

CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – February 17, 2026

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, February 17, 2026, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City, Utah.

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

Members absent: Jennifer Davis,

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

Others in attendance: Chet Smith, Anne Clark, Darryl Brown, Paul Bittman, Steve Nelson, Cindy Laffoon, Carter Wilkey

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

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

I. REGULAR ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes (dated January 20th, 2026)
(Approval)

Lunt motions to approve the minutes from the January 20th meeting; Hitz seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

Annexation Petition
(Recommendation)

Lindsay Annexation
100 East 3000 North

Judy Lindsay / Rick Holman

Dan Roberts: We are wanting to join Cedar City and take the property out of the county. Right there on 3000 North on the corner. Those are Spencer Jones condos. This is west of Maverick.

Kent: For your information Planning Commissioners, the property line sits right here, and they did work with that property to close the gap. There will be no gap, and the annexation is also including the entire 3000 North right of way.

Jett: That gap belongs to no one at this point.

Kent: No, it does. After the annexation of the property to the south. They did a parcel line adjustment between those two. That’s why there’s a strip there that wasn’t annexed previously.

Jett: It just squares it up then.

Kent: This will clean it up there won’t be any gap anywhere around that.

Jett: All right.

Webster: Any thoughts from the city?

Kent: No, this one seems straightforward from my perspective. Don, do you have concerns?

Don: No concerns.

Webster: Alright no concerns from the city. Commission, any questions?

Decker: To me, this is one of those things that if the city's fine with it, I'm fine with it. It just seems like it's going to clean a lot of things up. I'm very comfortable with it.

Jett: What are you going to do with it?

Dan: Can't tell you.

Jett: You can, you just won't.

Dan: Whatever gets approved, I guess. Probably uh multi- use.

Webster: Any other questions before we go to the public hearing?

Open Public Hearing

Close Public Hearing

Jett motions for a Positive Recommendation on the Annexation of Item 2, the Lindsey Annexation at 100 East and 3000 North; Hitz seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

General Plan Amendment Low-Density Residential to Med-Density Residential (Recommendation)	1000 North 3900 West	Watson Engineering
---	----------------------	--------------------

4. PUBLIC HEARING

Zone Change AT to R-2-2 (Recommendation)	1000 North 3900 West	Watson Engineering
---	----------------------	--------------------

Darryl Brown: Watson Engineering, yes, I hope this one is also barely worth coming for. We've got this property,

Jett: Where are we at?

Darryl: We've got 3900 West. Right here along the east boundary. If you can see that, we've got Magnolia Fields.

Jett: Yes, okay now I know where we are.

Darryl: This is a this is a portion of uh CV Land and Livestock 22 about 22 acres. Currently it's annex transition zone and low density. We're proposing medium density and R-2-2 zoning. We're budding up right up against the south side of Magnolia Fields here. You can see we've got R 2-2 and Magnolia Fields along 3900 West, and then across the street and about kitty corner from our property, another R 2-2 zoned property.

Jett: What is Magnolia Fields zoned?

Darryl: R 2-1 and R 2-2. Here in the R 2-2 area, we've got twin homes. The developer who developed Magnolia Fields is also developing these 22 acres that we're proposing.

Jett: What is it master or general planned?

Darryl: Right now, it's uh general plan low-density.

Jett: That's one, that's R-1?

Darryl: We are proposing medium-density and R 2-2 zone.

Kent: General plan is showing low-density residential. R-2-2, the proposal is that it would be compatible with what is around it. That's why they're proposing the general plan change to the medium density.

Jett: Paul, you have a good memory. Was the Magnolia Fields adjacent to the south? Was it R-1, and then we changed it to R-2?

Don: I think that was the case. That's what I recall.

Jett: I'll tell you my problem is I struggle with going outside the general plan, and there's exceptions to every rule. There are exceptions, and I need to figure out what you can give me a reason for an exception?

Darryl: I don't know if I've a reason for an exception, but I'll talk a little bit about the product that he's wanting to put up there. He wants to do a twin home subdivision.

Jett: You said next to it is twin homes too?

Darryl: Correct, not necessarily. It's not contiguous to twin homes, but we're basically a lot away from twin homes. Up here in this R-2-2 area will all be twin homes. We're proposing twin homes down in these 22 acres. The developer's thought is that he wants to provide more affordable homes. That's one of the biggest reasons why he's proposing this and wanting to build a twin home subdivision.

Jett: Who's the developer?

Darryl: It's Premier Development Scott Faler.

Jett: He owns that property already or he's acquiring that property.

Darryl: He is in the process of acquiring it. Right now, it's under CV London Livestock.

Jett: Randall, this is a question for you, can we rezone someone else's property without them.

Don: We checked for their permission Tom, sorry Randall.

Randall: No, you're good. Um.

Don: We don't move forward unless we have the property owner's permission for the zone change.

Jett: Okay. All right. You're hedging your bets a little bit.

Randall: It's not an uncommon thing when someone is trying to purchase a property that they'll have that contingent upon a zone change. I'm assuming that is one of the contingencies in the sale.

Darryl: Correct.

Don: Tom, I share your concerns when we change the general plan. There are certainly pluses and minuses. If we go through the general plan goals and policies, upzoning does help us with our state housing plan. That's that's something we have told the state we would do. Not in every case where it doesn't make sense. We talked with Darrell and and who was the owner again?

Darryl: Scott Failer,

Don: We talked about maybe more of a mix and match. I don't want to speak for him.

Jett: What do you mean mix and match?

Don: Well, maybe some single family, as opposed to just a sea of twin homes or a sea of R-1. He'd mentioned there's some resistance when when you do that as far as marketing the homes. I can't speak to how true that is. It is not totally inconsistent with with some of the stuff that's being built out there. Staff's concerns, one, we want to make sure we have some internal circulation. We don't want to see this just a looped subdivision off that master plan road. We talked quite a bit about that, right Darryl?

Darryl: Correct.

Jett: Why?

Don: For transportation purposes, to try to get a grid out there. We are not continuously looping and forcing left-hand turns onto. Connectivity to the north with what he's already got going on. Then there were some discussions about the primary access road there off that master plan road. We try to alleviate some of the concerns that this proposal could propose.

Kent: The developer has been very open to the suggestions we've made on that. We feel like we're moving in a good direction.

Jett: Regarding the transportation portion.

Kent: Correct.

Webster: Commission, any other comments thoughts.

Decker: I'm not sure whether this is either here or there and I've shared this in the pastum. People come in quite often and say, we want to do twin homes, or we want to do high density housing because it's affordable. There's some truth to that. There's an awful lot of truth about the more units you can put on a piece of land, the more money the developer is going to make. I think that's the main motivation. I just sometimes cringe when I say we need more affordable housing. Well then let's build affordable homes, we don't have necessarily do twin homes or high-density housing. I've run a lot of cost breakdowns in my career. I know it's doable. I just I don't know it just makes me cringe. Sometimes when I say we need to put more houses on one piece of property to make it more affordable. Again, there's some truth to that I get it, but also that's just a means to for the developer to make more money. I'm glad people make money, but I think our responsibility is to the city and not to the developers here. I think we need to do what's best for the city. Whatever that may be.

Jett: Can you tell me the estimated square footage of the lots is being proposed, or is that too premature?

Darryl: No, I don't have that information off the top of my head. We'll at least have the minimum.

Jett: I think that's seven. Is that right, Randall? Seven thousand square feet?

Darryl: I don't know if it's.

Randall: Yeah, I'm double checking because it changed.

Jett: I think we changed it down to seven. Because it was nine.

Don: I think you're right Tom, I just don't want to give you an incorrect answer. We did change that not too long ago.

Randall: You're correct, seven thousand square feet. If you're aiming for twin homes.

Don: Then we've reduced the width too. Down to 50.

Jett: Okay, I remember that.

Don: You'll probably end up with a wider product just because of the setbacks that were not reduced,

Darryl: I want to say it's going to be closer to 8, 000 square feet.

Don: You almost need at least 35-40 feet on each side to make that work?

Webster: Any other questions from the commission?

Open Public Hearing

Ann Clark: No surprise here, I'm completely opposed to this. It's so interesting that we always say, well, you know, it's adjacent to something that's already there. It fits in if we use that line of thinking. We'll just then build on to more twin homes. Medium density is high density. I'm sorry. We need to follow the general plan. The other thing is, I'm sick of hearing the reason about the state. The state never gives you an amount. I would like the state to come out and say, a certain percentage of your population has to have enough high- density housing for them or a certain percentage of your housing. It's not with the state, it is never enough. They will want more, and we need to say no to the state. It's like this federal government's blackmail. On this piece right here to say that you know well, there's townhomes there, twin homes there. We can use that for every single piece of property to change the general plan. I say we stick with the general plan, and I agree with Wayne Decker. It's mostly for the developer to make more money. It may shave off a few thousand dollars for the consumer but not much. The thing that we need to do is make affordable housing, single family homes. Where we're not piling people on top of each other because. Soon, Cedar City is just going to be a sea of high-density housing. Go look at St. George. I was just down there. I just went, oh my gosh, it's getting worse. At some point we have to say no, enough is enough. Sorry to the developers, this was R-1. We're sticking with R-1, and I think if we said no to the

developers, honestly, they would come up with a way to make affordable single-family homes. I think they will, but they don't have to thank you. Or and we thank you,

Jett: Ann. We can flip that around, and you say sorry to the developers. You might want to say sorry to the people that can't buy a home here.

Ann: I believe, I think back to the first house I bought. It was a small little house. It didn't have granite countertops. It had none of that. We could build smaller houses with smaller lots, with less frills. If you want to call it that, there are upgrades. People could get into a house where they're not on top of each other.

