

MINUTES
ENOCH CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
August 25, 2026 at 5:30pm
City Council Chambers
City Offices, 900 E. Midvalley Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Leonard Correa
Commissioner Delaine Finlay
Commissioner Bryce Poulson
Commissioner David Hoopes- Excused
Commissioner Kyle Jones -

STAFF PRESENT:

Council Member Trower
Ryan Robinson, City Manager
Lindsay Hildebrand, City Recorder
Hayden White, Public Works Director

Public Present: H Paul Walker, Matt Phillips, and Cecil Seright

- 1. CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING-By**
 - a. Pledge of Allegiance –**
 - b. Invocation (2 min.) –Audience invited to participate. – Given by**
Commissioner Poulson
 - c. Inspirational thought – None / Commissioner Jones will have the thought at the**
next meeting.
 - d. Approval of agenda for August 25, 2026 – Commissioner Jones made a**
motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Finlay seconded and all voted
in favor.
 - e. Approval of minutes for August 11, 2026 – Commissioner Finlay made a**
motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Poulson seconded and all
voted in favor.
 - f. Conflict of Interest Declaration – None stated**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.
- 3. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE AMENDMENT OF ENOCH CITY**
ORDINANCE 12.200.206 DEFINITIONS, 12.1900.1902 PERMITTED AND
CONDITIONAL USES IN THE RESEARCH/INDUSTRIAL ZONE, AND
CREATING 12.1900.1911 TEMPORARY WORKFORCE HOUSING

Commissioner Finlay made a motion to close the regular meeting and move into a
public hearing. Commissioner Jones seconded and all voted in favor.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Finlay made a motion to close the public hearing and return to the
regular planning commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner
Jones and all voted in favor.

4. CONSIDER AMENDING ENOCH CITY ORDINANCE 12.200.206 DEFINITIONS, 12.1900.1902 PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES IN THE RESEARCH/INDUSTRIAL ZONE, AND CREATING 12.1900.1911 TEMPORARY WORKFORCE HOUSING AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL

Commissioner Finlay directed the Commission's attention to the fourth "whereas" paragraph in the proposed ordinance, which stated that providing for temporary workforce

housing was a necessary step in ensuring affordable and flexible housing options are available to employees working on-site within the industrial zone. She asked if this was enforceable.

City Manager Ryan Robinson clarified that there is language within the ordinance requiring the housing to be located on the same site as the business, but acknowledged that in practice, employees may work off-site. He further explained that the "whereas" recitals are generally provisions that explain the justification for the amendment.

Commissioner Finlay raised a concern found in Section 12.1900.1911 regarding the definition of Temporary Workforce Housing, specifically on the second line, where occupancy was described as being "exclusively by employees of the landowner." She asked if it should read "business owner" instead of "landowner". What if the land is leased?

City Manager Robinson agreed this was a valid point and suggested the language be changed from "landowner" to "business owner," and confirmed the change would be noted and incorporated when the Commission made its motion. He suggested that the motion could reference all the discussed changes collectively.

Commissioner Finlay continued with the purpose statement in the proposed ordinance, which referenced "temporary on-site residency is necessary for active employment and operational requirements," and asked how the word "necessary" would be determined and whether it was enforceable. City Manager Robinson explained that the purpose statement serves to articulate the rationale for the code amendment rather than to impose a testable standard. He noted that the ordinance is only applicable in the Research/Industrial zone to applicants meeting specific standards, so the purpose language does not commit the city to a particular outcome: "We're not committing ourselves to anything."

Commissioner Finlay noted that subsection (b) of the occupancy requirements also referred to "the owner of the land" rather than the business owner, and suggested that language should be corrected as well. City Manager Robinson agreed, indicating that both sections referencing the landowner would be updated to reflect "business owner."

Commissioner Finlay also observed that the ordinance said nothing about whether spouses or children of employees would be permitted to reside in the units, only employees were referenced. City Manager Robinson confirmed this was correct and expressed his belief that the city likely could not restrict that, as spouses and family members of an employee would naturally accompany them.

