

CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – March 31, 2026

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, March 31, 2026, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City, Utah.

Members in attendance: John Webster, Jennifer Davis, Jim Lunt, Tom Jett, Steven Hitz

Members absent: Wayne Decker, Jace Burgess

Staff in attendance: Kent Fugal – City Engineer, Randall McUne – City Attorney, Donald Boudreau – City Planner, Amber Ray- Planner

ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION LOCATION/PROJECT APPLICANT/PRESENTER

- Pledge of Allegiance – the pledge was led by John Webster.

I. REGULAR ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes (dated March 17, 2026)
(Approval)

Davis motions to approve the minutes from the March 17th meeting; Lunt seconds; all in favor for a unanimous vote.

II. CITY ITEMS

2. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Text	26-IV-5 Pertaining to Public	Amber Ray
Amendment	Improvement Bond Revision	
(Recommendation)		

Amber: This is a proposed amendment to Ordinance Section 26-IV-5. This proposal involves requiring bonding for commercial projects with required public improvements. We want to make sure that when improvements are required with commercial projects, that there is bonding for those improvements, and that there is also the warranty period. We have taken the language from the bonding for the Subdivision Public Improvement and just added it here, a copy and paste with revisions as follows: Revisions to title, Revisions to make it applicable to required improvements, Revisions removing the word subdivider, Time frame specified as according to the bond agreement and revision to the numbering

Jett: Why

Kent: It came to our attention while working between engineering, building and public works. We were realizing there was a gap in our bonding requirements when it came to public improvements being built with projects other than Subdivisions and PUDs. We have had a lot of discussion with the City Manager, and City Council has weighed in on it. We talked about possibly just handling those things under the road-break permit that public works does, but both our street superintendent and public works director felt like that wasn't a good fit. The way their program is set up, it's not really set up for that. It's set up

more for someone who needs to do some work in our right-of-way. We looked at the options on what's the best way to do this. We decided add the same wording we use for subdivisions and PUDs. This will give us the tool to handle bonding and inspections and everything else for these public infrastructure improvements, the same for things that aren't subdivisions and PUDs as we do with things that are subdivisions and PUDs. We think it's going to administratively work a lot better for us and be better for the applicants.

Jett: Any financial burden to the developer.

Kent: I would say no because it doesn't change what they're required to do, and it actually, in most cases, will help them as opposed to putting them through the road-break permit process that has greater bonding requirements.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Jett motions for a positive recommendation to the ordinance text amendment in 26-IV-5; Davis seconds. All in favor for a unanimous vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Text

Sections 23, 26, and 32

Amber Ray

Amendment

Revising Numbering to

(Recommendation)

Match State Code

Amber: This is a proposed amendment to Ordinances comprised of sections 23, 26, and 32 where the state code is referenced. The state changed their numbering recently and now our references do not match their numbering. To prevent this type of correction needed in the future, we are proposing to reference the State Code in general rather than specific section numbers. One additional correction, in 26-I-4 (B)(2) Our ordinance defines an external dwelling unit as: A unit as defined by the Utah Municipal Code UCA 10-9a-530(1)(a). There is not a definition in the state code for the external dwelling unit. We are proposing the definition as: An accessory dwelling unit that is not attached to or within a detached single-family dwelling but is located on the same lot or parcel as the detached single-family dwelling.

Randall: That definition by the way, I took the wording from a bill that was proposed this year in the state legislature. It did not pass. We just borrowed that definition.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Jett motions for a positive recommendation to revising numbering to reference state; Davis seconds. All in favor for a unanimous vote.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

Engineering Standards

Revision to Section 1 Forward

Kent Fugal

Revision

(Recommendation)

