

IRON COUNTY, UTAH
IRON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 13, 2026

The Iron County Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting August 13, 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
Mike Platt
Roger Thomas

Staff Present

Brett Hamilton, Iron County Planner
Terry Palmer, Iron County Official/Zoning Administrator
Sam Woodall, Iron County Deputy Attorney
Lisa Woolsey, Iron County Building/Zoning Department

Staff Excused

Rich Wilson, Iron County Engineer
Merilee Wilson, Iron County Engineering Department

Others Present

Representing

Rand Bettridge	Self
Cal Crane	Self
Tammy Crane	Self
Marion Munn	Self
Rob Edwards	Self
Bryson Hinkins	Self
Diana Girlain	Self
Lisa Beck	Self
Peggy Carter	Self
Jim Carter	Self
Byron Stubbs	Self
Shelby Chapeese	Self
Felipe Benavidez	Self
Tim Watson	Self
Diana Stiller	Self
Brennan Moore	Self

1. WELCOME AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Cox opened the meeting at 5:37 p.m.
Mark Halterman led the pledge of allegiance.

2. ZONE CHANGE – Scott Day; RA-20 to R-1 - PUBLIC HEARING

Consider a request for a zone change from Rural Agriculture 20 Acre (RA-20) to Residential 1 Acre (R-1) on approximately 20 acres. The property is addressed as 3831 W 4000 N, Cedar City, UT and located in Section 19, T35S, R11W, SLB&M. APN: D-0605-0002-0000

Applicant: Scott Day, represented by Daryl Brown with Watson Engineering

Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the County Commission or continue the item

Introduction:

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- The property is located along 4000 North, West of Lund Hwy, East of 4100 West. It is a 20-acre site. It currently has some structures on there that take up about 5 acres of the site right now.
- There is a sewer line that runs along 4000 North in the front of the property and there is also a water line that runs along 4000 north. The sewer line cuts North on 3700 West. We have 2000 connections on this 4500 west line, so the proposed zone is RA-20 rural agriculture, 20 acres, and the proposal is to go R-1 zoning designation so that the R-1 property to the north is the

Valley Stratton project that came about a year ago. With limited connections that we have, even with a zone change is approved that is not necessarily going to guarantee them connections to the sewer.

- If we are out of sewer connections and we do not have any more, they will potentially have to negotiate something on their own, perhaps with the city or some other means or methods, or develop the site with septic systems with a five acre minimum lot size. That is also a potential option if the zone change were to be approved. So, these are the 13 evaluation criteria that we look at for all the zone changes. One of the main criteria is in 2B, it is not a 40-acre property as required in 2A, but it is adjacent to other existing properties that do have that R-1 designation. And there is of course, our R-1/2 zoning designation around it as well. The adjacent Equestrian Trails Ranch project lots are R-1/2 properties on the North side of 4000 North.
- Brett asked at the end of his presentation if anyone had questions for him and mentioned the applicant is here at this meeting.

Chair Cox asked the applicant Scott Day if he had anything to say. The applicant said he would answer any questions as needed.

Mike Platt asked how close it is to any annexation lines.

Brett responded:

- It is a long way from any annexation line, so, we would probably go back to the vicinity map to give us the best indicator here.
- For example. Cedar City and Enoch City are about 2 miles from any annexation boundary line.
- At last month's planning meeting, we spoke about the high-density proposal, and it was mentioned how both cities were spoken to and neither one were interested in annexing out there.
- Regarding water, since it is within the Cedar Valley, they would be required to have one ERU (equivalent residential unit) per household. They would have to apply and acquire those water rights before subdividing. Those water rights would need to be a priority date of 1934 or prior.
- The Rural Agriculture zoning could actually use more water the way it is than if it is changed to R-1.

Open Public Hearing:

Chair Cox opened the public hearing and read the consideration for the public hearing. He noted that the planning commissioners understand that this project is within an island of RA-20 and that their neighbors could potentially do activities that would be more impactful.

No comments were made.

Close Public Hearing:

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the County Commission

Motion: Mark Halterman made a motion to recommend the Iron County Commission that the zone change from RA-20 to R-1, for the 20-acre property identified in the agenda item #2, be approved.

Second: Seconded by Roger Thomas.