Jett: Yep, and interest rates were 10% and the home was \$ 65, 000.

Ann: My first house was 14%.

Jett: Okay, and the house was \$ 65, 000?

Ann: No.

Jett: Well, I just know that it's we've got to figure out something.

Ann: The twin homes are \$ 350, 00, townhomes are at least starting at three hundred and fifty thousand.

Jett: Yeah, I get it.

Ann: If you, if we don't at some point, say to the state, Parowan said no. We're not going to do that. If we don't at some at some point, put our foot down and say, I am sorry to the developers and everyone else. I bet, if you say no, this is our one, then if they don't buy it, somebody else will buy it that will try to put it in, but we they don't ever have to do you see what I mean

Jett: Have you driven out there recently Anne? Have you driven?

Ann: No, I haven't.

Jett: Well, there is townhomes across the street, I think what are those townhomes? Or what are those homes twin homes across the street from.

Burgess: Magnolia? They're single family across the street.

Jett: On the other side of on the west side of Magnolia, aren't those twin homes.

Jett: No, those are all singles.

Ann: Tom, if we use the excuse, well, these are twin homes. Then we might as well change that lot next to it to twin homes. Well then, we might have changed the next lot to twin homes. Do you see what I mean? It never ends because you're always going to allow a change because whoever last built there built, R-3 or something like that.

Jett: Let me ask you a fair question. I'm being serious because this is an issue that's going to have to be addressed. Would you be saying the same thing if it was all modular homes in that subdivision? They're all single family, but they're all modular.

Ann: Oh, prefab homes you mean?

Jett: Yeah, prefab. Would you be?

Ann: To be honest with you, I think a single-family home that's prefab would be better than people being built on top of each other. I look at all these high-density housing. Just wait till a fire comes through there. I'm just telling you. I'm just saying we've got to at some point say to the developers. No, this is R-1. We stick with our general plan, and I understand Tom, there's always some exceptions. I get that. We can't just change the general plan because a developer says, hey, right by us are twin homes. We're just going to add twin homes down here. It'll all work out. See what I mean? Because then who's going to buy the next piece of property and wants to change it? Yeah. Anyway, thank you.

Webster: Thank you, Ann.

Don: If I could just clarify for a moment when we talk about the state. Their moderate-income housing plans, the state gives us a menu, so to speak, in the state code of options that we can pursue. I don't recall how many there are, but there's probably twenty maybe more. I think there's more than last year. Quite a

few years ago, we chose three options which are required by the state. The state says you shall do three of these things. Because of our history with looking at these higher density zone changes, That was proposed to the commission and council, and that was chosen as an option that we would demonstrate compliance with. It is not necessarily mandatory by the state that we do these things. This is something we told the state we would do. If the commission doesn't like those things. That's something we can revisit on what options the planning commission. Ultimately, the city council thinks we should pursue.

Jett: Could you bring those to us one of these days?

Don: I can. We can just certainly have an open discussion with it. Come this March, who knows what they're going to do with the housing plan? We just don't know. That's certainly something I can bring to you, and you guys can look at.

Webster: Can you pull up the master plan again or the general plan and, zoom out just a little so we can kind of see.

Kent: This is general plan you're seeing here.

Kent: This is low density, Residential. This is the medium density here. We've got medium density general plan for all of Magnolia. It's not all zoned R-2-2. Only the portion where the twin homes are. It's all general planned the medium density. Then we have the medium density over here just off 800 North and 3 900 West. They're proposing to extend the medium density down and zone to the R two. Does that help?

Webster: Yes. Up to the north of uh just south of sixteen hundred, that's equestrian, is that right?

Kent: Equestrian here, yes.

Webster: Then everything this way is high density, right? The yellow.

Kent: Then if I turn the zoning back on you have, the R-2-1 and the R-2-2.

Burgess: What's that orange just to the west of what we're talking about, the half the pivot?

Kent: Over here, that is annex transition zone with medium density residential.

Burgess: What about on the other half of the pivot?

Kent: Annex transition and high density residential.

Webster: There is opportunity out and around there.

Burgess: As the person who's usually the very pro developer when it comes to arguments. I do think when you make a master plan. You ideally want to put the high density within a buffer of medium density within outside of that. The low density and the fact that there's so much already out there that is zoned appropriately. My initial thought is to try to maintain as much as that kind of Utah shaped part of that pivot right there. As Stevie's property has a low density just because there's already so much to the side of it. That's all already higher density. This is a very small project, to me it's not the end of the world because it's not loads more. I agree with Ann that it makes it easier for the next piece to the south to kind of go the same way. Then suddenly, we have this weird strip in no man's land in the middle of medium density. That's supposed to be single or low density. Then it just makes the argument easier for that to once again when there already is so much higher density, especially a little bit further um to the west. I mean that that's a huge amount. Of high and medium density over there.

Don: The idea between those or the idea in 2022, and none of these ideas are ever perfect, is that we as the as the industry grew out there. We may need some higher density to try to support the jobs that might be generated out there.

Jett: Can we feather? Like what you've done at Magnolia.

Darryl: To answer your question, similar to?

Jett: Do you have twin up and toward the front portion? Multi- family toward a single family toward the rear.

Darryl: The proposal is all twin home lots in here. Can you clarify your question about feathering?

Jett: Like twin toward the front and singles toward the rear. Is that kind of what you did in Magnolia?

Darryl: I think that is what we did at Magnolia.

Jett: Yes, I'm just asking if that was ever a part of the conversation.

Darryl: Yes, it was.

Jett: They just don't see the economics of it

Darryl: Right?

Jett: Chairman, may I ask that if we have somebody from the public. If they can speak I can kind of here what other people's thoughts might be. If they if they have some.

Decker: It's already open for discussions.

Burgess: One of the things I'm just looking at is coming off 56. That is a much easier argument to make, I think for closer to the major roads to be to be considered. What's the zoning of that down closer to 56.

Kent: That's all county here.

Carter Wilkey: I was on the, you know I was part of that committee that redid the master plan. This one's a little bit different than normal. Normally, what you would do is you'd have your higher density closer to the main road, and you'd go lower density as you go away. In this situation where this is all I&M, and this is kind of what Don was just alluding to, where this is all I&M. We went in the opposite direction. We put the higher density next to the I&M, and then we went lower density going away from it. That's why this one's a little backwards from what you normally would see. Normally, it would make sense to have your higher density closer to the road. Then as you mentioned, you would feather it. Headed this way, but with I&M right here, you also want to put the higher density as close to the I&M as possible. That's how come it goes backwards in this one section. I don't know if that helps or adds to what you guys are talking about here. That's kind of where my only other thing is. Kent, where does this come in with our needing to get water down 3900 West in that whole area? We're already hurting and now we're adding. Because of Magnolia Fields phase 2 was what put us over the top.

Burgess: Didn't that already get ran?

Carter: Yes.

Kent: As I recall and someone else can correct me if I'm wrong. The direction we got from council was. To establish that reimbursement area but not hold up development. We are pursuing the project to try to get it built. We're just collecting the fee and keep letting people develop while we work to get the solution built.

Carter: I guess my question is whether it's R-2 or R-1 with that new pipe. It's not going to make a difference either way, right? We're going to size it enough that.

Kent: Correct. Once that gets looped up uh the water system will be fine either way.

Carter: We won't care, okay. Sounds good

Burgess: Can someone tell me where this Staley West stuff's happening right here?

Carter: Well, this is Staley owns this piece right here.

Burgess: Then the argument then is going to be made also, okay, they've got to have industrial right there. If I was going to develop it, I would think right above that green square of Staley's that would make more sense for a higher density to kind of be the buffer between industrial and our and low density.

Carter: Is that what he's doing right here? Is industrial? See that's not in the city. That's all-in county. We don't have any idea what's going on there.

Randall: That is what we were told.

Burgess: If you make the argument, you want the buffer between the industrial, you want the buffer from the main roads and the buffer.

Carter: This was industrial.

Burgess: There's not going to be any low density left here.

Carter: Well, going to what you're saying, I think Mr. Burgess. If you had industrial here, you could in theory say high density right here, medium density right here, and low density right there. It's this is this whole piece right here because of industrial here now industrial here. You're kind of in a conundrum in this little piece of the world.

Don: This one is complicated.

Carter: This one is, and then the other thing is too. It is low density. That's what he was talking about where it's not technically continuous because there is one road, half of a road of low density between the two.

Burgess: The R-2-1?

Carter: Yes, because the R-2-1 does a little.

Burgess: They're like they're all single family back there

Carter: Along that road as well.

Burgess: Outside of that one little rectangle.

Kent: Commissioners, if I could just add one other one other thought to what Mr. Wilkey mentioned. Part of what makes this higher density here makes sense. In addition to it being against the industrial is that there is the master planned minor arterial road that would come through here. That would be you know, along a major roadway in the future.

Burgess: That will probably make 3900 a little bit less busy also hopefully.

Jett: That would put access into this subdivision.

Burgess: The goal would have both at Mid Valley.

Darryl: How wide is a minor arterial? Is that 75?

Kent: Yes.

Darryl: 39 is the same.

Kent: Yes, 3900 West and 4500 West are both master planned as minor arterials.

Darryl: 75 feet wide.

Burgess: They're the same size it's not, 45's not bigger? They're similar. What was the shape again? Can we throw that picture back up?

Darryl: It's just a little, it's just a square rectangular, yeah right there.

Burgess: I'd prefer it if it was rectangular the other way to have longer.

Darryl: Main road frontage than back and kind of do like what they did and have some R-2-1, at least back behind.

