

IRON COUNTY, UTAH
IRON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearings & Regular Meeting

July 2, 2026

.....

The Iron County Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting July 2, 2026 at 5:30 p.m., at Cedar Festival Hall ~ Located at 105 North 100 East, Cedar City, Utah.

Members Present

Erik Cox, Chair
Mark Halterman
Dennis Gray
Michelle Tullis
Kyle Christensen

Members Excused

Mike Platt
Roger Thomas

Staff Present

Brett Hamilton, Iron County Planner
Terry Palmer, Iron County Building Official/Zoning Administrator
Merilee Wilson, Iron County Engineering Department
Lisa Woolsey, Iron County Building/Zoning Department

Staff Excused

Sam Woodall, Iron County Deputy Attorney
Rich Wilson, Iron County Engineer

Others Present

Ron Flud
Beverly Flud
Janet Borg
Rachel Johnson
Ken Robinson
Linda Reynolds
Dallas Buckner

Representing

Self
Self
Self
Self
Self & County Commissioner
Self
GoCivil Engineering

1. WELCOME AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Cox opened the meeting at 5:32 p.m.
Chair Cox led the pledge of allegiance.

2. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT; Equestrian Trails Ranch LLC – PUBLIC HEARING

Consider a request for a development agreement amendment between Equestrian Trails Ranch, LLC and Iron County, to allow a maximum of 64 twin-home units within the master-planned subdivision. The project area is generally located north of 4000 N, east of 4400 W, west of 3700 W, and south of 4600 N (within Sections 18, Township 35 South, Range 11 West within Iron County, Utah).

Applicant: Equestrian Trails Ranch, LLC c/o Sam Williams

Representative: Dallas Bucker, GoCivil Engineering

Introduction:

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- This is a Proposed Development Agreement Amendment. The original development agreement was presented in February of this year.
- The project is located near Midvalley Road and Lund Hwy and is Southwest of those roads, along 4000 North and about 4400 West.
- The zoning on the property is all Residential ½ acre. Mostly surrounding it is Rural Agriculture 20 acre and some Residential 1acre property as well as being along the future Cedar Valley Belt Route that bisects the property.
- An overview of the request is to amend the approved development agreement for the Equestrian Trails Ranch Subdivision. The request is to allow attached twin-home units within the development. There is nothing in our code now that allows for twin-home units. Since they had a development agreement associated with the project, we felt like that was the simplest way to request an amendment for the project.
- They are requesting a maximum of 64 units, which is 32 twin home buildings. To clarify this would not be an addition to what has already been approved; it would be a part of what has already been approved.
- The total project area is about 264 acres, so at 2 units per acre that would be a maximum of 528 units is what is already approved. So the request is basically that the applicant would like to have 64 twin-homes out of those 528 units.

- Each unit would have to be on its own independently platted lot. A twin-home is an attached building with units sold separately on separate lots.
- Considerations for the Planning Commission and County Commission as well, obviously this introduces a new housing type that is not currently permitted within our county zoning standards. With an expanded development we look at whether or not it provides expanded benefits. With the development agreement the overall intent is that you are getting more from the project and development then you would normally get under our current development regulations.
- The amenity areas from the original development agreement there is quite a bit of open space, area trails, additional landscape feature, etc. It comes down to a consideration of whether or not this additional request for twin-homes fits within that existing mold that is already there and the amenities that they are providing or if there is something additional that you think would be needed.
- Another question we ask is if the proposed twin-home project advances a specific objective, housing policy goals, or development outcome. That is specific language from chapter 17.42 for development agreements. Additional questions include would we allow twin-homes here, should we allow them in other parts of unincorporated county, or should there be a future code development amendment where we look at it more broadly, or should we continue to look at it on a project by project basis. Also, we ask if the change in the housing form is consistent with the County's long term development goals. Obviously all these are just considerations. When it comes to a development agreement like this, there is a lot of discretion as to what can be done. The development agreement establishes its own set of criteria, and its own framework for this specific project.
- A packet was provided for the planning commissioners with an attachment regarding the development agreement, where the changes were highlighted showing the different sections of where twin-home lots were added. Also, a definition for twin-homes which describes the setbacks standards because they would vary with a twin-home. With a twin-home, you have a 0 setback where they are attached and there are additional sizing standards and parking standards as well. Additionally, CC&R's would be required to govern the additional standards.
- Phase 1 is for 481/2 acre lots and greater. Phase 2 is 15 lot. As an example he showed where the twin homes could be placed near Phase 2 along the proposed belt route. The amendment does not exactly state where the twin-homes would be but their intents is along the belt route. There is no stipulation currently that states where the twin-homes are required to be
- A summary of the public comments we have received are:
 - Water & aquifer depletion
 - Infrastructure timelines
 - Preservation of low density, quiet rural atmosphere, dark skies
 - Concerns with the original development already and the addition of twin-home's

Dennis asked if the going from ½ acre lots to 10,000 sq. ft. lots.