Motion passed: (Voting, Erick Cox, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Mark Halterman, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Kyle Christensen, aye)

3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – Fleet Mining Services, LLC; – PUBLIC HEARING

Consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow sand and gravel extraction on an approximately 97.4-acres, with active mining proposed on roughly 60 acres. The project includes no blasting, wash plants, or permanent structures, with extracted materials intended for UDOT projects. The project is generally located 1.15 miles south of the Kanarraville rest area on the west side of Interstate 15. APN: E-0401-0013-0000 & E-0413-0004-0000 (SEC 8 & 17, T38S, R12W, SLB&M)

Applicant: Fleet Mining Services, LLC

Planning Commission Action: Approve, Approve with Modifications, Deny, continue the item

Introduction:

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- The property is located southwest of Kanarraville near the rest stop on I-15, a little over a mile south on the west side. The project is on two parcels and owned by Omega Pharmaceutical who also owns property to the north and to the west. UDOT owns the other properties.
- The total acreage between the two parcels is 97.5. The disturbance area of the mining project is approximately 60 acres due to a stream/drainage area and power lines that run through the site. The mining operation will be west of that.
- The site plan indicates the crusher will be located at the north end of the property, the stockpiles would be just south of that, and the truck scale south of that near the road access. Employee parking will be at the north end just west of the crusher. The direct UDOT access is one of the biggest components of this property.
- Originally, when the applicant approached the County it was for all of the properties owned by Omega Pharmaceuticals totaling 250 acres. The requirements for improvements to Kanara Hills Drive were determined to be intensive because the road is not in good shape, is not very wide, and is quite narrow so the project was scaled back. Because this operation would only services UDOT related projects, UDOT is allowing them to use their direct access. The only traffic from this project that will utilize Kanarra Hills Drive and other county roads is employee vehicles, which includes approximately three employees on site each day.

- The proposed setbacks include a 50-foot setback from any of the creek areas and an additional setback of 25 feet from any of the transmission lines.
- The packet given to the planning commissioners prior to the meeting includes more information so he asked if they had any questions.

The planning commissioners clarified the location of the operation is south of the rest area about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from Hwy 144 and is located in the same area as the previous gravel pit and lagoons from the 1960's.

Gardiner Francis with Fleet Mining gave a brief overview, sharing that:

- The 60 acres will only be a sand and gravel operation.
- A 6-foot berm is being proposed at the perimeter of the property for shielding wind and for dust suppression.
- They own water rights for the property, so there will be active dust suppression at the transfer stations for the material, as well as on the gravel roads.
- Reclamation will be done concurrently using seed.

Open Public Hearing:

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

- Dianna Steele shared she is concerned about the road access. She has noticed large side-dump trucks on the road and is worried about the poor visibility and increased traffic.
- Chair Cox explained that UDOT is widening the freeway to put a third lane southbound starting right at the rest area and going down to the top of the Black Ridge. This gravel operation will only service building that third lane along the side of the freeway. The same company that is doing the widening project right now is going to be doing the next UDOT project as well, which will start in January 2027.
- Cal Crane shared his concerns that west of the rest area there is not a main road, access road, or frontage road to the freeway. The County does not grade the road because it is not theirs. South of the pond, there needs to be a turn back to the freeway for emergency vehicles so that when it rains or when the freeway is clogged up, the vehicles can get through.
- Tammy Crane shared her concern is Kanarrville Hills Drive and that it is just a small mountain road where people ride horses and kids come down it all of the time. Safety and traffic on the road is an issue with additional traffic. When it rains the road washes out all over the place. There would need to be quite a bit of work to make that a road the applicant can actually use so an alternate route is needed.
- Wesley Curtis asked if there is any restorative projects after the mining is complete and what that would look like because light dust problems exist when it dries out.
- Brett Hamilton shared the CUP includes a requirement to provide a reclamation plan, which has been submitted. At the end of mining, they would have to reseed the property so that natural vegetation grows up again so that it does not just become a big dust bowl.
- Chair Cox received a comment from UDOT from CJ Conner in Salt Lake, who is responsible for the rest areas, regarding the sewer lagoons. CJ asked that they only had concerns about maintenance and asked that the project not undermine the embankment and that the dust is controlled so that it does not fill up the lagoons prematurely. Chair Cox provided Brett with the written UDOT response, for the record.
- Chair Cox clarified the lagoons are on the property along the freeway. The material on the 5-acre parcel that UDOT purchased from the applicant will be taken out of the lagoons to fill in the pit that is already there. UDOT does not want to truck in any material from offsite for that lagoon project. Good clay has been found on the site that will be used to line the lagoons so material won't have to be imported.
- Brett shared there was a concern that there was already mining happening on this project site due to equipment located nearby.
- Chair Cox responded that he has clarified the concern with the person asking and explained that the equipment is for a completely different project. He also explained that the applicant will be allowed to access the project site from the freeway once there is a break in the fence so they will not have to use that Kanarra Mountain Road. The access would be for company vehicles as well.
- Rob Edwards with Fleet Mining Services asked what the acre footage was for the sewer lagoons.
- Chair Cox responded the lagoons go from the power line over to the freeway and are approximately 300 feet north property line. The widening on the freeway will squeeze the lagoon area so UDOT will make them longer and a little skinnier. UDOT is meeting Monday to discuss the next phase of the widening project to the north because it will affect the rest area. The onramp for the rest area is going to have to be widened and lengthened as well. The widening may push UDOT a little further onto UDOT's property. UDOT does not want to do this project now and then have to redo it so they are trying to think far enough ahead that it is not an issue.
- Brett shared that the two UDOT projects together, the acreage looks like it is about 27 acres. The lagoons would take up approximately 16 to 18 acres of the 27 total.

