don: I think it's not just do I personally think this is a good-looking building or it is Mr. Melling or somebody else. It is also what the overall impact of what you want Cedar City to look like. Now, a trained architect may look at that glass building and think it is beautiful. Personally, I disagree, but I don't know, right? Is a New York-looking style building, is that the image of Cedar when we go through all those goals and policies in the general plan, right? The quality of what people see, and Dave's not here, our Economic Development Director, but it's also an economic development issue. If he or someone else, if they are trying to relocate, let's say to Cedar City, Southwest Utah. They're bringing their business here, their families here, probably trying to get their top dogs to come along with them, whoever they are, he or she may be. What they see does affect where they're going to put their money. It does. If they see a Main Street in St. George that is beautiful, it's tree-lined, it has X, Y, Z amenities, and then they see Cedar and they're competitive, where might they go? Those are considerations that businesses have.

Hitz: Of course. I mean, Old Town Fort Collins, I mean, it's an attraction. It's beautiful and old.

Don: We're a tourist city, too. These are important things, I think.

Kent: I think that part of this kind comes down to what Cedar City is known for? What do people think about when they think of driving through Cedar City? It's not the modern glass building. I personally think those buildings look pretty cool. That's just my own personal opinion. That's not the character of what you expect to see driving down the main drag of Cedar City. I can kind of see why the general plan would steer us away from that into something that more traditionally fits Cedar City. The same goes for stucco. When you're in, parts of California, that is the historical look of that community, right? That's much different than that type of treatment in Cedar City. What we're trying to kind of figure out is what makes sense for Cedar City. We have something right now in our ordinance. Is that what's best? Or does that need some adjustment.

Jett: I have no objection to some reasonable ideas and thoughts. I just want to see how far we want to go. Because there's places that will dictate you down to what color brick you're going to use.

Lunt: I think this discussion was about the time someone in the south end of town started building a lighthouse in Cedar City because that is foreign to this area.

Burgess: It shows how fickle everybody is because at first, they already hated it and now when you say you're going to tear it down everyone all of a sudden love it.

Lunt: It used to be an eyesore, and you couldn't have lights spinning and nobody was allowed inside, and they wanted to turn it into a restaurant, and meals and entertainment up there. Now it's an icon. What's good back then is not what is good now.

Jett: My only concern is in government dictating designs. I'm not color blind, but I call myself color irrelevant. I don't really care. Everybody, it used to be grays and then it was limes and then it was all these different colors and different shapes. That stuff changes so rapidly with the trends that we're that we're showing and, oh, I want to do this now. That's my only concern with how deep into the weeds we want to get because things constantly change. In 30 years from now, power bills may be so high that we want all glass buildings because they're all the glass made by Tesla and that's what operates the building for the energy. I mean, who knows.

Burgess: It's also not citywide. It's just certain streets that they want to look a certain way.

Jett" If we opened here, we have the crawl. Well, it worked for this, let's continue to crawl into more areas. In our discussions, in our minds, please keep in mind how far we want government to play that, how deep we want to get. It doesn't become limiting, but it doesn't become a ghetto.

Kent: I think one thing to, I guess where my mind kind of went as you were talking about that, Tom, is that.

Jett: Most people's mind just went off someplace else.

Kent: There are, I would say, in most areas of town, allowing things to follow architectural trends may not be a bad thing, right? What do we want along these main drags? Do we want these main drags following architectural trends, which ends up very much dating each facility along there as to what era it was built in? Or do we want to try to maintain some type of consistency in the ascetic, right? In my mind, that's kind of the question. If we want to try to keep some consistency in the ascetic. Is what we have now appropriate or is there something we can do to improve it.

Jett: In 97, this order was around before that. In 97, Steve Corey, Terry Jones, the Carter brothers built a beautiful glass story building at 337 South Main. Today, that building would not be allowed, but it wasn't allowed back then. We go to the extreme on the north end. We have Le Barre cabinets, and I don't think it's an unattractive building, but I think it's orange if I'm not mistaken. Does anybody know what I'm talking about? It's a straight metal building. Then we have a brand-new building that was built two years ago. It's not Imperial Window. Right next to the jail, directly. Elite door and window, that's a metal building. The ordinance existed then. Again, I don't think they're unattractive. I'm just wondering.