Brett responded the development agreement already allowed for 10,000 sq. ft. lots, which took an average density, so, across the entire site it ends up being about an average of ½ -acre each or 2 lots per acre. With this proposal for the twin-home lots, they would essentially be going down to 5,000 sq. ft. lots.

Dallas Buckner added that there is Phase 1 & Phase 2 that we bought preliminary plats through. We have met with staff to talk about the potential of doing the twin-homes, which there isn't anything explicate but our intent has been and is reflected on the preliminary plat to do twin-homes along the belt route. From the overall density our proposal to have it internal to the subdivision. These are the ½ acre to acre size lots. We have a little more density on the 10,000 sq. ft. and twin-homes along there, once we get above the belt route we go back to the more quarter to quarter acre size. When we look at the overall layout we have the 528 acres that is aloud, with the larger lots the amenities, the trails, and our larger roads were not anywhere near there. So, with the discussion we hear at these meetings often about affordability and housing this is a way that we still have the same 10,000 sq. ft. lots but we are just putting 2 units per lot and we have capped at 32 lots or 64 units. Our intent is to show that's what is reflected on our updated drawings pending the development agreement approval is to kind of line it along the belt route so it is eternal to the project.

Terry so, at the end of the day we are going to eliminate 32 footprint houses off of the overall subdivision by going to twin-homes. Dallas replied the key is were not adding surplus to it, we are just using the existing that can change with the development agreement.

Terry the numbers will change from that single family to twin-homes. Dallas added there is a number of changes to the development agreement but a lot of it was definitions and everything tied to twin-homes, but everything else as far as open space, amenities, trails etc. is still in there as originally approved.

Chair Cox asked is there access to this subdivision off of the belt route. Brett replied no, there is no access for anything within this development under the belt route.

Dallas commented about the infrastructure question, which I am sure we will hear from the public, but with the Phase 1 we are doing a road dedication and obviously going to improve the eternal roads. With the Phase 2 we are required from the Development Agreement to chip seal but we are probably going to end up doing asphalt with the approval of Phase 2. Regarding water, we are working with the water conservancy district to add a feeder line within the belt route right of way to help service addition phases. The development agreement requires that Phase 2 will have a hard service road all the

way down to 4100 W. Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been approved and the staff has given technical approval for the drawings. The drawings have been modified to show the town-homes assuming they get approved and if denied those drawings will have to be reverted. The intent is to do Phase 1 and Phase 2 together. The paving of 4000 and 4100 should happen within the calendar year.

Kyle Christensen asked about the extra parking due to the number of bedrooms in the units. He asked if there would be any parking along the belt route.

Dallas explained there are two permitted accesses off the belt route into the subdivision. There will be no parking along the Belt Route.

Terry shared there will be an underpass for pedestrian crossing and another underpass for water and drainage.

Open Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing and read the consideration for the public hearing. The following comments were made:

- Janet Borg shared:
 - That she enjoys the process but she does not feel like her voice matters and feels this is a bait and switch situation.
 - The applicant is now asking for high density housing on a development that was previously approved without it.
 - She feels the creep of high density housing. She chose a rural area to start a nursery, which is an approved use in Rural Ag areas. At this point she doesn't want to invest in that because she doesn't trust if our property rights will be upheld and our properties will be devalued because high density housing will be next to agricultural land.
- Beverly Flud stated:
 - Approval of this project could be a detrimental precedence because the next builder will want to put twin-homes in.
 - That type of twin-homes and high density belong in Cedar City proper, in Enoch, or even in some parts of Parowan.
 - Bringing in twin-homes is going to ensure that the rural character that we all talk about will be contaminated.
 - People that buy twin-homes want the affordable home, but they are not buying in to what all of us out there love, which is the rural nature of the area.
 - Even though some of this subdivision lots are ½ acre, most of them are 1 acre. I do not know anyone in a twin-home that has a horse on their property, it does not work.
 - The 12 percent of twin-homes that are going into this subdivision will become the tail that wags the dog. Because the twin home owners will not like the flies, the horses, the trails and horse manure, etc.
 - She thinks the county requires a minimum of 9,000 or 6500 sq. ft. for twin-homes.
- Brett explained the County does not have any ordinances for twin-homes right now.
- Beverly continued:
 - The applicant, it seems, is trying to squeeze these twin-homes in with smaller lots, with no yard, no parking, etc.
 - The first time that we listen to the developers, they promoted this subdivision as Equestrian Trails Ranch. The words "equestrian" and "ranch" become ironic when considering twin-homes for this development.
 - She asked what the public benefit would be for the rest of the 88 percent of homeowners in the development and what qualities are enhanced by having a mixed-use plan.
 - There are certain expectations that people who will be buying these homes will have and that does not include mixed-use housing.
 - She asked if the twin-homes owners would be paying HOA fees because she feels they will become resentful when their fees are used for maintaining the trails, the parks, etc.
 - Her experience in California, Las Vegas, and now here guarantee twin-home owners will start complaining because they are not horse people, nor animal people, they are city dwellers. Twin-homes need to be in the cities.
- Linda Reynolds stated:
 - That no one has addressed the water.
 - She does not understand how the water works for this community for this subdivision.
 - When she bought 20 acres, she was required to purchase 2-acre feet of water. That water is now divided between 3 properties that total 20 acres.
 - She asked how the water will work for this subdivision, what the total number of homes is, and if the builder/developer has to purchase that many water shares, and if the water rights include the twin-homes.
- Chair Cox explained the developer did purchase water rights and gave them to the Water Conservancy District for this project.
- Terry Palmer explained that for each twin-home being proposed, the applicant is taking one house away so each side of a twin-home will be accounted for the same way 1 home would.
- Linda continued:
 - Even though you have a water right, it does not mean the water is there. The water is not there, we know it is not.
 - She knows that down the road this project is not going to work even though the County says that the developer had the money and bought the water rights so he has the right to do it.
 - Her concern, if this is approved, is that twin-homes would now be within the County's Tier 2 area and that other developers will want twin-homes because this applicant has them.

- Cedar is the perfect sized town. There is room for some growth, but if we are not careful, we are going to end up being like Price, Utah or Sunnyside, California where it is crime ridden because they do manufactured and low income homes. Sixty-four houses is not a lot in the scheme of things right now, but down the road, it is going to make a huge impact.
- Ken Robinson noted:
 - This is not something the County has approved before and not something, that exists in the County.
 - In a meeting with the Mayors of Enoch and Cedar City, they shared that the area for this project is not within their annexation plans. Annexation is going to be a hindrance because the subdivision would not be up to the municipality's standards that they have for annexation.
 - Additionally, the parking becomes a situation. Nobody parks all their extra vehicles, their toys, etc. in the garage, they are parked out on the street that becomes a hazard everywhere you go.
- Ken Robison continued: Explained he is speaking as an Iron County Commissioner: From the road department perspective, this becomes a very difficult development for the County to maintain, including pushing snow, and accessing the subdivision with all the things that were mentioned before.
- Linda Reynolds stated another other issue is crime. When you start doing higher density and lower income housing, it is just the fact that crime is going to go up and when you are way out there people tend to think they can get away with more shenanigans.
- Beverly Flud stated:
 - If the County is wondering why there is not a full house tonight, it is because of the timing of this meeting being the day before the July 4th weekend. She has talked to a number of people who were going to be out of town and would not be able to attend. This does not mean people do not care because they absolutely care. She is hopeful that everyone is going to be able to make it to the July 13th meeting.
- Chair Cox replied:
 - The first Thursday of the month is the regularly scheduled meeting and there were not changes made due to the upcoming holiday.
 - The planning commissioners have received and reviewed all of the letters submitted and the concerns are understood.