Close Public Hearing:

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:

- Dennis Gray asked if the reclamation is part of the conditional use permit. Chair Cox commented that they are going to stockpile the topsoil as their berms around the outside and when they are done, they will push it back and seed it.
- Brett Hamilton clarified that the bond is like any other bond we receive, which is included in the CUP.
- Roger Thomas asked if a condition could be added to the CUP indicating the light trucks could use Kanarra Hills Dr. until the I-15 access is open and then they would need to use that access. Employees could use Kanarra Hills Drive and it could be used for emergencies, but is not the preferred route for the project.
- Brett said it could be added under Condition #2 because that is where it talks about access.
- Chair Cox shared that when freeway traffic is plugged up, UDOT's default is to send them through Kanarraville on Old Hwy 91 and not along other roads.
- Public Speaker Tammy Crane asked how long it would take to make that I-15 access to the pit.
- Chair Cox replied the access to the pit is already there. The applicant has to come to UDOT and requested the access, if approved, they get a permit and are allowed to use it. Right now, Harwood and Reese have a permit to the sewer lagoons, so it is a temporary access from the freeway. We just have to have a traffic control plan from the applicant such as barrels up on the shoulder so that the trucks can get over behind the barrels and the pull in through the fence so the general public does not come through. It is a temporary break in the fence while they haul the gravel out of there.
- The applicant, Scott Day, mentioned that the access is already there from when the road was built in the 1960's and that is the same road we plan on using. The traffic for Kanarra Dr. is just going to be for our personal use to our property. Everything else will be coming off the I-15 access.

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

Motion: Roger Thomas made a motion to grant the Conditional Use Permit for the 97.4-acre property identified in agenda item #3, having found the application to be in compliance with the requirements of the Iron County Land Management Code, specifically Section 17.28.050.

Second: Seconded by Dennis Gray.

Motion Passed: (Voting, Erick Cox, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Mark Halterman, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Kyle Christensen, aye)

4. Discussion Item – Draft Land Use Ordinance Revisions & Moratorium Status Update

Discussion and review of proposed amendments to the Iron County Land Use Code in response to the County's temporary land use moratorium on certain large-scale projects. The proposed amendments would establish a performance-based, legislative framework for the planning, review, and regulation of projects that, due to their scale, complexity, infrastructure demands, resource requirements, or regional significance, require a more comprehensive and project-specific zoning review. Staff is seeking Planning Commission feedback on the proposed amendments and overall direction.

Introduction:

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- The staff has been working on proposed revisions for the Land Use Ordinance for the last two and a half months or so. This is in relation to the temporary Land Use Ordinance moratorium that the County Commission adopted on May 26th. The 180-day moratorium goes until November 22nd.
- Prior to the moratorium end date, the County wants to have some new ordinances put into place. This meeting is to review the general framework of what that ordinance looks like and get some basic feedback from the planning commissioners to fine tune the document and review the procedure for these types of projects.
- The name of this section of the Land Use Ordinance will be referred to as the Strategic Development Zone and is based on how development has been evolving within the County. Since the time the moratorium was put in place, additional projects that fit within this Strategic Development Zone have been presented to the County. Sometimes people want to do uses and projects that just don't fit perfectly within our use table so this ordinance will help with that.
- A project may be permitted with an Administrative Land Use Permit (ALUP) or a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Even within those permits, there are limitations on what the applicant is able to do.
- The Strategic Development Zone is intended to address the limitations that the County may require on some of the larger, more complex projects, since they may have a regional impact versus just an impact on that project and its surrounding areas. The proposed ordinance change will modernize the County's code so that it can keep pace with current projects and plan as the County anticipates what may happen in the next 5 to 10 years.
- The proposed code revisions will look at water, utilities, roads, transit, and energy infrastructure that go far beyond the reach of just that one particular site that the project may be proposed on. Rather than applying for a CUP, the applicant will be able to review the Strategic Development Zone to identify all the requirements. A CUP just determines if the use fits within the zone, and if it does, it is expected to be approved with possible mitigations for the impacts. With the code revisions, the Planning Commission will be able to determine if a project is appropriate for Iron County and if so, what conditions need to be met. The decision is a legislative decision where there is a lot more discretion of whether the County will approve, deny, or mitigate the project. CUP's will still be used for projects that are not regionally significant.)