Burgess: Isn't that what we're trying to do, is try to spell out what takes away some of the ambiguity and gives the city kind of tools to enforce.

Don: I think that is part of it. Now, has it been completely enforced on some of those buildings in years past? Obviously, no.

Jett: I'm not throwing stones.

Don: No, no, I don't think you are. I'm just trying to answer that question while we have some.

Jett: We're thinking, this is before you, you know, a lot of these buildings.

Webster: We're too restrictive. Where are we too restrictive? I mean, I get the whole, it's ambiguous a little bit.

Don: Well, let's move forward a little bit, if you don't mind, Chair. Next slide, Kent. These are just some examples of different building materials. I through these in there. These are three different Walmart's, three different towns. I think they're all Utah, if I'm not mistaken. None of them are hours, but there is quite a, I think there's a stark difference in what you see here. Probably the one in the top right-hand corner, that's probably 90%, architectural block, CMU-type product. I think these other two, and this is my humble opinion, are a much better fit if it was on Main Street or 200 North.

Jett: Warmer than the top right.

Don: Anyways, next slide, Kent. I through these in for fun. I mean, architecture. I'm sure these are beautiful buildings, and I think they're all made by famous architects.

Lunt: They probably fit where they're built.

Don: I don't think it's Main and 200.

Lunt: I don't think that building from Las Vegas would. I don't know where you could put it in this valley that would fit other than the landfill. It would look good out of the landfill.

Don: You should be doing this presentation, I think. All right, next slide, Kent.

Jett: If we go back, go back to that one last picture of the you. Could that building with all that glass across the front, could that be on Main Street? Not under our current ordinance, no.

Lunt: There's a new one that looks similar to it right there on the corner of 300 West and Center, or 300 West and 200 South, that new music building.

Davis: It's not on Main.

Lunt: Yeah, it's not on Main, but it fits.

Decker: We don't have any say over what the university does, do we?

Lunt: Yeah, well, nobody does.

Decker: The building on 3rd West by the University, I think that's one of the ugliest buildings in town, and someone might think it's the coolest building in town.

Jett: I agree with you.

Lunt: You have those two buildings just across the street.

Decker: I don't want to tell somebody why they can't build it within reason. The architectural design to me doesn't matter anywhere near as much as. I don't want to say this. Some of the garbage I see around, some of the rentals that are just kind of thrown together. I don't know how we would regulate that. I don't know. I've built houses where I have not liked what the owner put on the outside, but they wanted it, so far enough. I agree with Tom. I'm not sure how much government wants to be involved here. Tough deal. There are homes in this town that I like. There was a home up on the hill that people highly criticized on Leigh Hill because of the color they didn't like it. I didn't like it either, but far enough. I didn't have a problem with it. I don't know how much you do want to get involved. That's an interesting conundrum, isn't it.

Burgess: Luckily, Utah past their own legislation for residential homes. It kind of prevented cities from cracking down too much on any of this kind of stuff. It doesn't apply to historic districts or commercial buildings.

Decker: Say that again.

Burgess: House Bill 1003 prevents cities from mandating certain architectural materials or colors for residential.

Decker: And residential? Okay, thank you.

Davis: I get that. We don't want to come in and regulate everything. We do want, like these guys have said, we do want the Main Street to look nice and presentable. Because that's where people come in and they're willing to stay, willing to put money down on something, willing to move their businesses here and provide jobs and things like that. We have several companies that have relocated their employees here because of Cedar City. It's not just because of Main Street, but it's because of everything. It's the complete package.

Decker: I think every style of building, well, maybe not every style, but almost every style of building can look nice. I think Elite Door and Window is a great-looking building. I really like it, even though it's a steal building.

Lunt: It's functional for them.

Decker: Absolutely.

Lunt: They built for their needs, not for what their neighbors need.

Decker: All the graphics placed across the street, rainbow, is that what it is? That's a good-looking building. I like those buildings. I don't know. That's an interesting deal.

Don: It is tough. I admit.

Decker: I appreciate what Maverick did. We didn't like what they were doing. They came back with a change and said, what do you want? They said, well, you'd like this. and they said, okay, and they did it. Even though I'm opposed to Maverick being there, they did a great job with it. We made the best of it. It's good stuff.