Kent: We're looking at some revisions to the first section of our engineering standards, which is just a forward. What I've got in the strikeout here is what we currently have in that forward to our engineering standards. There's some wording at the top that I liked. The rest of this where we've really formatted this almost like it's a title page to a printed document, which we really don't have anymore. We have our engineering standards similar to our city ordinances. It's in Municode on the website. We don't really publish a book anymore. Listing out all the dates that we ever did revisions isn't very useful either. So

what we've done with this, the first paragraph of this forward takes the wording from up above at the top that we are eliminating with a few minor revisions. We're saying that the Cedar City Engineering Department has prepared these Cedar City Engineering Standards to be used for all work located within public streets, rights of way, and easements within Cedar City, Utah. Nothing in these standards shall be construed to prohibit the construction of higher-type improvements as approved by the city engineer. Like I say, that is almost word for word from what we had at the beginning part of the forward previously, just formatted differently. But then we get to the to the real meat of the change. Cedar City Corporation has adopted the 2026 APWA, Utah Manual of Standard Specifications and the 2026 APWA, Utah Manual of Standard Plans, collectively the APWA standards, we'll refer to it by that name later on, "As its standard construction specifications and standard drawings in conjunction with the city-specific requirements listed in sections four and five of these engineering standards." What we have now in section two is a little bit general. Section three, gets us into our design standards, which are not construction standards. Those are design standards. Section four is our construction specifications. Section five is our standard details. What we will be doing over the next while, and a lot of this in conjunction with public works, is we will be reviewing the information in sections four and five, comparing that to what's in the Utah APWA standard specifications and standard plans, and determining what we feel like we need to keep, where we would not want to just go with what the Utah APWA standards say. But in cases where we've got one thing, Utah APWA standards have another thing, but there's really no reason why we would do different than what the Utah APWA standards have, then we would just delete those portions of our of our sections four and five so that we would just leave it to the, the Utah APWA standards. This right now just sets us up that we would be officially adopting the Utah APWA standards, so that those are now available for us to use. It certainly covers things that our current standards don't cover. It gives us standards for things we don't currently have standards for. The last of that paragraph, we're saying that in the event of a conflict between the APWA standards and the requirements of sections four and five, sections four and five shall govern, unless the contrary is approved in writing by the Cedar City Engineer for a specific instance or project. We're saying that the default is the what we have in our sections four and five governs, but yet if in a specific instance, it makes more sense to use what the APWA one has. We're giving ourselves the freedom to use those if that's approved by a city engineer. Then this other one is kind of housekeeping. The term engineer in the APWA standards or any sections of these Cedar City engineering standards shall refer to the Cedar City engineer. The terms city and owner in the APWA standards or any sections of these Cedar City engineering standards shall refer to Cedar City Corporation. The reason we wanted that is there are a lot of places in the standard specifications and standard plans of with APWA where it makes reference to the engineer, that the engineer has the authority to do certain things. We don't want people to misconstrue that and say, "Oh, well, you know, my engineer I hired said this. Therefore, you know, that's what governs." No. The it's the city engineer. For all things in all public infrastructure improvements in Cedar City, those references refer to the Cedar City engineer for our purposes at Cedar City. So that's what we have there with this particular item. Like I say, the meat of it is adopting the Utah APWA manuals, and then just a little bit of cleanup there.

Tom: Is this going to add any financial burden to the homeowner or builder. Any additional rules or anything that's going to make it more restrictive or limit?

Kent: I would say no. Is there a possibility that there's something somewhere in the Utah APWA that would cost more to construct than what we have in our in our standards currently? I would say that's a possibility, yes. But I think there are also a number of things, as I see it, that if we follow the Utah APWA, it's actually going to be less expensive than what ours are. A good example is our storm drainage. We've got some very expensive storm drain boxes that we specify, where a standard manhole,

like you would use on the sanitary sewer system, does the job just fine, and it's a lot cheaper. I'm hoping as we work with public works, we can get to where we're just using those manholes in APWA instead of the expensive boxes that we've been doing.

Tom: I love the cleanup. Under one uniform. It is daunting as homeowners.

Kent: one thing that we are really lacking right now is a good general requirements section. We have nothing there which you'd really need general requirements for the construction contracts for our city projects. If everything goes perfectly on a project, they're not needed. But as soon as something goes south, you need rules. And this provides that for us that we don't currently have in any of our documentation we use for projects currently. These documents are available for free on the internet. Once these, these are adopted, we will link to that on our website so people can get to it easily. There is no cost to people, they're freely available on the Utah chapter of the APWA, the American Public Works Association website.

