



Mayor - Bryan Cox
City Council - David Fowles
City Council - Stephanie Allred
City Council - Tiffany Atkinson
City Council - Gerald Osborne
City Council - Kirk Brower

Hyde Park City Council & Planning Commission Workshop
113 East Center Street
Hyde Park, Utah

April 29, 2026

The Hyde Park City Council meeting began at 6:00 and was conducted by Marcus Allton.

City Officials Present: Mayor; Bryan Cox, Council members; David Fowles, Stephanie Allred, Tiffany Atkinson, Gerald Osborne (By phone) and Kirk Brower, Planning Commission Members; Melinda Lee, Heather Taylor, Charlene Williams and Michael Mowes, City Planner; Machael Layton and City Administrator; Marcus Allton.

Land Use Code Updates Process

Staff opened the workshop by clarifying that the moratorium discussed at the prior week's meeting was not a firm proposal, but one option among several for managing the volume of pending code work. The purpose of the evening was to walk through a comprehensive list of code updates prioritized by the City Council and Planning Commission, confirm that staff are headed in the right direction, and identify items that may no longer be desired.

Staff provided a brief overview of the land use code update process for the benefit of newer members, outlining the typical steps: direction from governing bodies, research and Planning Commission review, stakeholder consultation, legal review, and finally the procedural steps of public hearing and adoption. It was noted that steps one through four consume most of the time and that work sessions exist to allow substantive discussion before formal public meetings.

Retaining Walls

Staff identified retaining walls as one of the largest and most complex code updates on the list, flagged as a City Council priority from the March annual work session. The overarching goal of this update is to ensure that when a developer completes a subdivision, all lots are graded, stabilized, and fully buildable without interfering with neighboring properties. Staff acknowledged this standard will not resolve existing issues but will set a higher bar for future development.

Water Dedication

Staff presented a two-step approach to revisiting the water dedication ordinance that was updated in December to require all applicants to bring water rights, eliminating the fee-in-lieu option.

The first step would draft a code amendment allowing the city to provide water rights at no cost as an incentive specifically for commercial businesses that generate sales tax revenue. It was noted that the current water rights requirement has deterred some prospective commercial tenants, and that offering city-held water rights as an incentive is one of the few tools remaining to the city following state-level restrictions on other economic incentives. This benefit would be drawn from the city's existing water rights inventory.

The second step, dependent on the outcome of the ongoing water master plan update being conducted by Sunrise Engineering, would involve a broader review of water dedication requirements for all other development types. Staff noted that the December change was prompted by the need to take stock of how many water rights had been effectively committed by previously entitled units, and that the mayor is actively working to identify new water rights that could be purchased with collected fees. The possibility of using water rights provisions as an incentive for affordable housing was also raised as a future consideration, given that water rights are currently adding an estimated \$5,000–\$10,000 per lot to development costs.

Wolfpack Way

Staff presented a proposal to substantially revise or eliminate the Mixed Use (MX) zone, which applies primarily to the Wolfpack Way corridor. The Planning Commission had previously indicated the MX zone may not need revision, but the City Council directed staff to revisit it, with interest in restricting its geographic scope or phasing it out entirely in favor of new, purpose-built zone classifications.

Discussion revealed broader uncertainty about the MX zone's continued usefulness. Participants noted that the parcel layout along the corridor — with lots oriented east-west from the highway — makes achieving the intended commercial character difficult in practice. There was consensus that the MX zone should likely be eliminated and replaced with two or more new standalone residential zones with defined development standards, rather than continuing to use mixed use as a catch-all designation. It was acknowledged that the development standards — setbacks, lot coverage, height, and similar provisions — represent the most difficult and time-consuming part of drafting any new zone.

The group agreed that the immediate focus should be on creating new zone classifications with flexible housing options, without initially restricting them to specific geographic areas. The question of where new zones would be applied on the future land use map was deferred.

Discuss Code Updates for Residential Zone / Transition Zone / R-10

Staff proposed eliminating the existing Transition Zone, describing it as no longer viable. In its place, staff suggested converting the existing 55+ Planned Unit Development (PUD) into a new general residential zone, tentatively referred to as "R-10," that would not be age-restricted. The new zone would incorporate updated open space requirements and would allow existing PUD communities to fall under the new classification. Staff also noted that several senior communities have approached the city about converting underutilized turf areas into additional housing units, which this new zone could accommodate. The proposal was received positively by those present.

Agricultural Zone

Staff raised the question of whether the Agricultural (AG) zone should require a demonstrated agricultural purpose for new subdivisions, rather than simply permitting large lots that function as ornamental residential parcels with high water demand. The concept of a communal stable or similar agricultural amenity requirement was offered as one model. Staff also noted that a related update to the R-2 zone to include maximum lot coverage standards would be pursued to address the practice of property owners combining multiple smaller lots into a single oversized residential lot.