- To determine the finer details, the County will review what may cause a project to be included within the Strategic Development Zone, such as:
 - Projects including data centers, energy projects, solar projects, battery storage facilities, industrial campuses, etc.
 - Projects with a 100-megawatt threshold with greater significance so the County Commission will be able to review it and have legislative discretion. If a project has a lower threshold, it could still go through the normal CUP process because the impacts could be reasonably mitigated.
 - Unique projects that the County determines rises to the level of needing to require the Strategic Development Zone. Legislative discretion is built into the code to say that based on these criteria and objectives, the commission feels like the project should be included in the Strategic Development Zone even if it may be under any or all of the thresholds.
 - A massive warehouse may potentially be included into the Strategic Development Zone if it took up more than 250 acres or was a huge investment. For example, a large industrial campus with many components may require additional technical studies.
- Along with the Strategic Development Zone, there would be a mandatory development agreement. The intent is to front load everything at the very beginning of the process to have information available from plans and studies before the County does a preliminary analysis on the project. When information is provided for the building permit stage, all the information would then be available for a legislative rezoning, and a development agreement would be in place. A CUP would not be required in addition to being in the Strategic Development Zone.
- The actual process would be to obtain a rezoning into the Strategic Development zone, have a development agreement in place, and then proceed to obtain building permits while meeting all the stipulations, criteria, and phasing of the development agreement.
- When the previous application for the data center was processed, the County determined additional information was needed and there was not as much discretion as everyone would have liked, such as additional studies.
- The zone would have a list of standard technical studies that would be required. A list of what the County absolutely wants to see, will be in the code, but based on project type it is, there might be some additional technical studies that would be required. Every study is not going to be required for every project. The study requirements are going to be unique and based specifically on what the impacts are that the County needs to evaluate for that project.
- To summarize the timeline:
 - May 26th was when the County Commission approved the temporary Land Use Moratorium.
 - Tonight, August 13th, is to share this high-level overview to the Planning Commission.
 - September 3rd, at the Planning Commission meeting, will be to receive and discuss feedback from the planning commissioners. No recommendation will occur at the September 3rd meeting because the draft document will likely be presented then.
 - Later in September, there will be a community workshop where anyone may come and review the draft document, The County will accept feedback that day until a certain date that has not been determined yet. A few emails have been received with recommendations that the public would like to see incorporated into the document.
 - October 8th the Planning Commission will likely take action and make a recommendation to the County Commission.
 - October 12th or 26th, the recommendation will be reviewed by the County Commission and take action. This will allow for a buffer if the County Commission wants additional time for reviews or edits before the end of the moratorium.
 - November 22nd is the final day of the moratorium.
- Feedback from the planning commissioners is not expected at this meeting because of the limited information that was provided, but questions to consider for feedback include:
 - Do the thresholds discussed seem reasonable or is more information needed?
 - Is the framework of the Strategic Development Zone a good tool?
 - Do you like the idea of providing legislative ability to approve or deny projects?
 - Is the list of impacts a good list?
 - Is something missing from the proposed revisions?
 - Do the requirements cover the requirements placed on the previously approved data center project as conditions?
 - Do the proposed codified regulations for up front information what is needed for these types of projects?

Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:

Discussion and clarifications included:

- Originally, the discussion was to call this a floating overlay zone, but during the draft process the staff realized the studies and research would take a lot of resources. Instead, the Strategic Development Zone is a better way for the developer and applicant to determine if it is a good fit for their project. Currently, if the project doesn't come to fruition, the project goes away, but the zone doesn't. This way, when the project goes away, the next person has to start the process from scratch so that it can be reviewed properly.
- To clarify the zone, it was proposed to change the name to a Strategic Development District that could be applied directly to the project instead of the land. This would help the developer not have to do too many studies too soon.