Burgess: I think it looks fantastic.

Decker: It looks like a good-looking building.

Don: I think that Maverick's a good example.

Decker: It's going to take me six months to get used to not going to the 800 West, but it's a good-looking building. It's going to be fine.

Burgess: One example, though, is the hotel that we're doing the Hampton Inn. Otherwise, we would have just followed the Hampton prototype, and it would have been all stucco. I'm glad that we had it to the brick. I think it looks nice. I think it fits.

Lunt: It's going to look better. It blends in. It welcomes people to our community.

Decker: Good point.

Lunt: This thing in Las Vegas, can you imagine something like that on Main Street? People get off and say, holy, those people are insane. I'm going to fill with gas and I'm out of here.

Decker: I can't imagine any local where that fits in. I mean, urban gets away with a lot more.

Lunt: San Francisco and Las Vegas.

Decker: I spend a lot of time in Vegas. I can't think of a place in Vegas I'd like to see that. That's just me.

Lunt: The landfill.

Decker: The landfill is a good point.

Webster: I do agree with Jennifer, though, that charm plays a role in the city. If you drive throughout Utah and go through certain little cities, you're like, okay, it's charming here. I like it. Others you go through and, like, it feels.

Kent: I look at that Las Vegas photo, and the main thing I think when I look at that is, I'm just glad our climate doesn't allow for those upside-down toilet bowl brushes that line the street right there.

Don: You were right. You don't like the day palms.

Kent: Those toilet bowl brushes, yeah, I'm not real fond of those as a decoration.

Don: I'm not a big fan of palms either, but those are, like, the best-looking ones. Okay. The day palms. Let's do the next slide, if you guys don't mind. We've had some input from Mr. Melling. We spun our wheels as staff, too, in consideration of trying to think about what makes the most sense. The first thing we thought is we should get rid of this preferred and discouraged kind of language. Either we're asking for something or we're not. What we ended up with, and staff is not married to this, that's why we're here is permitted building materials. We have our traditional materials, quarried stone, cultured stone, full brick veneer, and composite lap siding. We struck hardy planks, architectural concrete, or stucco with recessed panels and reveal lines. Then there's no perfect magic number here, but we thought we'd start with 60%. We would not have a complete stucco box. Aluminum composite.

Jett: The building can be up to 60%.

Don: Yes, it would be up to 60% as we wrote this. I think we all recognize that stucco is a desired material to use. There's no doubt about it. A complete stucco building, I don't think, is Cedar City. Then we threw this in, and staff has kind of enforced it this way, other materials that emulate the permitted materials. There are new products coming online every day. Something that's superior, better, potentially cheaper. Our thought is, if the intent is the aesthetic impact of these materials. If we have a different material that achieves that intent, and Randall's not here. I can say intent today all I want, then we thought that would be appropriate. We changed accent materials to permitted materials at no more than 25% of the facade, precast concrete, which certainly we'd like to see downtown as accent, glass accents, except for mirror glass, wood, metal walls, colored architectural block, and other materials that emulate these materials. We kind of went down that same road. There can be, I think you mentioned, the sign company, and their name is escaping me. They have some metal. There's no doubt they're using it. We've seen some come in where they do use some corrugated metal as an accent. It's not the full building. It doesn't look like it belongs in an industrial zone. That can work quite well. Prohibited materials is your plain gray, flat-faced CMU, vinyl siding, obviously plywood siding, and mirrored glass. The one that Mr. Melling may want to speak to under the prohibited materials would be the aluminum composite. I'm not super familiar with those materials. Then if you go down one row there, Kent, and you guys feel free to jump in any time. We're trying to give some better guidance for staff here a little bit. What we say is when we're looking at these plans, if they come by our desk, that we would look at it on one plane. Let's say a commercial building had a porch and they've got columns and those columns are wrapped in brick or stone or something like that. We're not pushing in beyond that. We're just looking at it on one plain and do the percentages that way. That the fronts shall mean the elevation facing the streets where it's applicable. For the first 30 feet of any side, like the way it's written now. We would not be looking at people's storefront windows like glass. People need their storefront windows. We landed on you had at least two of these materials. Down to letter C, I think.