Randall: I apologize I didn't catch this earlier. You have in here in the intro that it's "to be used for all work located within public streets, rights of way, and easements." But some of these rules are applicable in PUDs. Some of the requirements with regards to structures, which we don't have a ton of those inside the those areas.

Kent: So what are you thinking applies to PUDs? They do use one of our standard details on curbs.

Randall: So even when we're looking at, like, earthwork and stuff like that, do any of our standards apply for earthwork within?

Kent: Well, but, but what we have in here for earthwork....what our standards really apply to are, are infrastructure items that we're going to accept.

Randall: We don't apply them to any of the private infrastructure?

Kent: I would say not directly. That is something we can certainly look into a little bit closer. And if there is a revision to that paragraph that we think we should make to make sure we're covered on that, I'm not opposed to that before we take that to city council.

Randall: Okay. I leave it to you.

Don: Could just be PUDs as applicable.

Kent: I'm just not trying to be real prescriptive of what people have to do on their private improvements that we're not going to accept and maintain.

Randall: That makes sense. I just look even like the storm drain where it says they're supposed to be able to receive it on their own property, I guess indirectly, that applies to the public works because we're telling him to keep it off.

Kent: Most of those are items that are those types of things that are covered in section three of our engineering standards, which is our design standards. This has nothing to do with our design standards. This has to do with the actual construction specifications and details that a contractor needs to be able to build things according to our standards.

Randall: That first paragraph is in section one applying to the entire thing, including section three.

Kent: Okay. I see what you're saying there.

Randall: It's not something you've added. That's the wording now.

Kent: That is the wording now. But you're right. This would be an opportunity to clean that up.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Jett motions for a positive recommendation for the Engineering Standards Revision of Forward 1 with minor modifications to clean up the language per Randall's comment with regards to PUDs; Lunt seconds. All in favor for a unanimous vote

5. PUBLIC HEARING

Engineering Standards
Revision
(Recommendation)

Section 2.1
The General Requirements
For Public Improvements

Kent Fugal

Kent: We're talking about the general requirements for public improvements, Section 2.1 of our engineering standards. I think the best way to lead into this is to tell you why we're looking at this. When Cedar Meadows and Lamplight were developed, nowhere along this entire western boundary were there any roads stubbed to the west. What that resulted in is that if you want to move between these developments, you either have to go out on the highway or go all the way down to Center Street to be able to move between them. Otherwise, there's no interconnectivity, not even any pedestrian access between these neighborhoods. You end up having to go down at least to 25 North to get across and get up there. There's no other way to get through. When the property to the east develops, nowhere between Highway 56 and Center Street is there a place that we'll be able to get through. We'll be faced with the exact same thing we are on the west side. By contrast, when you look at the Mountain Shadows subdivision, not only do we have our master-planned Center Street that comes through that's stubbed out so that can be continued over to Westview, but there are other stub roads that were put in to allow connectivity between that subdivision and adjoining subdivisions. That's kind of the lead-in to what we're trying to accomplish with this. Going to this actual section of our engineering standards, this general section we've proposed some changes to the wording on this, trying to make sure that when we're talking about improvements of a public need, that we're including all of the infrastructure, the streets, water, sewer, drainage, but also gas, power, communications. We want to make sure that we've got connectivity of all these things between developments. Currently we have in there "the required improvements shall extend from the nearest acceptable point of existing improvements." Well, that's kind of a given. You've got to go connect to it somewhere. You're going to go where it's the nearest. But then we say "it needs to provide for future extension to adjacent properties." But what we had in there before was just "and shall be compatible with applicable city master plans." We've revised that some. We tried to strengthen that to say that when applicable, improvements must also comply with city master plans. There's not always a city master plan that applies to a given project. But when there is, it needs to comply. What it says currently is that "all water lines shall be installed to the boundaries of the development." We're completely silent on anything else having to be extended to the boundaries of development. For some reason, water was singled out and said, "That has to be extended." But even though we said up here before that all of these other things need to happen, we only said that water had to be extended.