Decker: Is there still a buffer between that and the Staley development, proposed Staley development?

Burgess: The rest of the CV farm is all right there.

Decker: How big is that area between the two?

Darryl: That's probably thirty-five acres.

Decker: Okay.

Darryl: Or more including this.

Decker: I misunderstood that.

Burgess: This at 69 acres in including that piece

Decker: That piece is how many acres?

Darryl: 22.

Decker: Approximately 40 acres?

Darryl: Yes. Single family portion of Magnolia is all medium density.

Decker: That changes the picture for me considerably considering that Staley development I didn't have my bearings straight on that.

Burgess: It's going to be hard for R-1 to thrive here. R-2-1 maybe, but you're surrounded by somewhat unappealing low-density.

Decker: Yeah, that changes the potential.

Lunt: What is to the east of 3900 to Lund Highway up? What is all that?

Burgess: That's all Schmidt new stuff, and it changed too.

Randall: Those multicolored ones you're talking about are Cedar 106, once known as Plum Creek. It starts with on its east side, higher commercial than high density to low density. It does the feathering you guys were talking about within itself.

Burgess: It also changed the road.

Don: It's changed three or four times.

Randall: We've done threading four development agreements on that one so far.

Burgess: There is a big part of low density, that big rectangle on the top. It's not part of that development, but behind it to the north is all still low density.

Don: I think we got two maps on there. It's hard for me.

Kent: That is currently zoned as annex transition general plan is low density, right.

Don: That t Cedar 106 is a poster child, so to speak, for that kind of feathering concept. It is very divisive. I mean it looks kind of stark on the map. Right? I'm not a big believer that all the high density we use as cannon fodder for our roads and industrial plants. I think for transportation wise and for jobs, some of that higher density makes sense. This one is a little bit more difficult. There's no perfect answer for some of these questions, whether that R-2-2 makes sense. My original suggestion was we could kind of mix and match this, do an R-2-2 and not just have a sea for 1 type of development. I think ideally, it'd be great to have some twin homes mixed with some smaller single family residential. My understanding is there's some resistance to that in the marketplace. Jennifer might know that better than I do. This is a difficult one to chew on.

Decker: Some resistance to what in the marketplace?

Don: Darryl, you correct me if I'm wrong. If there's, let's say on one side of the street, it's all twin homes or there's a mixture of twin and singles. Sometimes, the single-family folks, that's not the neighborhood they want to buy into, right?

Darryl: That's what he's experiencing.

Don: That's what I was told by the developer.

Burgess: That's why we did to our subdivision is just off the map to the south here. We have the stuff close to the highway commercial, higher density than as you get farther back. I mean ours are only R-2-1, not any R-1, but like they're all single-family homes. It feels like a low-density kind of feel to it.

Don: That's the townhomes, right?

Burgess: Even that like we did that development trying to go. They are affordable, like trying to reach kind of people that are being priced out of single-family homes. Those are also the people who have the hardest time getting approved for a loan also. It hasn't done as well as I'd rather probably sell houses to baby boomers than young families, because they can get loans.

Carter: One other thing, commission just remember. You're looking at two agenda items, but you're looking at them kind of together. They don't necessarily have to go together. Your medium density is also what would allow the R-2-1. Which is single family home, single home, smaller lot. In theory, you still have the option to change the density or the general plan portion of it, but not the zone portion of it. They are two separate different items just so you know. The medium density would also include R-2-1.

Burgess: I think the R-2-1 is universally liked. Because all the people like Ann saying, like we want single family, but maybe a little more affordable.

Carter: I think in today's market, the R-2-1 is probably the model that you're going to see a lot of developers move towards, or even smaller

Burgess: All of Iron West is that because of that reason gives us smaller lots.

Carter: That's what all the rest of Magnolia Fields is R-2-1. I just wanted to make sure you guys yeah clarification that there is two separate things there.

Decker: That's a good clarification, thank you.

Don: The R 21 is 7000 square foot lots and 50-foot widths. It was changed not too long ago as well.

Ann Clark: I just wanted to say one thing. Imagine that you have, and I realize that there's just a few of the R-1 houses. Imagine you came and you looked at that map and you said, Hey, but across the street from me or next to me or whatever is going to be an R-1. I'm okay because it's zoned R-1. Even though we have other high density around us, we will have R-1 houses, The problem here in this city is nobody can count on the city. I'm just going to say it. I've said it before, the man that bought across the street from me, kind of on the corner, I asked him, why did you buy here? He said because every time I went out with a realtor, there was an empty piece of land. They said, well, it's zoned R one or whatever, but you never can trust that it will be changed. I understand that we can say hey, it's mostly high density, so we might as well just make it high density. It might be more convenient. I always think of the people that are sitting there that are in R-1 houses that trusted the city when they zoned it R-1. Now, they're going to wake up with a big surprise one day. And that's all I'm saying. If we don't hold on to what we say we're going to do, there's a lot of lack of trust in it with the citizens in this city. Because they can't trust the general plan. They don't know what's going to happen. They think, hey, I think I'm safe and then you know suddenly, they voted you out. I'm just saying that when you think about this, I understand you're thinking about other people but think about the people that are already there too. What they thought when they were buying there. Thank you.

Burgess: That also includes the landowner who is going to get a lot of different prices for his land versus what the zoning is also.

Jett: You are saying that if, R-2 has a higher premium than R-1, R-2-1 okay.

Burgess: Per acre.

Webster: Well, despite it being in the county, the green portion is still mostly R-1, right?

Burgess: Until it becomes I&M-1 or I&M-2.

Webster: Any other thoughts? Don, any additional thoughts from you?

Don: I don't really have a whole lot more to add. I do think the R-2-1 could help us meet our housing if a little bit higher density. It would be consistent with what we've got going on to the north, and it would still be a single-family product. Which I think could meet the spirit of maybe the higher density R-1. That might be a suggestion for the commission to pursue here.

Decker: I'm open to change my mind, but I would right now be comfortable with R-2-1, but not with R-2-2.

Burgess: I would be comfortable with that, But I would also be more comfortable with R-2-2 if they flipped it, and it didn't go deep into this. We could keep that kind of middle ground as R-2-1 or R-1. Keep this stuff on the main road, which will be harder to do lower density anyway. I don't like the idea of it going deep into it and skinny. I'd rather go skinny along 3900.

Jett: Well said. So how far back are you proposing to do R-2 off 3900? How deep is that lot?

Burgess: Well, just in I don't know about that one, but even just looking at what they've already started there in Magnolia. I like the idea of Magnolia that skinnier strip. If you kind of continue that same idea on. Instead of way back. Then the bulk of the property in the back can end up being buffered lower density.

Jett: Are you proposing in your thinking that we'd just do a little sliver or the whole front would be R-2?

Burgess: I don't care if it goes all the way down across the whole thing. It probably would make sense just because of that main road, and it's just harder to do lower density stuff off there.

Lunt: You want to extend that west boundary of the R-2-2 and just bring it clear down to the Staley property.

Burgess: I honestly wouldn't care if it even matched Magnolia all the way down. Because you'll get single family homes in that lighter yellow in the R-2-1.

Decker: Isn't the only proposal before us to change from A-T to R-2-2? Our opinions may be nor here or there. The proposals to change or not to change. That's my understanding.

Don: I think we have to stick within, even if we follow that idea with the R-2-2 adjacent to the main road. We have to stick within the geography that is proposed tonight.

Jett: I'm real torn and I said my comments at the very beginning. I'm very much pro development, developers, and builders. That's the only way we can help hopefully bring down our prices a little bit is to supply. It goes back to my original comment that I struggle with changing without. You make some good arguments, and this body has made some good arguments. Carter's made some good arguments going up against industrial. The art is some kind of level of compromise. I see that kind of what and correct me if I'm speaking wrong. That's what some of the people are thinking, kind of split the baby a little bit. If we put high density in the front and put low density in the back. The low density is going up against unless I'm not understanding an industrial area.

Decker: There's just one proposal before us.

Jett: Yeah, I get that. I'm just saying this is.

Decker: Let's decide on this proposal or recommendation, not a decision. We don't make any decisions.

Jett: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to figure out.

Lunt: Sir, is your developer, talked about rotating that piece and going with the road? Or this is the only yes,

Darryl: Yes, that this portion that we're proposing is what CV is willing to sell. He's not willing to sell the frontage along 3900.

Burgess: I don't want to make too many assumptions, but my assumption on that point would be because he probably thinks there's a premium for the one on 3900 for even higher density.

Tom: Say that again.

Burgess: I don't know him. I don't know what his thoughts are, if this was my property and someone came and wanted to buy 20 acres. I would push them deep as well because I would look at the 3900 frontage as something I could continue to do more of higher density ongoing as well with the argument that it's on 3900. If he got approached to buy. It might have to do with were kind of, he's going to continue to farm in the meantime or other things. It could be a lot of things, but I would be thinking that it would be easier to rezone. The 3900, and then you could get this one part of R-2 because it's next to Magnolia. Then I could maybe later get more R-2, too, along 3900 because of its proximity to it.

Jett: How wide is that lot? I know it's about 1800 deep but how wide is it? Then you're the one you're looking at.

Darryl: Yes, it's five something. It's shown on the uh on the PDF.

Randall: Show it as 522 feet.

Hitz: The gentleman that owns this property owns that whole section. He's just willing only willing to sell the upper section that you're presenting.

Darryl: Yes, that is correct.

Jett: Mr. Bittman, you're our chief executive officer for the city. I want you to share some of our pain. Do you have any input?

Paul: I am glad to say, I am not member of the Planning Commission.

Burgess: Well spoken.