Close Public Hearing:

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:

- Kyle Christensen asked and Terry Palmer explained the applicant is taking one ½-acre lot and putting one twin-home on it. The applicant will eliminate one single family dwelling off of another lot. At the end of the day, there will not be any additional houses than the original total of 528 that were approved. Each twin-home is counted as 2 houses.
- Dallas Buckner, representing the applicant, explained:
 - Regarding water: The Water Conservancy has specific rules for all types of residential projects and the applicant is subject to those rules no differently than a single lot owner that is hooking up for a quarter acre twin-home would. The rates are different based on the size of the lot and usage. Because the developer is subject to the same rules that everyone else is as far as connecting to the Water Conservancy District, the information will be provided on a plat-by-plat basis.
 - Regarding the bait and switch comment: The developer is proposing a change to a development agreement and everything is above board and is going through the proper process. There are certainly no guarantees by asking for this request. He is at this public meeting, he has worked with the staff, and he will go to the county commission meeting as well. This is a proposal for consideration, but there is nothing about this request that says if he jumps through the hoops he is going to get it.
 - Regarding parking and the lot size: Cedar City and Enoch both have a twin-home ordinance. The proposal for the County exceeds Cedar City's requirements from a lot area standpoint by putting in a minimum of 10,000 sq. ft. These are by no means small twin-home lots and the parking language in the proposal matches one parking spot per bedroom, which is generally in line with what Cedar City has, but it would exceed the 9,000 sq. ft. that Cedar requires.
 - Regarding who would live in this area: The thing that makes this proposal different is that the twin-home owners would be a part of the HOA and not part of any other nearby twin-home project. The developer is doing this at his own risk for his own subdivision. He is requesting twin-homes in his subdivision along with other housing types. He feels comfortable with the product that he is going to put forward, and that it is not going to detract from the other lots that he is going to develop and sale.
 - The developer is not asking for town-homes near other developments because that would be extreme. He is asking for twin-homes within this subdivision to promote single ownership. This way there would be no rentals or duplexes sold to investors. They feel this is a happy medium. Dallas asked and Brett clarified that the R-4K zone allows for 3-plexes and 4-plexes, which is not what this subdivision is asking for.
 - One of the planning schools of thought says that when you go through and do just one homogeneous subdivision of 200 or more ¼-acre lots, like those done after World War 2 when zoning rules came into effect, you are not