Hitz: Would this rectify that issue we had a few weeks ago where someone wanted to just be responsible for, like, 100 yards of the road?

Kent: Not necessarily. That's a little bit different because that's where we have this master planned road. That was on Center Street. We have this master planned road. And then the question on that was, do they need to improve both sides of the road. You guys made the recommendation, and we were glad that you did. It was in line with what we were hoping you would do of saying that at least across the frontage of that of that property and the little gap that we had on the east end, let's fill that in with the improvements on the south side. Our ordinance actually requires that. When that went to city council, we did not get support from city council for that. City council approved a deferral agreement to not put in any of the improvements on the south side. But that's really kind of a separate issue. That's not here. We're really trying to address the interconnectivity of our infrastructure between developments. I was in just some conversations with Tyler Romerl, and we were talking about this issue. He had looked at our at our wording here. He made some suggestions on some ways to strengthen this. I appreciated him taking the

time to do that. I then took what he had sent to me and made further revisions. In some cases changing something that he had said and in other cases just adding to. Now what we're really saying is that when no topographical barriers exist, that all improvements shall be installed to the boundary lines of the development. And then topographical barriers include but are not limited to mountains, canyons, and extremely steep slopes. He had in there natural drainage channels. The reason I pulled that out is because natural drainage channels come in all different sizes, and some of those are very easy to span. I didn't want to say that even just a minor drainage ditch was a topographical barrier. But we do say not limited to. If there is a drainage channel, the drainage channel certainly can be a topographical barrier if it, in fact, functions as a barrier. Then we say topographical barriers, as determined or agreed to by the city engineer - it's not just up to the developer to say what a topographical barrier is - that when those exist, then access for bicycles, pedestrians, and maintenance vehicles to the boundary lines of the development may still be required in the absence of stub streets. So if there are no stub streets, there may be reasons why we still need to let people get to some open space that's just outside of the development, or we have a need for maintenance purposes to get to some facilities that the city has in that open space. Maybe it's a sewer line that goes through it or something like that. We inserted in there- wording that access for those things may still be required even if there aren't any stub streets there. Then we said, "Streets and new subdivisions shall continue the alignment of existing streets and adjoining subdivisions or their proper projections when adjoining property is not subdivided." Then we say, "Streets, alleys, and utility lines shall be arranged in a manner which will, insofar as possible, facilitate convenient extension and connection thereof to future streets, alleys, and utility lines developed by the owners of adjoining property." At the time their property is plotted. So what we're really trying to get at on this is there needs to be stub streets like we saw on Mountain Shadows, so that neighborhoods can be cohesive rather than having these artificial separations everywhere one developer ended and the next one started. That's what we're really trying to accomplish with this. I'm hopeful that this wording does what we intended to do. I feel pretty good about it, but I'm certainly interested in any other thoughts you may have.

Tom: I'm shocked that, that, uh, that happened. But when those subdivisions went in, and Jennifer would be well aware of this as a real estate agent, Cedar City was on fire. I mean, you thought you were buying dollars for 50 cents when it comes to land and, and developing. It was just insane. I can see where things got missed, but I'm shocked still.

Kent: And there are plenty of other examples around town. I picked out that because you could see such vivid demonstrations all within one area.

Davis: But also, we didn't have the wording then to help make that happen. We didn't have the teeth.

Randall: A couple councils ago, we tried to bring one of these in, and they said without better guidance, they were not going to enforce it. So this was an invitation from our council a couple of years ago to get this in. We kind of had a rough go on that one.

Hitz: You're looking to minimize exceptions, right?

Kent: Yeah. We're not trying to we're not trying to go out and tell people exactly what needs to happen, but we're saying that there needs to be that interconnectivity. We need to get these improvements extended to the boundaries of the subdivisions so they can be picked up on when the next property develops. We're trying to get all of that in here but still provide some flexibility for them to lay a project out in a way that makes sense.

Don: I think this one is hugely important.