Webster: Is there anybody that would like to make a recommendation?

Hitz: Jace, I think if I understand you, Jace is that Ann's argument seems correct. It would just be a domino effect.

Burgess: That would be my, gut reaction. I'm not saying that's right, that's saying that would be my thinking. It might have just as much to do with where his pivots are and easier to keep. I'm not much of a farmer.

Jett: I just know that we have to figure out some way to balance the economy a little bit. We're not so high on our prices. I looked at the market very closely, and it's obscene what our market is.

Burgess: Part of that is the as a developer, the price of land is high, you almost have to get a higher density to make it worth even doing. This is a tough one for me. I'm not terribly opposed to this section being R-2-2. I would feel better if it matched the Magnolia as far as east and west. We're not cutting into that one section of low density in the middle that's still left.

Carter: The market will do that on its own.

Jett: Well, I get that.

Webster: You wipe out all your opportunity for low density.

Burgess: Correct.

Jett: We're trying, we're skewing the market sometimes and I'm trying to figure outlet the market naturally. Gravitate to a balancing point.

Cindy Lafoon: I live in Equestrian Point, and I've been there for 12 years, and I moved out there because it was rural. It was quarter acre, half acre, one acre, five acre lots. Now I'm getting high density all around me. We're becoming the island. I am not opposed to development. I understand that we need affordable housing. I think changing the general plan and changing zoning every time a developer comes in and wants to put high density. I don't think that's the answer to affordable housing.

Jett: Do you have an answer?

Cindy: As someone who's been there for over ten years. What do you say to the people that that moved into a rural area?

Jett: Completely agree with you.

Cindy: That we didn't have to have high density everywhere. Once you change the zone, then there's just going to be more. I'm torn because I know that we need some answers. I don't have those answers. If I did, I would clearly be the smartest person in the room, but I'm not. I don't know what the answer is to affordable housing. I don't think that just taking every available piece of dirt and putting apartments or high-density housing is the answer because that creates more problems down the road. In my opinion,

Jett: I know thousands of combined man and woman answers hours were put into this, read the master plan when we, when we did this in 2020-21, something like that and yeah.

Webster: To my way of thinking, the general plan or the master plan isn't against high density housing. It's just saying this is where we want it, and we want it away from here, and we want it away from here, and we want it away from here, and we want to be able to keep some of the feel of equestrian point.

Decker: Are we through with public hearing? I would like to move this along unless there's more public hearing.

Close Public Hearing

Jett motions for a Negative Recommendation for the General Plan Amendment change from Low Density to Medium Density; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

Jett motions for a Negative Recommendation for the Zone Change from AT to R-2-2; Decker seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

II. CITY ITEMS

5. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Adoption
(Recommendation)

Impact Fee Facilities Plan & Paul Bittmen/Fred Philpot
An Impact Fee Analysis

Jett: Mr. Chairman, I make a comment here. I spoke with Jennifer Davis, one of our members of the commission. She's home with the flu. This discussion. We're going to have tonight is going to alter our housing, alter our economics, and the potential affordability of our market. She asked if we could please table this issue. She could be here that I know there's some urgency on this issue, but I'm just out of courtesy to her. I felt I would pass on this. This message from her.

Decker: I would like to see that happen also.

Paul Bittman: There's a public hearing before the city council scheduled for March 4th. Bringing it to this body is required by statute to bring it here. You don't need to make a recommendation; you just need to hear it. If you want to table it. You'll miss your chance to hear it, and it's going to go to the council on March 4th, unless they delay that public hearing on their motion and send it back to you.

Webster: Since this is a public hearing, we go ahead with it. If we don't want to make a recommendation, it will still go to the city, and we'll still have allowed for a public hearing. What are your thoughts?

Randall? Does that work?

Randall: Yeah, that works. Jace was just asking a question with regards to whether you could still hold it. The planning commission could make a vote on the 3rd of March. You can, and we've done that where we've kind of expedited hearings. Just know the minutes, never make it to the council. While you may discuss it on the 3rd. The council will never get the details; they'll get if you discuss it heavily today.

Kent: We have our consultant that has been working with us on the impact fees on Zoom, Fred Philpot. Fred, do you want to go ahead and share your screen? Is that okay? You ready for us to go ahead and have him proceed?

Fred: Yes, I can do that. Can you guys hear me?

Kent: Yes.

Webster: I'm not opposed to not making a vote on it, but I think since we've planned to hear it, we can.

Fred Philpot: Alrighty. Yes, I've been assisting the city, going through the impact fee facilities plan and impact fee analysis. Let me jump back a little bit. The purpose of the impact fee is to identify impacts from new development activities. We need to identify system improvements and project improvements and ensure that the impact fee includes the cost. The proportional cost of system improvements in the calculation of the fee. There are specific definitions relative to some of the services that we look at for public safety and roadway facilities. Which we've followed relative to our analysis. The two main components that we've addressed are the impact fee facilities plan or IFP and the IFA. Which is the impact fee analysis or proportionate share analysis. The impact fee facilities plan is a process of whittling down essentially your entire list of capital improvement needs that is identified in a master plan and a capital facility plan or capital improvement plan. Identifying what growth is related and what we anticipate happening in the next 10-year window. Essentially, the impact fee act doesn't specify that we

have to look at a 10-year planning window. There is a requirement to expend impact fees within six years from the date they're collected. So based on that requirement. The standard of practice is to shorten that window for master planning or a capital facility plan that may look beyond a 10-year window and try to isolate what is needed in a relatively short planning window. In line with that requirement, to expend those funds within the appropriate timeframe. To do this, we have certain steps that we need to fulfill to ensure that we're complying with statute and case law. We have to look at your service area and demand, level of service. We need to look at existing facilities and excess capacity in the system. Identify future capital facility needs and then evaluate any financing strategies associated with existing facilities and future facilities. This is a graphic that illustrates essentially what the proportionate share analysis means. We're tying our evaluation to the demand variables that we're calculating. It needs to pass through the lens of that level of service, ensuring that we're maintaining the level of service. If there's anything identified that exceeds the level of service. We can show that, but it doesn't go into the calculation of a fee. Then we identify the relationship between existing and future facilities that are necessary to serve that demand. Again, that is, in essence, the foundation of this proportionate share analysis or impact fee calculation. Process wise, we must go through certain noticing, which the city has done in completion of the analysis. Then we present findings to staff, which we've done. To provide input from them ensuring that we're addressing things appropriately. Then we have the presentation in work session. Often, we will present draft findings for review in preparation for public hearing. There's specific noticing that's required to hold a public hearing. Then the city or MCT has the opportunity to hold a public hearing and act. The action that you can take is you can adopt the proposed fees, you can modify it lower than the proposed maximum, or you can reject impact fees altogether. If you adopt an increase to those fees, then there's a 90-day wait period before that becomes effective. We've looked at parks and recreation, public safety, both police and fire, stormwater, wastewater, culinary water and transportation for this analysis. As we look at those components. The service area is citywide, including future annexation areas. Our level of service is defined by each service that we're looking at. It's specific to transportation, culinary water etc. Our existing facilities and buy-in is also defined by each service and evaluating those system components. In addition, the future facilities were evaluated to determine what was needed. We worked directly with city staff to evaluate proposed capital improvements and ensure that we're allocating those to new development activity. Then again, all of that along with any financing. Outstanding debt or interest expense was evaluated and brought into that proportionate share analysis to determine our fees. Here is a summary of that. There's quite a bit of detail in the actual impact fee facilities plan and impact fee analysis that you can review. This provides you with a summary table. I will point out that for wastewater and culinary water, we kept that on a per ERU or Equivalent of one inch meter across the board. You're going to have different developments generated the requirement for different meter sizes, and that would be specific to the actual development. For parks and recreation, that is typically assessed to residential development only and not assessed uh to non-residential development. For fire and police as well as transportation, those fees are on a per. Thousand square foot basis for non-residential. For residential, it's typically on a per unit basis for those fees. You can see when we look at typically what we'll look at a single-family comparison and say, okay, what is our proposed fees? What is it going up to? You can see, there's a pretty hefty increase relative to what you currently assess. Now I will point out that I believe in a lot of these cases, in the previous impact fees. You did not adopt maximum impact fees at the time this study was done in 2020 and amendments later. This is purely a comparison of what you're charging now to what we're proposing as the maximum fee. On a single-family residential unit, 143% increase or an increase of \$12,000 and some change there. I also provided some comparisons here, just with some communities in southern Utah. Obviously, there's many communities that assess impact fees. I wanted to pull some that are larger communities that have uh all the fees that we're looking at

here. I will point out that St George has a power impact fee. They have more than the fees listed here. Trying to keep it from apples to apples. Again, if we have the proposed 20,891. St. George's is a little bit lower, Whereas Washington is a little bit higher when you look at the fees that they assess. Pretty similar fees across the board when we're compared to Washington, a good benchmark their relative to fee assessment. Showing to me essentially that we're not out of the realm of reality of where fees are at for some other communities. I would also point out St. George is going through an update to their impact fees to account for inflationary pressure that has happened since their last update. It's likely their fees will be going up from what is listed on this chart here. We're involved in that; we're helping them go through public safety and all the utilities to update the capital costs for their impact fee facilities plans. Because their costs have increased substantially since those fees were calculated. It's likely that I'll be seeing a jump here that will be more in line with what we're proposing for your community. That's a crash course. I'm happy to go back through any of the findings, address questions that you may have relative to legislation or the process or specific fees.

Webster: Thank you. Would you mind going back to the demand slide?

Fred: That slide?

Webster: Yes, is that suggesting that our existing would only cover half the demand in the future? Is that right?