Kent: Hey, Don, can I ask you a question on B2? My question on that, we had a lot of discussion on that dance studio out in the Fiddler's Canyon area. The way this is written that side that is exposed to Main Street. That's not the front of the building, are we saying that the material requirements would not apply.

Don: Well, if I wrote this correctly, in my opinion, it would be the elevation that is facing Main Street. Now, if it's not clear, we've got to make it clear.

Amber: Also, the applicable streets, and we're talking just about Main Street and 200 North to 56.

Kent: Okay. Because when I read that, I thought, well, the street that it front's on, so to speak, is that local street to the east of it. Maybe there's some clarification.

Don: Yeah, there certainly could be. No doubt. No doubt we could use some clarification. This is my opinion, I think the material requirements become even more important when we get between 200 North and 200 South, where we it's the last remaining of our historic core. We tightened it a little bit. This isn't perfect by any means. We should probably run this by our downtown economic committee. Where we landed today was permeability materials are limited to quarried stone, cultured stone, full brick, veneer, and composite lap siding. Other materials may be used at no more than 25%. Then we thought the entire building should be treated as such. That would just be this narrow corridor where we're sitting right now. I think a more traditional look without writing lofty language that you should meet the character of the neighborhood, which is difficult to do. We're trying to tighten that strike zone, so to speak, right in this historic area. I'm not saying this is perfect by any means. Then lastly, I don't want to beat folks up. I don't want to beat folks up that are rehabbing an existing building that doesn't comply. If you're fixing up your stucco or you're stripping it off and putting new and it doesn't comply. I don't want staff to be in the business of chasing those. That's where we're at. It's open to the commission. I know Melling got some comments for sure.

Jett: Just one final thought, then I'll shut up.

Hitz: Yeah, because I have to run, but I think this is quite phenomenal, something that's really needed, and I like the way you've couched the wording. I think the intent is right where we want to go, so hats off.

Webster: I agree.

Jett: It's good. I just want to, one quick, keep one thing in mind, and Jace is directed toward Jace. Because Jace and his family do a lot of building. Make sure the building they can do off Main Street. I'm just picking on you because you're building a new building right now. There won't be a significant cost difference enough, assuming he chooses to go fewer premium materials. There won't be a cost difference enough on the overall project. Well, I'm trying to rent mine and get a return, and he won't have a problem renting his and get a return, if that makes any sense, what I'm trying to say.

Davis: It does.

Jett: It's not directed towards your building. You're just building a new one.

Amber: I think, correct me if I'm wrong, but Mr. Melling did go over that with your group of people, of doing some cost comparisons and things of is it even logical to try to produce these things like that. You can clear that up, but I did see that in your notes.

Tyler Melling: We have a few different people and different trades that we've ran things by. I think we're close to where this needs to be. It's hard to tell someone if you have property. We're developing a few different areas of Main right now. It's hard to tell a business owner, sorry, you can't be on Main Street. The city doesn't want you there because you can't pay the price to have it look the way Cedar City wants you to have it look, right? That's a hard conversation to have. I think if you don't want metal buildings, there are some businesses that you're just not going to have anymore. That's why we have elected officials. They get to make the decision on whose rights matter more than others. That's how it works. I think it's good to revisit this and look at some of the things we have. I appreciate Don working on this because we're close. I think opening stucco up to 60% is a huge savings. Because you can do a lot of nice things where you're using Stucco to infill. We have wind, and when we do have precipitation, it falls hard and it falls at an angle, and stucco is very good at. Generally, as long as they do the flashing right, it's very good at preventing moisture from entering the building, right? A lot more than a lot of types of siding or other materials. Opening aluminum composite, which is a premium product. It's certainly not cost savings, but it's a nice accent. They make it look like wood. They make it look like metal panels. They make it to look like siding. There's a lot of things that can be used for. I think opening it up and because a lot of people, if you have an architect that's not familiar with working with the city. They may