- The project will not need to be 100% engineered by the time they request to Strategic Development zone, but because the projects may be a half a billion dollar project, the applicant could invest a little additional time and resources to make sure that the County can make a good, educated decision rather than defaulting to assuming that everything is going to work out.
- A CUP not in this zone would work similarly to the development agreement required for this zone, but the development agreement would be contractual for the project not for the land like a CUP is.
- Under the Strategic Development Zone, the land would be required to be reclaimed and returned to the owner at the end of the project.
- When comparing this zone to the Specially Planned Area (SPA) zone, they should not contradict one another. Since projects in the SPA zone are primarily residential, it would be best in the Strategic Development Zone if a project included residential, it would be ancillary to the larger project so residential is a lesser component. This will keep applicants from bypassing the strategic development process.
- The smaller projects would not be required to do upfront studies, but this is required of the larger strategic projects because they need to realize the cost to the County when the project does not develop.
- Once a draft of the Strategic Development Zone is ready, it will be posted on the County's website under the Data Centers Updates section regarding the moratorium.
- There is not a specific location for the zone, it will be up to the developer to find possible locations that meet their needs and conform with the County's requirements for distance.
- Currently, the A-20 zone is in 80% of the unincorporated part of the county and allows these larger strategic uses. The strategic zone will have criteria that says before the County will even look at the project it must meet the eligibility criteria. The criteria will weed out project from being located where the county doesn't want it to be.
- A CUP allows the County to take a permit away if they do not follow the conditions. The development agreement, a contract between the developer and the County, does the same thing but even better. Noncompliance consequences can build in liquidated damages, involve litigation, and can be more specific than a CUP. CUP can be revoked, but a development agreement could have additional penalties and restrictions.
- Due to the existing workforce of the County, it was suggested that some built-in technology be included for monitoring by the public for sound levels, water usage, etc.
- If a developer chooses to use the infrastructure and benefits of the Inland Port Authority, there may be funds that could go directly toward administrative costs such as additional personnel for monitoring although that is not a guarantee.
- Potential to include incentives to projects that use clean energy could be included in the ordinance.
- The community workshop needs to be planned well so everyone can be heard, and it is a respectful exchange of ideas. Using a public involvement firm may be one way to manage it. Doing the workshop with another event like the Iron County Transportation Expo on September 17th was suggested.
- The ordinance could include required community outreach for each project or refer to a policy of options for outreach, but how that would look in the ordinance needs to be determined. Good planning includes making people aware, being part of the project, providing input so that it can help it turn out better.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENTS...** Non-Agenda Items

Open Public Comments

Chair Cox opened the Public Comments.

The following comments were made:

- Mike Platt shared that he has concerns about the sewer connection issues between Cedar City and Iron County regarding the growth areas surround Cedar City.
- Terry Palmer shared there are ongoing discussions between Cedar City and the County to resolve the issue and create an agreement.
- Brett stated he is optimistic due the recent conversations regarding sewer, development, and annexation. Many developments need to be within the cities because of infrastructure.
- At the recent County Commission meeting, a project was tabled until Cedar City and the County could come together. The plans needs to include the big picture and those who are working to find a resolution are appreciated.

Close Public Comments

Chair Cox Closed the Public Comments.

6. **MINUTES...** consider approval of minutes for the July 2, 2026 meeting.

Motion: Dennis Gray made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2026 as the official record of that same planning commission

meeting.

Second: Seconded by Chair Cox.

Motion passed: (Voting, Erick Cox, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Mark Halterman, aye; Roger Thomas, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Kyle Christensen, aye)

7. **STAFF REPORTS...**

Building Department: Terry Palmer stated that everything seems to be going good.

County Attorney: No comment.

County Engineer: Absent.

Planner & Services Coordinator: Brett Hamilton mentioned that some of the staff will be doing another visit to a couple of different data centers next week and will be meeting with Eagle Mountain's staff as well. The staff plans on asking some great questions to get some more feedback from an agency that has several data centers and large scaled projects to help educate and inform our ordinances as well. One center has been there for 10 years and the other for 15 years. He plans to send a report regarding the visits to the planning commissioners.

8. **ADJOURN**

Chair Cox adjourned the meeting at 6:53 p.m.

Minutes Approved September 3, 2026 by the Iron County Planning Commission

Lisa Woolsey

8/4/2026