Fred: This is purely illustrative. It is not proportional to things that we're calculating.

Webster: All right, perfect thank you. That's helpful.

Hitz: Could you go to the slide. This percentage changes across the board. That's what it's estimated to be with the new impact fees.

Fred: Yeah, and your non-residential will be different again. I just provided it. Assuming a one-inch meter so you can see like wastewater. Those are all the same fee culinary water. It's all just a one-inch meter. It'll vary based on. Whether they need a four-inch meter or six-inch meter, it's going to be that percentage is going to fluctuate.

Jett: I am a little confused on the one thousand per one thousand square feet.

Hitz: You have ten thousand square feet.

Fred: You multiply ten by building space building square footage.

Jett: Say that again.

Fred: For fire, police, and transportation it would be per thousand square feet of actual building space. If I was building a thousand square foot convenience center. It would be based on a thousand square feet as my unit. It's a fee per thousand square feet for those.

Jett: If I build a ten-thousand-square-foot warehouse.

Fred: Then you're ten units, and we'd apply the ratio of ten times.

Jett: One hundred sixty thousand.

Fred: No, because some of those fees depend on meter size. Some would depend like here, if I lived in transportation. It would be 10 times \$604 for transportation and 10 times the \$19 for police, and fire. The stormwater has to do with acreage and specific development type. Wastewater and culinary water on meter size. When you get into non-residential, it's a little more specific than residential. It will vary.

Hitz: It'd be nice to see some examples of various sizes, square foot wise.

Jett: If you have a 10,000 square foot building. I'm paying \$13,540 for stormwater.

Fred: Or the actual schedule.

Jett: Your charting is a little bit confusing to me, but I'm a simple minded individual.

Fred: Yeah, stormwater industrial, that fee is per thousand square feet. Yes, you'd have 10 times that.

Sorry, I misspoke on stormwater. That one is per thousand square feet based on the different land uses.

Jett: Which one is?

Fred: Stormwater the one you asked about.

Jett: It's per thousand square feet for the building? If I have a 10,000 square foot building, I'm paying \$13,540 in storm water?

Fred: Yes, that is correct. That's not uncommon. Most entities have a fee when they assess a fee; It is per demand unit and for fire, and police. It is typically per thousand square feet. For transportation, it's per thousand square feet of building space. Wastewater and culinary water are typically based on meter size and stormwater; that one does fluctuate where it may be on a per acre. Basis it could be on a runoff coefficient. In your case, it is a combination that we've looked at different land uses and applied a runoff coefficient that we could get out of value per thousand square feet assessment. It is quite typical for impact fees too, for non-residential to be much higher than residential because they are paying. Per thousand square feet based on their demand. It is tied to the demand variable that comes from those land uses.

Kent: If I could offer on the stormwater, that does depend also on how they handle their stormwater. We do have in our ordinance that if they completely handle their stormwater on site. They're not discharged off site at all. They're storing it all on site. Then there is no impact fee for the stormwater.

Jett: Permanent or slow discharge?

Kent: They're talking about permanently holding it on site. It depends on how that's being handled. We have cases where a portion of the impact fee is paid. Because they're able to handle some of the water and some they're not, and they're discharging it into city system. Some where it's all going into city system, they pay the full amount of the impact fee, whatever council chooses to adopt. Then we have some where they don't pay any stormwater impact fee. It just depends on the details of how they handle the stormwater for their project.

Jett: I have some property, it's Fort Cedar. I run into the irrigation canal; I'm not going into the city system.

Kent: That water eventually makes it into our master plan storm drainage facilities. Yes, if you're discharging into the irrigation, that's still going into our master plan facilities that the impact fees are designed to help us be able to fund to build.

Fred: I'll point out that your ordinance allows for consideration of data that a developer or builder can provide to the city that would suggest an alternative fee. This provides a schedule that the city can use to assess the fees. Then we also include a nonstandard formula that is utilized in the case where a developer comes in and says, hey, I think I'm different. My demands are going to be different. Here's the data and the city can consider that and adjust the fee to address those unique circumstances and treat uh.

Development on a case-by-case basis if necessary.

Lunt: Is there somebody that can go back to the last fee increase and tell me what was proposed and what was accepted? It seems like we're kicking part of this can down the road every time this is presented. I don't know anything about it. What was proposed and what was accepted?

Paul: The council, the last time the impact fees came up. They got a similar report, and it said, here's the maximum allowable fee you can impose pursuant. I think they took 10 percent, was it 10 or was it 20? They got the discount. If you move that forward, they changed that discount a few years ago for stormwater and fire. Kept the discount on everything else because they could see the stormwater, and the fire impact fees. We did an update in 2020-21 somewhere around there.

Fred: I also point out Paul that it doesn't necessarily kick the can to future development because the impact fee has to be proportionate. It can create potential challenges in your system if you don't maximize the impact fee. Then you must identify alternative funding mechanisms to help mitigate infrastructure needs. We can't then take any policy decision that creates maybe a deficit. Then put that on future development activity. That's not justified in the statute. That doesn't result in an increased fee

in the future. It just means you may have more deficiencies in your system that you have to mitigate with utility revenues or general fund dollars. It doesn't go on the backs of new development.

Paul: These system improvements are going to come. I'll give you a typical example of how we spend our impact fees for sewer, water, roads. We'll have a developer come in and propose a development. We'll say our minimum size of a water line is an eight-inch line that you have to put in to serve the development you're going to do. We want you to put in a 12-inch line because we need to feed more water there to serve the rest of our system. We pay that developer out of impact fees, the cost to make that line bigger. We do the same, we do similar stuff with sewer all the time. We currently have uh some very expensive uh impact fee eligible projects for sewer. On the west end of town, where all the industrial development's going in. Our sewer system doesn't just follow the boundaries of Cedar City; it goes out into the county and back into the city. When we upsize those lines that have to run through the county. We work with Iron County to figure out how we split that up, and we pay that developer to put a bigger line in. We've spent impact fees in the last few years looking for water, and that's been expensive. These impact fee projects are going to be here if we don't impose the impact fees as Fred alluded to. You can stretch your general fund dollars only so far, you can stretch your utility receipts. Only so far on that list, would the general fund go to fire police parks and recs. The other items on that list have utilities that cover them. Transportation's kind of screwy because it's normally C road funds that help cover that, but those dollars only go so far.

Jett: Paul, I suggested. I hope I'm not out of line with Paul Cousins. Paul was telling me that we have a and this is picking on the sheriff's department. As for this example. That is how far the sheriff's department is getting stretched by us, putting more subdivisions farther out of town. He says our sheriff's department needs more deputies because their areas just, they're getting spread, thinner. I suggested, I said, why don't we basically draw circles for night? I use the example for the city. We have a mile, five miles, ten miles, twenty miles. We have places again. I'm not picking on any place, but subdivisions out in West View. That are in the city next to the county and then in the city next to the county. We're sending our law enforcement out there farther. Law enforcement is just a metaphor for the water and the sewer and the and the roads and everything else that's going out there. Is there a way that we could draw a circle and then another sphere. Said, hey, if you're within this boundary, it's X with this Y, and with that Z. I think I did my ABCs right.

Paul: We don't really have any say on how the county chooses to develop. Some time ago Iron County chose to allow denser development. That's the road they've been going down for years, and they've incorporated their municipal service tax. Which was supposed to be paid by people that live outside the cities to offset the cost of municipal services that they need to provide to those people. I don't know if your concentric growth circles would solve the county's problems.

Jett: That's the word I was looking for. Well, I am talking about even for the city. Because we're spreading ourselves farther, but we have to go over county property to get to city property. Like 4B Ranch is an example.

Paul: Sure, that's not an unheard-of way to do growth. I don't know how you would do that now that we have growth everywhere. How do you rein it back in. I don't know how it plays into impact fees.

Jett: I just know that we're getting. Farther out of our center. I recognize as we grow, we're going to get farther out of our center. I think that there needs to be some place in the conversation to figure out. Because developers go out to the 4B area. Because the land's cheaper than buying it up in maybe up in Fiddlers or out there in South Mountain. It's because it's farther away so hey, I can get the property cheaper. Sometimes I feel that we are maybe passing those costs on to everybody else because the developers get the property cheaper out there.

Carter: He's asking, can you charge a higher impact fee if you live or if you develop further away?

Paul: You could set different impact fee areas. You could set up different impact fee areas where impact fees could be charged and they could be spent. I don't know what the analysis would look like to, necessarily say that those further out would be a higher impact fee. Cedar City has traditionally not limited where we can spend our impact fees in that manner. If you set those districts up, you can only spend what was generated in that district in that district. We've chosen not to do that. We've chosen to keep it flexible, so we can respond to where we need to use them to make our operations work.

Jett: I agree with you that that's important. These are just questions that I have.

Hitz: Have a question, Paul. We have a master plan and I'm new to the city. Is there a master plan budget that kind of goes hand in hand with the master plan?

Paul: Yes, each of those master plans that we do for our utilities we provide has a list of projects. At the bottom of it says, here's how much it's going to cost you, and the dollars of when we did this.

Hitz: Is there anyone that changes that budget master plan when we change the master plan?

Paul: When you say a budget for them, it's not a budget. It just shows you the cost. There's no money budgeted for that cost.

Hitz: I know semantics.

Paul: For stormwater our 2022 plan said, here's 90 million dollars of stuff you got to do to implement our plan. That was four years ago, I'm assuming that ninety is probably different now. We budget them as we go. We budget them as we can afford them. We budgeted them as we see growth happen, and we try to keep up with that growth area. All our master plans do have that analysis in them. They all change every seven to ten years when we redo them.