not know, oh, you know, this is the city's practice as long as it looks like this, right? They may take a look at something and say, oh, well, if these materials look like these other things, then that really helps a lot. I think also specifying that lap siding doesn't necessarily mean hardy plank. I can't think of any commercial applications we'd be using it on right now. You're seeing in saddleback a lot of, now I'm planking on it, LP siding is being used in lieu of the old vinyl siding. It's more traditional than vinyl siding, but it's a better look, and it's generally a little cheaper than hardy board. One of the things I would like to touch on, though, that I think would help a lot on the architectural side. Because in practice, it's on this page that B2, where frontage will mean the elevation facing the streets and the first 30 feet of any side. A lot of times, if you have an architectural wrap, you're not going 30 feet, right? You're going between 8 and 15, generally, depending on the size of your column. Whatever you're doing, you're going to want it to match up to that point, and then maybe you're going to use another primary material, like for certain hotels, maybe they do have more of a stucco type of look. We see that a lot with hotels, again, because of the water issues and some other stuff.

Lunt: How do you classify the new sizzler in your new building? Because underneath that facade, they're stucco buildings, aren't they? As I saw them go up, it looked like stucco, and then you put the brick veneer on them. I think they look fantastic.

Tyler: Yeah, and for this, it would be classified by what you see. The veneer, right? Even though there's a green coat underneath.

Burgess: There is a layer between the building and the veneer that's so protective.

Lunt: When I was there going up, I thought, stucco, holy moly. What are the Burgesses doing? Then they put the veneer on it, and I said, I know exactly what they're doing.

Tyler: Yeah, and a lot of times, even if you do leave a stucco layer with that synthetic coat, you have a lot more options now than you used to. I grew up in San Antonio where everything was masonry because you could exploit illegal labor at below minimum wage. It was a lot cheaper to build everything out of full-block masonry, right? It just depends on where you're at. Here, we don't do that as much, so it is a lot more expensive to do full-block masonry. You'll do a veneer instead, but I think we're close. Our company would love to see this work through the process sooner than later just because we're still working on lease negotiations with different mix of local companies and national chains that are looking at the North Main area, but we can't lock in rates. As it stands because as the ordinance says right now, it is about a 5% cost difference on their lease rate. If it has to be primarily masonry or otherwise look like the building, we just did for Starbucks and Johnny Mac's. We would like to have a similar style, but if we could use a little bit more stucco and lap siding It certainly lowers the cost drastically, and 5% on a lease rate is a big difference for a small company.

Jett: One quick silly question. Does this apply to all four sides of the building?

Tyler: Well, that's what we were getting at with this is it's just the side fronting main. You're going to want it to match architecturally, but that would be my only critique of that B2 is you're also looking at the first 30 feet on either side as you come off the street. Architecturally, that might be harder to match because a lot of times your wrap on a column or a projection only is 8 to 15 feet. I would like to maybe see that closer to, say, 10 feet. Again, if you have the Main Street face look a certain way, you're going to roughly match that, but especially on whatever wrap you're using for that corner. It would be nice to start with whatever other material you're using. Generally, in a lot of them, it would probably be primarily stucco with some other lap or other siding accents, but you may exceed 60% off that main street.

Jett: I'd like to see the sides to be allowed to not have any of the requirements and just strictly stucco in the front. That faces the 200 or faces Main Street. Because people aren't looking at the side of the building. They're looking at the front of the building.

Webster: I do agree more with you to wrap it a little, maybe not 30 feet.

Burgess: 30 feet almost seems like it would be weirder in 10.

Tyler: It is weird.

Burgess: It's like not enough to be like the whole thing, but it just stops. 10 is still part of the front.

Jett: Just rap it five feet around the front then.

Don: It depends on the depth of your structure. What oblique angle you may be sitting at.

Jett: That would be my, everything else I think is great. Sorry if I sound like I've opposed everything. I just want to know what we're trying to think of ourselves because we're still a relatively conservative community. We want to limit too much government. I would like to see it maybe five feet on the sides, maybe even, and zero on the rear, of course, because then the only.

Tyler: The lower that side wrap, the more architectural freedom you have to make the wrap look natural.

Jett: Right.

Tyler: The wider it is, the harder you're going to be trying to shove that square nail into the circular hole.

Jett: Is five feet within the.

Tyler: I think anything less than about eight feet, you're going to no longer restrict the architectural decisions. Because you're just going to wrap it in a way that looks more natural. Right. I think even five feet is great. I can't think of any applications where you're not going to have some kind of return to match the style because for weatherproofing and everything else, it just makes sense. Depending on the types of projections you're doing, 30 feet kind of.