Kent: We had the Cedar 106 project just north of 800 North between Lund Highway and 3900 West. They were wanting to vacate a right-of-way they had dedicated because that's not where they want the street now. And they kind of changed around the way the way the general plan designations and zones were oriented through their project. And they wanted a bunch of stuff. Well, we worked out with the

development agreement with them that they agreed to stub roads to the north, to provide connectivity between the different properties within their development because they're proposing to sell these off as different things. But we got them to agree in the development agreement to provide connectivity between those and to stub roads to the north so that when that next big, long piece of ground that runs all the way from Lund Highway to 3900 West develops, we can have some connectivity there. But we did that through a development agreement because we didn't have anything in our ordinance to enforce it. But we got them to agree to that to help them get what they wanted. But this gives us more teeth to be able to press the issue and insist that we get connectivity.

Tom: I still think we should bring something for this body to discuss what we've talked about. I think that you just mentioned 800 North. I suggested we put basically a walk way right through the middle of the neighborhood so it connects with other neighborhoods so the kids don't have to go out, on the roads per se, to access one subdivision after another. And give them credit for their parks, give them credit for their bike trails, you know, that type stuff. To make Active transportation. I think we should really have that discussion at some point. I just think it's important.

Kent: And of course, one good way for us to accomplish that is making sure we get appropriate routes for active transportation on our active transportation master plan because that becomes something that's much easier for us to enforce.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Davis motions for a positive recommendation to the Engineering Standards Revision to Section 2.1; Jett seconds. All in favor for a unanimous vote

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Engineering Standards
Revision
(Recommendation)

Section 3.2.3
Cul-de-sacs

Kent Fugal

Kent: We're looking at some changes to our to our cul-de-sac standards.. This is driven primarily by compliance with the fire code. Our current standards for subdivisions is 50 feet radius for cul-de-sacs within neighborhoods that are just local street cul-de-sacs, which is the vast majority of cul-de-sacs in town. We require the 60 foot for cul-de-sacs in industrial subdivisions or commercial. The problem is with the 50 feet, distance from face of curb to face of curb across the cul-de-sac only ends up being 89 feet. So you've got an 89-foot diameter of the drivable surface, from curb to curb, and fire code requires 96. We are short on meeting fire code, even if there are no cars parked in there. And once there's cars parked in there, then we're really, really short of meeting fire code. What started us off on looking at cul-de-sacs was the fact that our cul-de-sac bulb dimensions do not meet fire code. I had a lot of conversations with Mike Shurtz, the fire marshal, and Mike Phillips, the fire chief, about this, and they agreed we needed to pursue this, make our cul-de-sacs to where they meet the fire code. Our current standard drawing has this table where we have all these different dimensions for cul-de-sacs on different types of roadways, including arterial streets. We're never going to terminate an arterial street in a cul-de-sac. It just doesn't happen. This gets rid of the meaningless part and puts us into a standard cul-de-sac configuration that will meet fire code in our neighborhoods and still accommodate what the needs of the industrial areas where we have larger vehicles that need to be able to turn around. The other thing is we looked at the maximum allowable length of the cul-de-sac. There was a lot of discussions with city council in one of their meetings last year where someone was requesting a variance to our maximum cul-de-sac length. And they had asked us to take another look at cul-de-sac lengths and see if we had lengths

there that made sense. We don't want to have a cul-de-sac that's a mile long. You go a mile in there and for people in the back of the cul-de-sac to go anywhere, they have to drive a long way even just to get out to the cross street. But what is an acceptable length for a cul-de-sac? As we looked at the fire code, it's got some different lengths based on how wide the roadway is. The wider it is, the longer the cul-de-sac can be. But it really ends at 750', and it says anything longer than 750 feet requires special approval. We broke this up into two pieces. We're saying that in residential zones we don't want those cul-de-sacs to be longer than 550 feet. Now, this is similar to our existing requirement because existing requirement, we measure from the right-of-way line and we allow 500 feet. We moved it out to measure from the center line of the cross street, which I think is more consistent with the fire code. And we added 50 feet to that. So we're 200 feet less than what would be allowed in other zones, which is the maximum that the fire code would allow, the 750. With any of these types of standards, if there's a situation that really suggests that a different cul-de-sac length should be allowed because otherwise, you leave a piece of the property totally inaccessible, we still have the ability to work with the fire department, is the fire department okay with that, or are there are there some mitigating measures that should be taken to allow it? And we can work that out, and we can approve something a little bit different when it's needed. This is what we're proposing: 550 feet measured from the center line of the of the cross street to the center of the cul-de-sac. We're saying 550 feet in residential zones, 750 in all other zones.