- creating a community. A community provides different types of housing within a development, which gives people the ability to get into a twin-home and potentially move up a $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ -acre lot without having to move clear across town.
- Regarding the roads: The County Road Department was outspoken during the development agreement process about what it would take to maintain the roads. Another school of thought says the more density that you put on a road, the more the costs can be distributed towards the infrastructure within that tax base. More taxes are applied when more doors are on the same structural road than would be for 5-acre lots that border a road.
 - Beverly Flud asked and Dallas clarified the 10,000 sq. ft. size of each twin-home lot would be the minimum size.
 - Beverly Flud shared:
 - That when she and her husband were shown a property in Las Vegas years ago, the Realtor said the lot was a really wide 55-foot lot, so it is all a matter of how you sale it.
 - She hears what is being said and she knows the commissioners love more tax revenue, but it still comes down to that the approval would be setting a really bad precedence for the future and for all who are protecting the rural atmosphere.
 - Ron Flud asked if anyone can name another successful project that has had twin-homes in an equestrian park, with an HOA, with bridle trails, etc. He is hearing that people buy twin-homes because they are affordable, but he wants to know how they are going to pay for the two horses in the corral. He just does not see twin-homes being successful.
 - Dennis Gray reminded the public to direct their comments to the planning commissioners, and not back and forth between them and the applicant. He was appreciative of their civility, but encourage the pubic not to continue down that road.
 - Beverly Flud asked what the benefit to the 88 percent of the soon to be land owners will have once the houses get built, and how twin-homes would enhance their lifestyle. She cannot see the benefits in the master plan. Twin-homes do not bring anything except for more warm bodies and they do not like animals.
 - Chair Cox shared:
 - They could continue to debate a lot of "what if's".
 - He shared an example that his son lives across from the subdivision that he lives in and it is nice to have them close by. This project may facilitate something like that where a young family could live somewhat close to their parents who have those horses on a 5-acre lot, but that may be the exception rather than the rule.
 - When an R-4K project was presented on Midvalley Road, he was opposed to it because he did not think a 10,000 sq. ft. lot belongs out near Three Peaks. He has been consistent in that thought process so, it would be his recommendation that this project is not a good fit. He knows the public is probably shocked by that because so many times the planning commission gets accused of just being a rubber stamp and that we really do not think it through. He is sympathetic to the public.
 - He is on the fire department and has fought a lot of fires out in that area for 20 years. The more people living out there, the more difficult it is to defend against fires. The fire department is at Three Peaks almost every weekend. There is a fire station on 1600 N Lund Hwy so the response times are pretty good for that area.
 - Beverly Flud shared that the Sheriff's response has been tremendous when she has called them out to our property.
 - Linda Reynolds feels the proposed neighborhood, on July 4th and 24th, with all of those fields and fireworks could be crazy.
 - Beverly Flud asked if everyone was familiar with the twin-homes on Lund Hwy, just off Hwy 56 and noted there is nowhere for them to park. Their driveways are so short they cannot handle a full size pick-up. From what she has seen presented at this meeting, she sees the same thing happening with this proposal.
 - Chair Cox shared that as humans we always judge from what we see as to what is going to be in the future. I have worked with Dallas a long time; his firm is conscientious about what they try to do to make it the best they can, noting that is not always the case.
 - Linda Reynolds stated:
 - She feels the applicant is going the extra mile and she appreciates that, but if approved this starts a precedence. The next developer is not going to be that conscientious, so it is a huge concern.
 - She asked about the map that was shared during the presentation that showed a road that looked like it was going up and out of the neighborhood and if it going to Midvalley Road.
 - Chair Cox explained that the road is not going to Midvalley Road because above the subdivision there are 5-acre lots.
 - Brett Hamilton pulled up the map and shared where the project ends, and showed that it does not connect all the way to Midvalley.
 - Terry Palmer added that the County does have master planned roads that will go to the west and to the east eventually.
 - Brett Hamilton stated that 3700 W is one of the master plan roadways that will connect to Midvalley.
 - Dennis Gray asked the planning commissioners if they could discuss the proposed amended development agreement between themselves before carrying on.
 - Terry Palmer stated:
 - Regarding affordable housing, he has recently reviewed emails from the State of Utah and Modern Income Housing. Iron County, along with every county and city in the State of Utah, has been mandated to put an affordable housing plan into place. This project being presented tonight has not been proposed as part of the mandate, but it would still meet some of the requirements if twin-homes were approved. In the next month, he will begin filling out the State's report,

which is about 60 pages, on what the County is doing to comply with Modern Income Housing requirements. If this proposal does get approved by the planning and county commissioners, he could say that this is one more step to meeting the Modern Income Housing mandate. The State has not put a number on how many low income houses are required because it varies from county to county. Iron County will lose funding from the State if it does not comply with the mandate on certain criteria.

- He just wanted to let the public know that the State of Utah is mandating Modern Income Housing.
- Linda Reynolds stated that she agrees with affordable housing, but feels there is a place for it. She has observed that cops are always patrolling within those places due to crime.
- Terry Palmer added:
 - He has spent hours with the State of Utah over low-income house and its location, and they do not care that Wal-Mart is 7.4 miles away from the middle of Lund Hwy and Midvalley Road. He has told the State that it does matter because the County does not have the infrastructure to support it in more rural areas.
 - He agrees the proposed location may not be the place for twin-homes, but he is not the one that decides that because the governor will come down and visit his office if the criteria is not met.
- Chair Cox added the State is significantly behind the mandate goals. For example, the first year they did 20,000 houses and last year there were only around 7,000.
- Terry Palmer added the State is trying to come up with different things to help reach higher numbers. The County cannot mandate it, but when an applicant comes in, especially the ones closer to the municipalities, the County will ask the applicant what they are including to meet the mandate for Modern Income Housing.
- Rachel Johnson stated that it has come up multiple times that anybody who lives in a smaller house or higher density housing increases crime. That is a prejudice, it is classist and it is not factually true.
- Dennis Gray shared:
 - After looking into this, he understands the long-term goal the County has and that the County needs to meet the mandate. He does not know if what is being proposed tonight advances a certain, specific objective that the County has for the area in Equestrian Trails Ranch.
 - He feels that what was previously approved for the subdivision pushed the allowances as far as they can go. With it not being permitted within the current county zoning, we need to look at this as a bigger picture if the State is coming down and identify some areas upfront stating these zones are where we can do that.
 - He feels development agreements are great, but feels if we do this it does set a precedence where there is nothing like it right now. He understands what the developer is doing and respects them, but this request does not check all of the boxes for him.
- Chair Cox shared an example on how million dollar houses in the Peak View Subdivision were built and then the developer added 10,000 sq. ft. lots right next to them. The reason why he is oppose to the twin-homes for this project is because if he had a 1-acre lot and had a big house on it, he would not want someone putting 10,000 sq. ft. lots right next door to him.
- Terry Palmer stated that the County is not trying to sell this idea. The applicant came to the County and asked what they had to do to present what they wanted. He shared that he is on that fence and could go either way with this. He feels that there have been good discussions at this meeting and he appreciates that.
- Chair Cox stated that he feels there must be some areas that the County can identify that make better sense.
- Michelle Tullis asked if Chair Cox had closed the public hearing.
- Chair Cox stated that he had closed the public hearing and that if there were no other questions, he would accept a motion.
- Dennis Gray clarified that the recommendation would be made to the County Commission who makes the final decision.

Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the County Commission or Continue the Item

Motion: Dennis Gray made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that agenda item #2 for the Development Agreement Amendment for Equestrian Trails Ranch LLC, be denied.

Second: Seconded by Kyle Christensen

Motion Passed: (Voting, Eric Cox, aye, Dennis Gray, aye, Mark Halterman, aye, Michelle Tullis, aye, Kyle Christensen, aye)

Brett Hamilton shared the next public hearing will be held at the County Commission Meeting on Monday, July 13th at the courthouse in Parowan at 10:00 am.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS... Non-Agenda Items

Chair Cox opened the public comments.

No Comments were made

Chair Cox closed the public comments.

4. MINUTES... consider approval of minutes for the June 4, 2026 meeting.

Motion: Michelle Tullis made a motion to approve the minutes of June 4, 2026 as the official record of that same planning commission Meeting.

Second: Seconded by Chair Cox.

Motion Passed: (Voting, Eric Cox, aye, Dennis Gray, aye, Mark Halterman, aye, Michelle Tullis, aye, Kyle Christensen, aye)

5. STAFF REPORTS...

Building Department:

Terry Palmer shared:

- The building department has issued 263 building permits to date. We are ahead of last year.
- He is seeing more industrial builds right now. There are 2 industrial subdivisions the County has approved; Silver Hills and Lakeside. The health department is questioning if they are going to issue any more septic permits than they have already issued for these 2 subdivisions because industrial/commercial businesses have been built there, but the public health department did not address contamination levels on the site. A meeting has been scheduled with the health dept. and the County to work out where things stand and what has happened. The meeting will also include capacity on the 4000 W sewer line, the CUP's issued in Industrial zones, procedures, etc. The County feels that they followed all of the procedures correctly in this case.

Chair Cox shared:

- The asphalt operation near 2000 Flushes owned by Gilbert has defaulted so the County needs to be aware because of the CUP associated with it.
- The gravel pit near Summit owned by Frank Nichols is using the BLM land UDOT has leased, traveling through private property, and dropping into the 600 East road that goes under the freeway. If the County can stop that by enforcing the CUP, UDOT will not have to get the State's attorney involved.

Terry noted that Rich is aware of the situation and that the staff will follow up.

County Attorney: Not in attendance, so no report given.

County Engineer: Not in attendance, so no report given.

Planner & Services Coordinator:

Brett Hamilton shared that during the moratorium for data centers, the County is looking at doing a workshop with the community in August to get feedback from the public.

Chair Cox gave an example of how educating the public has been helpful for the Cedar City Police Dept. regarding flock cameras taking pictures of license plates. The public felt it was a violation, but Chief Adams explained that no faces are in the photos and using the cameras has helped solve crimes. He has used Facebook to get information to the public.

Brett added this is a great opportunity to educate the public, but also to get the information out in front of people so they can feel like they have provided input, received feedback, and made a difference.

Chair Cox shared that Mari Eddy, a realtor, called him to ask about the metal building being leased for model rockets located on Kane Springs Rd in Parowan within an agriculture area. He told her to call Brett to see if it is allowed within the agriculture zone. Mari told him that she or the business owner would contact Brett.

Terry Palmer noted that he thought they were planning to locate in the Lakeside Industrial Subdivision.

6. ADJOURN

Chair Cox adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Minutes Approved August 13, 2026 by the Iron County Planning Commission

Lisa Woolsey

8/14/2026