Jett: Those who aren't building commercial buildings are involved. Everybody thinks landlords are rich. Well, they can be, but they take a huge financial risk and enslave themselves for a long time with debt. No one's out here guaranteeing that we're going to be able to rent our buildings out or get a return significant enough to carry us through. I think we need to show a certain level of respect to the people that are willing to take the risk.

Kent: I have a question, Tyler, for you, if you don't mind. On that question of the 30 feet and you saying maybe something less makes more sense. We don't want the idea that, well, there's just this sharp corner right at the corner of the building and we're going to have one material that comes right to this point and then another going the other way, right? We want some kind of corner treatment that makes sense, that helps pull it all together. Is there a way to accomplish that without trying to specify a minimum number of feet? Is there something in the industry that makes sense that says, this treatment must match this, and I don't know what that's called.

Tyler: Yeah, depending on what you're using, a projection rap, a column rap, I'm not an architect. I think what Don has tried to state here gets really close to that. I think really what you do is if you state this and you just have a lower number of feet extension. Then the architect because we must use architects for any commercial jobs anyway. Then the architect has the freedom to do whatever makes sense with that application that's still going to make sense. Because at the end of the day their stamp on it they don't want it to look ugly. They're going to want it to match. For example, the Starbucks building we ran into a little bit of a hiccup Don was good to work with us on it. We had some metal paneling that didn't match the ordinance, it looked nice. Then we looked at an alternate product and at the end of the day we just said screw it we're going to use hardy board and that's what we did

Jett: Rather than put our planter in, because every time in the past, it's always, oh, you're a design professional. We need to give the planner, if something doesn't quite work, some authority because they don't like. You've seen it. Hey, look, we follow the rules. This is what the ordinance says, and don't ask me to because I don't want to lose my job or be criticized or favoritism. Or maybe we need to give the planner some authority, and then if it doesn't work, the developer can go directly. Without going through planning commission directly to that the city council asked for a variance on that type of material.

Tyler: There are a couple things that I think help in this that weren't in place a year ago, or maybe it was a little over a year ago that we were getting permitting for that. One of those changes would be to shorten the amount of the return because the return made sense, but then that metal paneling started within 30 feet, right? Because you don't usually have a rap that goes 30 feet back. I think it went back to maybe 15, and we picked up another 15 of that metal paneling, which was exclusively prohibited. It would now be allowed. In addition to that, it does say that staff can approve other materials that look like the permitted materials. We've now added enough permitted materials. We've factored in, I think, just about every architectural style.

Jett: We are giving staff a little bit of leeway then.

Tyler: Yes, I think.

Jett: Is there an appeal.

Tyler: I mean, we could always appeal stuff, but nobody has time for that.

Don: You can always appeal, certainly on something like this, if Melling and I are arm wrestling about this. Does this emulate something, you can always appeal that decision to the Board of Adjustments.

Tyler: Right. At the end of the day, I mean, if you're waiting on a permit, I mean, for us, we were in the penalties stage of permitting because we had tenants that we owed to as well. We just had to move forward.

Jett: They can feel comfortable given some, I'm going to use the word, variance. without sinking the developer.

Tyler: Right, I think this new language gives a lot more breadth to that. I think we ran this by several people in our office and in the trades that we work with, and this encompasses just about everything that we're looking at. We do have another site that is much more difficult to develop, much less desirable for development. We can't command the same rent, and that one's still going to be tough. It's going to be tough with any design standards because really that location, the only thing that pencils out is a metal shed, right? Cedar doesn't want that on Main Street. We'll just have to find something else that'll work.

Webster: If you changed B2 from 30 to what would make you happy.

Tyler: I think the lower the better. It's like lot widths, right? The city changed lot widths a year and a half, two years ago. In R21, it's now 50 feet. I don't know of anyone who's doing 50 feet, right? We saw a lot of lots at 70 feet when the minimum was 70. Now that the minimum is 50, we're seeing a lot of them at like 55 to 65.

Don: Your setbacks impact that.