Jett: Paul, I don't want to pick on you.

Paul: Go ahead.

Jett: I know that these numbers are going to turn our housing into other than the high-end earners they are building their McMansions. I just looked at these numbers. I mean the other one has turned our housing upside down on its head. It's not staff's problem. I'm just saying that the economics of real estate. It's going to turn our housing market on its head when it comes to affordability of people trying to get started, be it a twin home or a single-family home. Paul, I don't know what to do. I'd hate to be in your seat because you're dealing with things that I can't even imagine that you have to think about.

Paul: One theory is that these projects are going to be built. If you don't have growth pay for the cost of growth. Then your general fund pays for it, and your ratepayers pay for it on the well.

Jett: We're damned if we use them if we don't.

Fred: Another item I'll bring up is we will often get comments relative to affordability, which is a concern. It's a statewide concern relative to housing, housing shortages, cost of housing and affordability. There are mechanisms to help with that as entities look to adopt strategies that help with moderate income, housing and affordability. As Paul's discussing, Impact fees are a mechanism to recoup the cost of infrastructure system improvements because of new growth, and future development. If you were to eliminate those fees, the counter question I guess is would the value or price of homes decrease?

Jett: Could you say that last part again? I'm hard to hear.

Paul: If you didn't do impact fees. Do you think the cost of a home comes down?

Jett: I don't think so, but the cost of a home inversely may not go up. I can't remember the exact number. I think I am correct. They said you eliminate for every thousand dollars a home goes up, you eliminate a certain percentage of the people that are being able to qualify for a home. Now, I know, there are different arguments that say, hey, if you give a discount, the developers are just going to get richer. Well, a friend of mine told me tonight. He said, if the markets in a hyperinflated market, they're probably right. If the market is a balanced market, probably no. They'll probably pass those costs on because it will figure out a balance point. I'm just afraid and I understand cost or cost or cost, but what did we tell the

person? This isn't your problem. This isn't our problem. This is a society problem. What do we tell the guy that, him and his wife just graduated from school and they're trying to buy home? They said, well, your cost just went up ten thousand bucks or twelve thousand bucks and sorry. I just don't know how to how to deal with these.

Fred: What I was just trying to highlight with that question, comment on the price of a home is as we look at affordability. I think legislators and city council's decision makers have challenges relative to determining affordability and what tools are available. As we look at impact fees, I guess we need to determine if we push or pull this lever. Does it address the issue of affordability? Or does it have to do more with market factors and appreciation or depreciation of property? Again, if you opt to make a reduction or adopt a reduction in fees, does it achieve the objective of affordability? In my experience, there's not as direct a connection between those two variables of impact fees and the price of the home. It's more the latter part you described, which is market conditions. To that end, I'll point out that. There are mechanisms to help with that. To look at your moderate-income housing strategies, you can reduce or waive impact fees for affordable housing initiatives. You can adjust on a case-by-case basis. Those might be better tools to promote affordability rather than wholesale reduction in impact fees, for example. Those are just things to think about. As we talk about impact fees and their impact on affordability.

Decker: Absolutely everything contributes to affordability. I have a concern with one of these slides. It was a concern I had years ago when impact fees were uh bumped up 127%, I believe that's right. I was very active in building homes, then and I was vehemently opposed to it. The one thing that just drives me nuts is when I say see something that says, well, St. George does it. Well, Washington County does it, and this is what they're doing, and this is why we're basing this or is there a real need? I think we need to scratch our heads over that always. I'm not questioning your figures because I don't know enough about it to question them. I think when we get into analytics, sometimes we just start comparing what other cities do and say, well, they're doing so therefore we have to do it. Instead of just determining what our affordability is and what we need here in Cedar City to maintain our infrastructure. I get a little frustrated when I see this, especially extreme increases like this. Everything contributes to affordability. This will drive affordability; this will drive home prices up. I don't think there's any question about it. Do we have to do it? I think we need to examine absolutely every other avenue before we increase any kind of impact fees, which is essentially a tax.

Fred: Speaking to that, I agree with you on comparisons. It's not an apple-to-apples comparison when you look at what other communities charge. We simply provide that for an economic comparison, but none of the analysis considers any fee comparison when determining the actual fee calculation. Everything that we include relative to Cedar City's impact fee account calculation is based on your level of service. Your infrastructure needs. You can have confidence there that those are purely comparative only economic comparisons. It's just when we get to city council meetings, often that is a request to say, well what are our neighbors charging? They like to see that. That addressed that first element is it doesn't influence the analysis whatsoever relative to what others are charging. Then yes, cost is cost, and as costs go up for cities, then that cost goes up for the development community. Those costs have to be borne somewhat in some way. Again, the market drives prices, and it can affect supply and demand variables. All those factors are influenced by impact fees. Which is outside the scope of this. Then the third item that this being a tax is that it may be a matter of perspective, but impact fees are an element. A fee mechanism that is allowed by statute as long as we comply with the statutory requirements relative to the IFP and IFA. All the noticing which the city has done. The intent is for this to be a proportional allocation of cost of system improvements.

Decker: Allowed doesn't make it right.

Webster: Let's do this real quick. I know Carter had some things to suggest or to talk about.

Open Public Hearing

Carter Wikley: Perfect, I have one comment and then a couple of questions. Regarding your comment, Mr. Hitz as far as the budget. The way that it works is whenever we are coming up on an impact fee study that we need to do. We do all the master plans for those different categories right before it. That master plan says this is how much all those projects are going to cost. Then that is the number that the impact fee is based off. The last two or three years, they've done all the master plan updates that sets says these projects need should be completed; here's the cost for all those. Then that's the number that this study uses to push to bring that forward is that correct Fred?

Hitz: I appreciate that. Then when we change the zoning request.

Carter: The master plans are all based off the current general master plan.

Hitz: Nothing happens when those are changed. Until the whole master plan is changed again.

Carter: If we were to make a master plan change today. It would be on the next round of sewer master plan, transportation master plan or fire master plan when that change would get picked up.

Hitz: What would happen if you did it in real time?

Carter: I don't think you'd be able to keep up. You'd be doing this every week. That's part of the reason why that's part of the reason why going against the master plan is a difficult thing. Because our impact fees and all of our master plans, whether it be water streets, fire, everything's based off the current master plan. When you make big changes to the master plan, you can start to skew those numbers.

Hitz: I think I understand.

Carter: My other question was, and this could be to Fred, it might be to Kent or to Don. Tell me, because every different uh group has different definitions. What changes us here from single family to multi-family? Let's say I'm building a single home, that's single family. What if I'm building a twin home? Which one do I fall under Fred? Do I fall under single family or multi-family?

Fred: Typically, what we evaluate is uh single family detached or attached versus more than more than that as multifamily.

Carter: What if I have four townhomes? I mean, by lending laws, by real estate laws, that's all considered a single-family home. A fourplex is four and below. If I build a fourplex as four separate units, four separate meters, is that four separate single families or is that one multi-family?

Fred: Yeah, I'd have to review that with building.

Kent: I believe that there would be four separate single-family units.

Carter: Okay, then if I build a five plex or a six plex am I charged this? For each one of those five, we'll say I build a six plex, six apartments. One owner, one tax ID number, six different units. Am I charged these times six or am I charged these times one?

Kent: Times six is per units.

Carter: It's per the number of doors?

Kent: That is correct.

Carter: If I built a twenty-unit apartment building, is it times twenty?

Kent: Correct.

Carter: My other question, and this is to you, Fred, who knows a lot more about this than I do. Has there ever been a way of. I'm going back to being a single-family mostly. Multi-family, I'm not as concerned about because all multifamily are pretty much the same size. I do struggle a little bit if I go and build. There are standalone homes now that we build 900, 1,000 square feet, 1100 square feet. If I build an 1100 square foot home, one bath, maybe two versus I build an 8,000 square foot home that has five bathrooms. I struggle with this. Is there a way Fred with other municipalities ever looked at? On the single-family

side, either basing it off square footage, number of bathrooms, number of possible residents, or is it all most just always do one house is one house?

Fred: Yes, most will do one house is one house. It becomes a matter of isolating demand data to that level of detail. I can speak to Cedar City that that can be challenging. To parse out the data on a system-wide basis using that information and isolating the demand variables to that. Impact fees do use to some degree a lot of averages. Again, there is within the ordinance a way to look at development on a case-by-case basis. If we say, hey, this is maybe something that's creating demand than a typical or average single-family home, then we can evaluate that.

Carter: Okay, that was just my one thought there. Because at the end of the day, a house that has two bedrooms or three bedrooms. We know that a house that has five or six bedrooms and will potentially have five or six people or more. They're going to use more storm water. They're going to use put off more wastewater. Well, not wastewater but they're going to use more. They're going to flush more toilets; they're going to turn on more taps. They're going to use those things in a different ratio. I was just curious about that. I think that's my only question.

Jett: Fred, may I ask you a question? Looking at just looking at storm drain and I made that discussion a few minutes ago. Why is a home \$393. We'll say the home's 1000 square feet. We'll say a warehouse is 1000 square feet. Why is the home \$393? But the warehouse in the industrial area is \$1,354 and then why is this institutional \$39,378.

Fred: Because, it has to do with the assumed runoff coefficients. You're going to have more impervious areas likely in non-residential development than residential development. Even though the building square footage is going to be the same.

Jett: I get it, but I don't.