Lunt: Is there any restriction on parking in that cul-de-sac? That seems to be a problem with a lot of places.

Kent: It is a problem in a lot of places, especially when people do 90-degree parking, and they nose in right up to the curb. Technically, to meet fire code, there should be no vehicles parked in there. The only way to address that would be to sign that as a fire lane, no parking, so that it could be enforced. The challenge with that is someone comes over to visit somebody who lives in there, or they need to just drop something off, and they stop, and they park there. How strict is too strict? So we've left that. I don't think that would change the dimensions we're proposing. But whether there end up being some parking restrictions associated with it, I think that's a topic for another day with our fire department to try to determine what is reasonable there. If there's only a couple of cars parked in there, it's usually not a problem.

Tom: So we're not changing the diameters of the cul-de-sac as long as that entrance into the cul-de-sac is less than 550 feet?

Kent: We're changing both because right now, we're allowing a cul-de-sac that this radius dimension here is 50 feet, which does not provide adequate for fire code. We're changing that to 60. So we are making the bulb itself larger, and then we're modifying the length of the cul-de-sac to where it's a modest increase on a residential area, but we are adding another couple of hundred feet for non-residential areas where cul-de-sacs would be. And the reason I feel like that makes sense is you let's say you've got a cul-de-sac in an industrial subdivision. Those tend to be fairly large lots. You're not really serving a lot of properties within that cul-de-sac. Allowing that to be somewhat longer doesn't carry the same negatives that you have in a residential area. You've got an area there that you cannot access anything to either side. There's only one way in and out. You don't have that street connectivity that helps neighborhoods be cohesive. Any cul-de-sac is kind of a negative to that, although we recognize that there are people who really enjoy living in cul-de-sacs. This is trying to balance that. We're trying to say, "Okay. Cul-de-sacs can be allowed, but there should be a limit on, on their length." There are cities, even here in Utah, that say, "In new development, cul-de-sacs are not allowed, period." We didn't want to go to that point, but we thought, let's make sure we have some reasonable limits on the cul-de-sac length and make sure that the cul-de-sacs meet fire code.

Tom: Are you locked into the 60-foot? What if 65? That would give you 10 more feet of circle. Have you

looked into that? Would that be an advantage for the city?

Kent: You do start running into issues of how you're going to make that work when you're trying to lay a subdivision out. You've got this road going back in there that has lots on either side, you get to the cul-de-sac bulb, and now those lots have to take on a completely different shape to make them work. You still have to meet setback requirements off of that right-of-way line. It starts getting very difficult to fit a home in there. The larger we make that, the more the more we're making it really difficult for people to develop.

Tom: I just wondered if access for 5 foot on each side would be better.

Kent: We were kind of viewing the 60 feet as more of a practical maximum.

Tom: And you guys have analyzed to make sure that lots can still adequately be developed?