Tyler: Right, your setbacks impact that. There are other restraints, right? If you see everybody trying to meet the minimum, then your minimum maybe isn't set the right way. I would think the same for this. 30 feet is going to create some wonky architectural decisions. I think if you set it at something like 5, you're almost never going to see 5. You're going to see something between 8 and 15, maybe more. It allows more architectural flexibility.

Don: It does. Do keep in mind that the ordinance, let's say we have a brick facade on the front. It doesn't say you must continue brick 30 feet. You would certainly want some return to make it look right. It does say you have to use one of these other materials. Or it could be brick or other materials. We're not dictating the length of a wrap, so to speak, but we are dictating the materials applied in that 30 feet. That's the difference.

Tyler: Right, I would just think if you have it lower, you're going to get a better work product than at 30. I don't know what the magic number is. It's certainly higher than 5. I'm not sure anything over 15 is going to have the result you want. Whatever you decide on that. That's fine.

Webster: That would be 10.

Tyler: I think 10 is also safe.

Don: 10 always sounds official. If I'm hearing direction from the commission, it seems like the commission would like to entertain less than 30. That is what I'm hearing.

Davis: Yeah.

Don: I see a lot of heads nodding, so. We can certainly return something.

Jett: Would he entertain five? Something like that. Then if the developer needs it more, then that's up to them.

Tyler: In practice, you're going to get most of them 8 to 15. For any kind of column or projection, you'll see it at 8 to 15 feet generally.

Burgess: I don't want to say 10 and have the 8 to 15 already cut at the knees.

Tyler: Because OSB comes in 4 by 8 sheets, right? Right. That's why 8 feet is a nice, if you're going to set a minimum, 8 would probably be the highest I would like to go. Because you do have some, that's another several sheets of OSB that have to be cut. The minute you go above 8, you might as well go to 16.

Webster: What do you want?

Tyler: I'm not an architect.

Jett: I said 5 feet. 5 feet. Then a few. Go ahead. If people need more, they need more.

Tyler: I think five feet would be nice. In most situations, eight is going to be cheaper than five.

Burgess: As a minimum, if you say five, you're only going to see eight. I still would rather that than ten when now you can't do eight. One other thing, and Melling touched it a little bit with the LP siding but think back 20 years ago and go into your grandma's house and look at the linoleum flooring and you just think to yourself, vinyl flooring is the worst stuff on earth. Fast forward and almost every single building you see has any kind of cheap flooring, it is vinyl planks now and they look fantastic. We're going to see the same thing in vinyl siding in the next few years we're already starting to see it. I'm a little hesitant on the previous page to have vinyl in there. At the same time, I think you need to say something because if you just allow any vinyl there's some hideous terrible vinyl out there. There's also kind of like what LP is to hardy board um there are some luxury look luxury vinyl planks right now. That you could put up that would look better than LP even. It's just tough to kind of get into the weeds.

Don: That's why we're trying to keep that emulate.

Tyler: Don, do you think maybe on that permitted, if instead of composite lap siding, we just said lap siding.

Burgess: Like wood or metal grain lap siding, something that's not just going to allow just flat, smooth. That's what I'm saying is a lot of vinyl now has wood grain and looks nice.

Tyler: Granted, with a lot of the vinyl siding now, I think you're right, Jace. Like in a commercial application, if we were building a property that we were going to own and be a landlord for, we probably wouldn't do vinyl siding today, right? If we wanted that look and something a little more durable, we'd do an LP product or a Hardy product or something like that.

Don: How durable? You can educate me.

Burgess: I haven't used it yet, but it seems like the new stuff's durable.

Jett: It's attractive.

Burgess: It's only getting better because they're starting to realize, there's some value in creating a manufactured product that looks real and looks legit but also nearly indestructible. I think that's where vinyl fighting is going to end up. I'm not positive because I haven't used it yet.

Tyler: I agree. In 10 years, it's going to be a different story. We already see that with fencing, right? Vinyl fences today are completely different than vinyl fences 20 years ago.

Burgess: Now they cost about as much as blocks. Yeah.

Tyler: Maybe we would.

Burgess: Like Tyler said, I'm not using it, so it's not restricted to me to have that word in there. I'm just thinking, like, in a few years, we're probably going to see it more. We can also change that when it happens. Yeah.