Kent: If I could jump in on that, your commercial and industrial uses need to have a lot of impervious surfaces for parking, for vehicle circulation, for those kinds of things that a home, for instance, would not have. A home has its driveway, and that's it. You don't have the same kind of demand there that you would have on the commercial or industrial uses. The institutional frequently has much larger landscaped areas than what a commercial or industrial would have. You'd think schools, for instance. You have much larger landscaped areas for that. It all comes in on that on that runoff coefficient as Fred mentioned. Your different land use types, behave much differently from each other in terms of the stormwater generated from those sites.

Jett: I can show you storage units. They have very little asphalt or our shops, 1000 to 1200 square foot shops. It's dirt and dirt, then a driveway.

Kent: As Fred mentioned it, this analysis has to because there's not another way to do it consider some of these averages right? When you have a project that is significantly different from an average project, then there is that opportunity to look at the individual projects.

Jett: We do have a recourse to speak to our City Engineer to say, hey, can this be fair?

Kent: We have something built into the ordinance on how to deal with those, and that's what we would follow.

Jett: Okay, thank you. That helps.

Webster: I like one of the things that, Mr. Pittman said too, either growth pays for growth or somebody else pays for growth. The school district, since I'm a part of that, is bumping up against the exact same thing. Where we want school quality, classroom size, all those things that we've enjoyed as a rural community, but we want all the conveniences of a city. When we see seven hundred and two area codes and things like that, call we're like. They wanted to move here because it's rural and get away from the very thing, they're demanding that we produce for them. They want all the conveniences of the city, the ruralness of the country, and somebody's got to pay. The school district is bumping up against the

inability to pass bonds to pass truth in taxation things, and things like that. Eventually, I agree with Mr. Bittman, it's just like the rubber band is as tight as it can get. I don't know that that addresses this, but it seems to me to be a metaphor for the same type of thing as we're experiencing this growth, and we want affordability, but affordability comes with a cost too. I don't know the answer. These are my thoughts. Any other comments from the public?

Don: The money must come from somewhere. I don't know if these numbers are perfect or at what they should be, I don't, that's what we have.

Randall: Well, I can give you the legal answer. We're meeting the requirements. It comes back to the same thing. If you look at our master plans, if you disagree with something that's in there that doesn't need to exist, then great. Go back and tell us what to remove because we don't need this water tank or that pump or that street. Because that's the only way you're going to affect these numbers. Is to remove things from the system that our council, with your advice as they came through, said we need these things. Once that is in, and it is in now you're going back to what's been said repeatedly who pays for it? Because somebody is. The city will always subsidize a little bit. You come in with a specific industrial use that's slightly lower. We're going to adjust those impact fees for that specific development. Well, that's now a difference, the city's going to subsidize. Do you want the current taxpayers to subsidize half or more than half of the cost of these systems? Because if we don't change our impact fees, that's what's going to happen. Those of us that are already here will be dramatically subsidizing as we already are right now. People who are moving in.

Jett: Well, I'm going to start selling property out in Baker, Nevada by Lehman's Cave because it's cheap out there.

Hitz: I have a question and it's probably a stupid question. Is there a way to uh on a single family to base it on instead of a flat fee on some of these items, base it on square footage of the home? Would that be a fairer way to do it. Because as Carter says, some homes are 1,000 square feet, some are 10,000 square feet.

Fred: We will have to evaluate the demand variable and go back into our analysis to determine that. For example, we're assuming that a larger square footage home would result in increased demand, but that may not be the case. You could have a larger home that has less demand on a system. Take parks and recreation in my personal experience. I lived in an 1800 square foot house, and we used the park facilities all the time. I am now in a 360 square foot house, and we don't use the park facilities as much anymore. It would depend on the service. We'd have to analyze the system based on those new demand variables rather than the average that's in here.

Jett: Let me ask you one other question. There seems to be somewhat of a movement for tiny homes in our society. Let's say I'm going to build a 700 square foot one-bedroom tiny home. Will I still be paying \$20,891 dollars for 700 square foot tiny home?

Fred: I think that would fall under the case-by-case review.

Jett: I'm having a hard time.

Hitz: Case by case review,

Jett: Who does that case-by-case review?

Randall: That would be you presenting it to the engineering department. You as the developer would come, and at least, this is how it's been done. Is that they would come in and show the impact will be less in some in one of these categories. Therefore, once we see that your information seems correct, we will reduce the impact.

Jett: This applies to all the items. Well, probably excluding police and fire because our gaps could be kind of hard to quantify.

Randall: Exactly, these are what you're seeing here and what the council will be considering is the default amounts, where they start from. If you can show you are substantially different. Because of the size of your units, for example. Then yes, you could potentially justify a lower fee for your specific house or development.

Jett: Okay, you ready for that Kent? 400 people a month come to visit you?

Kent: They're going to visit me anyway so that's okay. One thing I guess, I would just uh comment on, procedurally here is this will be considered by city council, right? I think it would be wise for you to make whatever recommendation you want to make to city council for their consideration. Coming out of this, it's not necessary, but it I think it. It's certainly making a matter of record what this body thinks. If you, feel like you um are of enough like if you're like-minded enough to be able to put together a recommendation. I think that would make sense. Let city council know what you think on this. Because it is going to be going to city council, and they can either have your thoughts or not have your thoughts.

Decker: There's no way, I can sit here in the last 20 minutes with all these figures and decide whether and not have any idea if it's justified or not. I have absolutely no idea. I'm not sure any of us do. If I have no idea, I've got to say no way.

Kent: If I could comment to that. I think these numbers are all justified because there's a state law statute there that governs this. The analysis has been done and in compliance with those requirements. The analysis is there; the backup is there to support all these numbers. Then it becomes a policy question as to whether the entire amount is charged or whether some of these should have some haircut on them, right? That's where I say that that's something that this body. As a policy recommendation to city council could certainly make a recommendation.

Decker: That said, I honor your opinion, and I'm a lot more about it than I do. What I know of you is, I'm extremely impressed, but I don't know. I'm not going to say, yeah, let's charge this. If I don't know, because I've taken your word for it and I trust you, but there's no way in the world. I can vote for something like this, if I don't know all the details. There's no way to figure out those details in 20 minutes. Even if I had a lot of time, this is out of my element. I just got to say that it just seems ridiculous to me to have these kinds of fees go up like this. That's my take on it without knowing as a semi-retired contractor. Has the Home Builders Association been notified, or have they offered any input?

Paul: The Board Realtors, the Home Builders, School District, all involved in this.

Decker: What's been the input there? Or has there been any feedback was?

Paul: They were all very polite and said, thanks for letting us know. They haven't come up with a policy position or anything else. The feedback you've given tonight is valuable in its own right to say. At first blush, it looks high. It looks too high to me. I mean, that's good feedback that the council can use that. That's helpful. It.

Jett: Just scares the wits out of me.

Decker: Everybody comes up here that's been in business for a long time and says, Well, back in the olden days. I don't want to be that guy. This is just so much higher than it was in the past. I don't know. I just can't see the justification, and I'm not saying that it's not justified. I'm saying I don't know, and if I don't know, I can't vote for it.

Jett: What makes it harder for me is there's nobody to blame. There's no one to say, "It's your fault. "That is the hardest part about this. As we've all discussed we're kind of damned if we do, damned if we don't.

Paul: I appreciate you having that perspective, but I just kind of see it a little different. You guys aren't going to vote to impose the impact fee tonight.

Jett: No, I get it.

Paul: The most feedback you can give the council is probably something you've already given them by saying, "Gee whiz, that number looks way too high."

Decker: That would be my stance.

Paul: I think that that's probably valuable feedback for the city council to get. Whether they get it from the planning commission or get it from the development community, the real estate community, the schools or anybody else. That's probably good valuable feedback.

Burgess: If you look at it as an item by item. We see a 143% increase for single families in total. They range from 33% increase to 200 plus increase. 340 for police. The one that speaks out to me, the most, is just the 204% park and recreation increase. That just seems like of all these things on here, the one we have the most control over spending. I hope that if this is the future, we're looking into it. Then that would cause us to change some of the things we're promising because, obviously. In the world of affordability being the kind of paramount problem in housing, adding twenty-one grand to every house just seems like a real tough barrier.

Carter: To your point Mister Decker. As a member of the city council, hearing your guys opinions, of course, is something that I personally and I am sure all my colleagues do as well. We do take that very seriously and it's something that is weighted heavily. Having this discussion tonight and having those in the minutes. I think it will be crucial whether your actual recommendation comes tonight versus your recommendation comes the day before, and it gets passed to us via our legal counsel and our staff or waits written down on a piece of paper in the minutes. I don't think it makes that big of a difference. I'm only speaking for myself. What I'm trying to get here is if you don't feel comfortable making a recommendation tonight, there could still be a recommendation made on the third. Before we talk about it on the fourth, it just won't be written down in the minutes. The recommendation will obviously still be passed to us either way.

Decker: Does anyone read the minutes?

Carter: Yeah, we read the minutes. They're included in all our packets. We read through and hear about the conversations personally. That's part of the reason why I am here. Me, I am here. They're not minutes, don't take this the wrong way. Minutes are never as good as being in the meeting personally, obviously, every single word cannot be written down. Whether the recording or being in person is more helpful. On these big items, I think that we do either watch or try to be here to really hear what happened and get a better idea. There's that too is the recommendation.

Decker: That's why I voted for you.

Carter: Oh, thank you. The recommendation could come technically the day before, but it would be good. I think Mister Burgess makes a good point. I'll be honest, I think what he just brought up is, Look at them maybe in different ways. Some of them seem like high percentages, but when you look at the total dollar amount, 300% of \$200 is not as big as 300% of \$2,000. You look at the total dollar amount for some of those. The percentages are bigger; the actual dollar amount might not be as large of a thing. Some of those things are more needed and some of those things, as was mentioned, parks and rec might fall under the want category. We need to weigh that also when we look at those things.