Kent: Yeah. And there are a lot of cities that have 60-foot requirement because of fire code. It still works. The developers have to plan for it as they're laying out their subdivision. Maybe they don't make those lots on either side of that road as shallow as they might otherwise. Maybe they make them a little deeper and a little narrower so that they get enough depth that they can make the cul-de-sac bulb work. We get it too big; it becomes problematic for them. It really does. We didn't want to create problems. 60 feet is still workable in a development layout, but it accomplishes what we need to with fire code compliance. And then the other part of this, our current standard says is that if measured from this right-of-way line, you go more than 30 feet, then there needs to be a temporary turnaround. The big problem I see with that is if this is more than 30 feet long. If you tried to put a temporary turnaround there, you're going to leave one or both of these lots basically unbuildable until the road goes through. And then when someone tries to connect to it, you've got a section of roadway that's not even built for them to be able to connect to. We want to have streets stubbed out to adjoining property that can then be extended in the next development over. Our maximum length of a stub without putting in a temporary turnaround is working against us. It's making it difficult for developers to do what we're asking them to do. So last, we wanted remove that barrier to getting these roadways stubbed to the to the end of their development so that they can be extended in the future. That's why we're looking at a longer distance. We're looking at going back closer to what the old standard was before we shortened it up to the 30 feet. We are using the same measurement standard going from the center line of the edge of the cross street, and we're saying 150 feet maximum. That's what the fire code says is the maximum length of a dead end without a turnaround under fire codes. They're saying if it's 150 feet or less, there's no reason to have a turnaround. The fire department doesn't need to go in there and turn around. Over 150 feet, you need to. So that's why we're saying 150 feet on this and measuring it in the fashion that we had agreed with the fire department was the most consistent with the fire code measuring from the center line of the cross street. If we take everything from what we've talked about on this drawing and go back to the text, in residential zoning districts, shall not exceed 550 feet in length from the center line of cross street to center point of cul-de-sac. Then we say cul-de-sac streets in all other zoning districts shall not exceed 750 feet in length from center line of the cross street to center point of cul-de-sac. And we say the turnaround radius at property line of cul-de-sac streets in all zones shall be not less than 60 feet. Before, it said not less than 50 feet for residential areas and 60 feet for commercial and industrial areas. Now, we're saying 60 feet everywhere. Then we've added this language here saying a temporary cul-de-sac is required on any street that ends in a temporary dead end where the length of the street is longer than 150 feet from center line of cross street to temporary dead end. We've added another provision here where one or more lots front the dead end street that do not have frontage on the cross street. If you just have the corner lots, and you're stubbing a street in between them, there's no reason to put a temporary turnaround on the end unless it's excessively long. If it's just a short stub between two houses, we generally don't need to plow snow in that. But if we've got a house back in behind one of the corner houses that has their frontage onto it, that changes

things. Where one or more lots front the dead-end street that do not have frontage on the cross street. Once again, if there's a reason to make an exception somewhere or maybe they can provide a hammerhead turnaround, maybe there are some cases where we could approve it, working with the fire department. Generally, there would need to be a temporary turnaround if they have lots to front it, or it's longer than 150 feet.

Tom: Out behind Spanish Trails where those modular homes are. It's a real long road, and they have three cul-de-sacs, but they're not dead ends. They widen out. Is that classified as a cul-de-sac also?

Kent: I would say no. But there are there are reasons to do that. Sometimes, they'll do that where they need a temporary turnaround, but they don't want to just end the improvements with a gravel turnaround. You'll build something like that and then just have a short stub going out of it. And then the next phase comes, and you can pick it up and take it further. There are various reasons why someone might want to do that, but it doesn't change the fact that you still have a long dead end. That may or may not overcome the fire code compliance issue. But there are reasons that it makes sense sometimes to do what you saw there. One of those types of things could be say there's a situation where you are trying to develop the property with topographical barriers around it that you can't really access any other way, we say, "You know what? This needs to be an 800-foot, 900-foot-long cul-de-sac." Well, a mitigation to that might be to do exactly what you're talking about at the midpoint. If I, as the city engineer or a future city engineer, were to make a decision that the developer wasn't happy about, they can always appeal that. We're not trying to take away their ability to appeal that and take an issue before city council if they feel like it needs to go before city council. The city council has empowered us to work with developers to resolve issues, to meet specific circumstances associated with the development and move forward.

John Webster: I know that fire trucks and school buses shall venerate your name forever after for increasing the size of the cul-de-sac bulb. I think it'll be great.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Davis motions for a positive recommendation for the Engineering Standard Revisions to 3.2.3; Lunt seconds. All in favor for a unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Amber Ray, Planner