Don: Well, as staff, I think we've got some decent directions here. We can bring something back. I think we'd probably be looking at the first part of January and try to get a recommendation out of this. I mean, Tyler and I could talk. I'd still like to talk a little bit more about that composite aluminum. I think that's how we wrote it.

Tyler: Yes, ACM.

Lunt: Are we taking the rough edges off this, and eventually the city council will.

Don: I think it's ready to bring back to you guys in some shape or form here.

Tyler: We would love to see that because we would love to. I was just talking to Kent a couple weeks ago. We're working on submitting a master sight plan for everything between that new Starbucks and Western Ag credit.

Don: I think my only small hesitation is what we've changed for the downtown core. I'll talk to Dave tomorrow and see if they're having a meeting this December.

Jett: Well, if it's not going to affect, we're not asking to make any changes to our downtown core.

Don: The way its written, its more restrictive than what it was.

Jett: In our downtown core.

Don: That's the way I crafted it.

Jett: Okay.

Don: We're kind of loosening it.

Jett: Thank you for clarifying that.

Don: I don't want to speak for them. I think most of them would like the more traditional, the brick, the concrete, et cetera. If we are making it more restrictive, it would be nice to have some input from them. If they have a meeting in December. I'll get it in front of them for some comments.

Tyler: I think, Don, with the downtown, what you've put in here pretty much matches all of the recent projects downtown. Except for maybe what we see in some of the older buildings, there is stucco on that backside. Maybe that's something.

Don: There it is. I would imagine the new hotel wouldn't quite meet this either. With the amount of stucco utilized on the hotel. The hotel looks nice. I'll try to make that effort and see what we come up with.

Webster: That works for you then. You feel like you can, regress a little bit?

Don: Oh, yeah. I think we've got good direction, and I do want to see what, if I can get some input from the folks.

Webster: Well, I think based upon what Tyler said, as well, sooner rather than later is better.

Kent: I will say if there isn't a meeting with the downtown folks we can get in in December. Then we probably need to push far enough into January so that we can meet with them before bringing it to you. Fair enough.

Jett: Or we could separate that part the downtown part.

Don: If you take out more restrictive, my concern for the downtown folks is the opposite.

Jett: No, I'm saying separate, take the downtown section out and make that two different areas. We don't put any limitations or slow down potential development.

Tyler: Maybe if I could suggest maybe the schedule. This comes back to Planning Commission, first cycle, because I know because of the public notice requirement. If it came back to Planning Commission first cycle of January and went, sometime before it went to Council for a decision. It also went to that downtown board just to look at that one paragraph. Then we may still be able to get on. I think the key

would be getting it on the second cycle of January for Council's agenda. They won't be deciding until the last Wednesday of January. That way, our timeline's good, but then you'll have time to also get with downtown before then.

Don: We'll see if we can herd all those cats into a box.

Jett: If we do get it with city council, if we do get it with planning commission, if we could schedule on the closest city council work meeting there is. It could be like go today and then the meeting would be tomorrow, that type of situation.

Tyler: I know many on the council have already expressed interest in looking at this. It's just a matter of what it is when it's all done. I appreciate all your work on this and the time you've all spent tonight on this.

Webster: Good, thank you. We appreciate your work. Enjoy the night. Speaking of timelines, my hourglass runs out in about two minutes. Can we punt, how big of a discussion do we need to have on that?

Don: It can be super quick.

Jett: Or we cannot and wait for the other members to come that might have some input.

Don: That's true. That's a good point.

Jett: It's hard this time of year because parties and activities. I know you said we're sure to it, but we weren't planning on having it.

Webster: Well, this was a good discussion. I think this is the kind of discussion we need to have when we have the time and the inclination to think about it. We are all running out of inclination. Anyway, let's push that one. Maybe we can put it on, keep moving it.

Lunt: All right. I think you've done great on this.

Webster: I love it.

Lunt: These things, the materials and stuff. You've put in some time and thought. I think it's going to work.

Don: Amber had a lot to do with this, too.

Lunt: It's going to make the city inviting people. That's what it's all about.

Don: If nobody likes it, it's Amber's. If we like her, she does good.

Webster: Awesome. Thank you, everybody.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Faith Kenfield
Faith Kenfield, Executive Assistant