Webster: Thank you. Let's do this before we close the public hearing. We do have the benefit of having the mayor here. Do you have any thoughts that you would like to share on this matter.

Mayor Nelson: Same as Carter, I wanted to come and just hear discussion. Because I think it's valuable to get every perspective we can possibly get as we're trying to make decisions that are going to affect a lot of people. I think one of the ones I've personally been wrestling with, and as we're starting into our budget discussions, is the comment that Paul made is hard. We haven't done a tax increase on the normal citizen in over 30 years. Everybody that's been here, lived here, we haven't increased taxes on them.

We're subsidizing new growth. Because if these are the projects we need, they still get paid for. I can show you from last little while we spent a lot of money out of the general fund for water. That's just the most recent example. It happens repeatedly. When we expanded the sewer plant, did all that come from impact fees last time? We did the sewer plant expansion. I'm going to guess no. I've looked through some of the projects, we do you get some from here, you get some from here, you get some from there. It doesn't all come from new growth. That's a hard thing that I do wrestle with and how to balance that and is. If all the public understands that or are okay with that. Then they also complain about how we don't have enough parks, and we don't have maintenance and we have weed growing. There are things that we also hear as negatives that. We don't have general fund money to go take care of those things because we are subsidizing the projects that we need to do for growth. It's a hard balance that I also don't know the answer to. I do struggle with that idea that uh that we are subsidizing it from the general taxpayer, or we need to make it public that by doing this. When we must go out for a tax increase that everybody's okay to pay the tax increase, knowing that we're subsidizing new growth with it. It's a tough issue. A couple of thoughts that I had tonight just listening was on like the affordability piece. Tom's idea about the square footage, maybe is something we should look at of how we incentivize what we need with reductions and things but leave the actual numbers for Impact fees may be higher. Then we come through with how we reduce or our incentivize, if you develop closer to town because that's less impact on our systems, then we'll give you a reduction. If you develop these smaller homes on smaller lots, then we will give you a reduction on impact fees. It helps bring in line what we want in the development community with a carrot or an incentive. I had some good thoughts to listen to you tonight and thank you for your service and taking it seriously. The way you're evaluating it.

Webster: Thanks, Mayor.

Jett: Mayor, I'd, just like to say, I know, Paul's office, engineering office, Don's office and many others. They've spent hundreds and hundreds of man hours, working with the one that's doing our study. I just don't want you to think that we're discounting your time by our frustration. Because our frustration is just a reflection of everybody else's frustration. It's like being in a traffic jam. You just go who do you blame? Because you're part of that same traffic jam. The people that are complaining and so it is hard. This is a very, very sensitive issue. It's going to affect, I don't care if we raise it a thousand or raise it ten thousand, it's going to affect a lot of lives. I just hope we can approach this and it'll affect a lot of lives. If we don't do it. It'll affect a lot of lives if we do it.

Cindy Lafoon: I just want to thank you guys for serving because it is a thankless job, and you guys are faced with. A lot of decisions all the time that are always tough decisions. There's you can please some of the people, some of the time, and that is how that goes. I want to thank you for serving first. Second of all, I do agree with the mayor that we can't keep kicking this down the road. These fees seem high right now but is that because we've because previous boards. Have kicked the can down the road and not wanted to raise taxes or spend money or ask for higher fees. With the growth that we've experienced, now we can't keep kicking the can down the road. We must address the issues that are before us now. So that's all I wanted to say.

Webster: Thank you, Cindy, I think that is well said.

Close Public Hearing

Burgess: Can I get one sentence on minutes. The proposed new parks amount is higher than the current water. If you look at the culinary water right now it is a concern most members of the community have. We're going to be paying more on these new proposed impact fees per home than we're currently even paying for culinary water. I want to see now the plans for like the parks, because that is so much.

Webster: Thank you, Mr. Burgess. Okay, with that in mind, back to the commission. Does anybody want to make a recommendation for anything?

Decker: I can't support it. I did my part.

Webster: Did you want to make a recommendation? I think we flushed it out, sort of how we wanted it to go to the city, not without some comment and I'm happy to entertain that any motion.

Decker: I'm not quite sure how to phrase that, but I'm just I can't support these extreme numbers. With the knowledge that I have. I'm not quite sure how to propose that.

Decker motions for a Negative Recommendation on Increasing the Impact Fees to this extent on Item 5; Hitz seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

Kent: I just wanted to thank Fred before he jumps off the call here. Thank Fred, for taking your time with us tonight.

Fred: Thank you.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Text Amendment
(Recommendation)

26-IV-16 Pertaining to
Commercial and Industrial Building
Materials

Donald Boudreau

Webster: Don, for the last item can we push it?

Don: There's probably a little pressure to get it done.

Jett: Is this the building material one?

Don: Yes.

Jett: Can we push it?

Don: That's the chair's pleasure.

Webster: What's the urgency though? I don't want to push something that's urgent.

Don: Well, I think there's a little desire there from at least a certain developer to get this done. Very similar to what you'd seen in the past. I can be super brief if you want to get this done.

Webster: Let's go with super brief and get it done.

Don Boudreau: I won't do my half hour PowerPoint presentation tonight. As you know, this has been around the block a couple of times. This is our required building materials on 200 North and Main Street for all buildings within 150 feet that have frontage on those streets. We changed this from preferred. Materials and discourage materials to what's permitted and what's not when we try to loosen things up. We can entertain modern materials. I'm going to go quick for permitted materials. We still have quarried stone, cultured stone, brick, lap siding, architectural concrete or stucco. We changed that to no more than 60 % of the aluminum composite materials. We're seeing a lot of. We see them at the college and lots of new buildings. So long as they're non-metallic, no or highly reflective. Then one thing we've done in past practice is other materials that emulate the permitted materials. If some get a new one that comes out next week, and somebody wants to use it, and it looks like something that is permitted. We want flexibility to be able to do that. We changed things from accent materials. We took away subjective language like limited amounts of stucco used for vertical surfaces is only if the quality of the design merits. That is tough for staff. We are playing judge, jury, and executioner. We've gotten rid of that type of language. Materials at no more than 25% of a building facade include glass, wood, metal walls, which is all one of the concerns. Is the prefab industrial stuff that can be a good piece, or it could be a good part of a building's frontage. As it's limited, colored architectural block tile, and then again, this clause about

other materials that emulate these materials. Lastly, we have prohibited materials: your plain gray CMU block, vinyl siding, plywood, mirrored glass—the real highly reflective stuff you might see in a bigger city. Probably the biggest change is that they have been proposed from the last time you saw this. We took this to the Historic Downtown Economic Committee. We had some restrictions there that would just be along Main Street between 200 North and then 200 South. The strike zone, so to speak tightens a little bit right in, what I would describe the historical core of the city. Those materials include corded stone, cultured stone, architectural concrete, and full brick. Then the other materials are no more than 25 percent. They wanted that to take down to more of a historical, you know, historical building materials. The other thing they asked for were colors. They didn't want to see the real bright fluorescent colors. If you look at subsection B1.

Jett: Is this in the downtown zone.

Don: This would just be downtown. It would just again between 200 North and 200 South. We came up with some language. We think we can enforce fairly earth, tone colors, a prohibition against your bright fluorescents and highly reflective metallic type materials. Again, those can be subjective. If you look at the next subsection that's C. We tried to give staff some guidance on how we would evaluate these things. Then lastly, subsection the last section D. We thought it was important that we could certainly maintain nonconformity. If you're rehabbing your building, you want to put up the same material. Staff are not going to tell you I'm sorry, you have to change your materials. There's going to be materials let's say in the historic area that. We don't know maybe historic if they're if they dig them up underneath some stucco or something along those lines. We want those to be able to be placed back as they originally were. That's as fast as I can go. I think the biggest hangup I shouldn't say hang up. Part of the discussion at the last meeting was the return or the wrap, how much of each side of the building and.

Jett: I thought five feet was enough.

Don: I went through the minutes. There's a lot of discussion. I landed at eight feet. There was discussion about your typical lengths of construction materials. We stopped at eight feet. The one thing I did add was if you are on a corner side, let's say downtown on Main Street, you would still need to finish at that corner side. We wouldn't end that'd be your visible side on the street. You wouldn't have a eight-foot stop and then a big giant wall of stucco.

Jett: Say that for me again.

Don: Materials apply to the elevation facing the streets.

Jett: The streets are the street.

Don: The streets, Main Street and 200 North. Okay, even if you were to reverse your building, the materials would be applicable to the side, the elevation that is facing the street. Then there was a lot of discussion about how far on each side of the building those materials should apply. Previously the ordinance indicated thirty feet. If I understood the direction from the last meeting. The commission wanted that significantly reduced. That's now been changed to eight feet. Okay with one exception, if you're on a corner, then we want to see those materials apply to at least that corner side, the visible side of the building. That is staff suggestion.

Jett: I am going to build a building on 100 West and 200 North. The side would be the 100 West that side also.

Don: If that's the corner side.

Jett: The corner side that would so it would have faced 100.

Don: That's correct.

Jett: I think that's reasonable.

Don: That concludes my report. Happy to answer your questions.

Decker: Sounds great.

Burgess: You can see that it addressed a lot of the things we talked about.

Don: Yeah, I think we were close.

Webster: I agree. We have been through it a couple times with some slide examples and picture examples. Would anybody like to make a motion?

Open Public Hearing

Close Public Hearing

Jett motion for a Positive Recommendation the change in Building Materials along Main Street 200 North with the changes that Don presented; Decker seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22p.m.

Faith Kenfield

Faith Kenfield, Executive Assistant