Subdivision Lot Combination Prohibition

Staff proposed adding language to the subdivision ordinance to prohibit the combination of platted lots after a subdivision is recorded. The rationale offered was twofold: lot combinations undermine the city's financial projections for infrastructure maintenance and tax revenue, and they create legal and engineering complications related to easements and public utility easements (PUEs). Council Member Osborne, participating by telephone, questioned the significance of property tax loss given the city's low tax rate, and noted that an unimproved lot still contributes some tax revenue. Staff and Planning Commissioner Lee responded that the more significant concern is the utility and infrastructure cost burden — the city is maintaining road, water, and sewer infrastructure sized for multiple homes while collecting utility revenue from only one. It was noted that approximately a dozen such combinations have already occurred, creating ongoing complications, and that the intent is not to undo existing combinations but to prevent future ones.

Other Code Updates

Public/Institutional Zone

Staff proposed exploring a restriction on the Public/Institutional (PI) zone so that it would only be available for properties newly annexed into the city, rather than being applicable citywide. The concern driving this proposal is that valuable infill land — particularly along commercial corridors — has been and could continue to be developed as non-revenue-generating uses such as churches or care facilities when the city has no mechanism to direct such uses elsewhere. Staff cited a local senior living facility and a converted theater in North Logan City as illustrative examples. Planning Commissioner Lee expressed support for the concept. The group agreed

that the idea warranted further research to determine feasibility, and it was added to the work list.

Industrial/Commercial Sub-Zones

Staff noted ongoing interest in creating sub-zones within the industrial and commercial zones to allow more nuanced land use control and checked in on whether there remained an appetite to pursue this. The item was acknowledged to be worth exploring.

Parks Code, Plan Professional Zone, and Housekeeping Items

Staff noted that a new parks code is being drafted to implement e-bike restrictions and other park regulations, drawing on a model ordinance from Mill Creek City. The obsolete "Plan Professional" zone, which no longer appears on the zoning map, is also slated for removal from the code text. Updates to the definitions section and the establishment of zones chapter were identified as ongoing, catch-all items to be maintained in parallel with all other code work.

General Plan and Future Land Use Map (GP/FLUM)

Staff noted that any new zones created through the code update process will require a corresponding update to the General Plan's future land use map and a rewrite of Chapter 2 of the General Plan to reflect progress made to date. It was acknowledged that a General Plan amendment requires a 30-day public notice, including a utility bill insert, and that public turnout and community concern should be anticipated.

Capacity, Timeline, and Path Forward

Staff presented an honest assessment of the city's current capacity to complete the identified code updates. Land use applications consume approximately 90 percent of the city planner's time, leaving little bandwidth for proactive code work. Several options were presented:

USU Summer Interns: Staff have applied, in partnership with USU, for up to two AmeriCorps-funded summer interns to assist with code and general plan updates, at no cost to the city. The outcome of the application remains pending.

City Council and Planning Commission Participation: Staff recalled that elected and appointed officials previously assisted with drafting code language and proposed returning to that model. The group agreed to begin with the new standalone residential zone concepts. Members were asked to come to the next workshop prepared with written ideas — not full code language, but specific preferences, concepts, and wish-list items — to avoid spending consultant dollars on open-ended brainstorming.

Consultant: Staff indicated that a targeted consultant engagement, with a well-defined scope, could be completed for under \$20,000 to \$25,000 and could accelerate the most complex code drafting. It was noted that budget season is underway and that if this option is desired, it should be incorporated before public budget hearings are held. Planning Commissioner Lee and

others expressed support for using a consultant on the hardest items while ensuring staff and commission members provide detailed directions upfront to avoid inefficiency.

Moratorium: After discussion, the group decided to place a definitive pause on the moratorium option at this time. It was noted that a legally defensible moratorium resolution would require significant work with the city attorney, and that the group had not yet identified a basis sufficient to justify one. The option may be revisited if circumstances change.

Work Groups: Council Member Osborne, prior to disconnecting, suggested that small working groups consisting of up to two council members and two planning commissioners could meet outside of public meetings to advance code drafting work, consistent with open meetings law requirements.

Members were directed to come prepared to the next workshop, scheduled for the 13th at 6:00 PM, with written ideas about new residential zone structures for the Wolfpack Way area — specifically addressing whether to create one mixed residential zone or multiple separate zones, and whether placement should be geographically defined or citywide. The full workshop presentation was noted as being available in the city's online portal under the current date. Staff closed by asking the broader question of what the city wants to be as it grows — whether the goal is to maximize tax revenues, preserve a unique community character, or some combination — and encouraged all members to reflect on that question as it would inform how purpose statements are written for each new zone.

Adjourn: 7 :00

Donja Wright

Council member Osborne made a motion to approve the minutes of the workshop from April 29, 2026. Council member Brower seconded the motion. Council members Fowles, Allred, Atkinson Osborne and Brower voted in favor. The motion carried 5/0.