Commissioner Finlay addressed the language in subsection 2 of the occupancy requirements, which stated that "the property owner shall maintain an active number of employees residing in the units." She expressed concern that this language was unclear, particularly regarding whether units would need to be occupied year-round if the work is seasonal. City Manager Robinson clarified that the intent was simply to require that occupants be active employees, so that the landowner or business owner could not rent units to individuals who do not work for them. He agreed the sentence needed to be rewritten to clearly reflect this intent. The Commission agreed to change the language to require that units be maintained for active employees, removing the phrase "an active number of."

City Manager Robinson introduced his own concerns about the ordinance, directing the Commission to Section C, subsection 3, regarding location and setbacks. He explained that the setbacks specified in the ordinance default to those of the Research/Industrial zone—18 feet when adjacent to a right-of-way, and 20 feet when adjacent to residential property. However, he noted that for fire-resistant materials, there is no interior setback requirement, meaning temporary housing units could theoretically be placed directly adjacent to one another: "I don't know if anyone's going to go put them all side to side, but it might be helpful if we want to add something in there about it's got to be some 10-foot setback in between each module."

Matt Phillips, the applicant for the initial use of this ordinance, was invited to comment. Mr. Phillips identified himself as the property owner at 6040 North 700 East and stated that he also operates a property management company and manages an RV park near Diamond Z Arena. He offered a practical perspective based on his experience, noting that a standard RV site dimension of 30 feet by 50 feet provides adequate clearance between trailers: "I think, gives clearance between trailers in case of a fire or something. Just makes it look better." He suggested that if a minimum site dimension were to be codified, 30 by 50 would be a workable and industry-standard figure.

City Manager Robinson said a 10-foot minimum wall-to-wall separation was the minimum he had seen in similar standards, but noted the 30-by-50 figure would more naturally account for vehicles parked alongside units. He consulted the city's AI-assisted code review tool and found that interior side setbacks in the city's mobile home park, mobile home subdivision, mixed residential, and RV zones all defaulted to 10 feet.

Chairman Correa recalled previous discussions during the RV park ordinance process, where the Commission had settled on a 15-foot spacing. Commissioner Poulson noted that requiring a 30-foot site dimension would also naturally limit density on a given parcel. Mr. Phillips confirmed that at his RV park, he sets his sites at 30 by 50, and that customers even pay extra for the larger upper-tier spaces. The Commission agreed to include a minimum site pad dimension of 30 feet by 50 feet in Section C, subsection 3.

City Manager Robinson then directed the Commission's attention to the density limits section, noting that it contained the phrase "shall be determined during the conditional use process." He explained that the state has been pushing cities to reconsider the conditional use process, characterizing it as administrative rather than legislative. He recommended striking that language and simply stating that density shall not exceed the more restrictive of the two listed options, without tying it to the conditional use permit process.

Council Member Kimberlee Trower raised a concern about the maximum density of 5 units per gross acre and its potential impact on the city's water quality. She noted, "I do have a concern that we put 5 units on an acre on a septic system in Enoch. I am concerned." City Manager Robinson acknowledged the city has significant nitrate issues in its water and agreed this warranted consideration.

City Manager Robinson then raised a related concern about the potential for large parcels to absorb a disproportionate number of units. He presented a summary he had assembled using an AI tool, comparing the two density options, a percentage-based approach and a numerical unit-per-acre cap, across various parcel sizes from 5 to 50 acres. He noted that on larger parcels, an uncapped formula could result in 100 or more units: "I don't know if that's what the intent is for this." He suggested adding a maximum acreage cap to prevent the ordinance from being used in ways beyond its original intent.

Council Member Trower asked whether the conditional use permit process would require any such proposal to come before the Planning Commission and City Council. City Manager Robinson confirmed that yes, all such applications would go through both bodies regardless. Commissioner Poulson suggested a maximum per business rather than per acre might be more appropriate. City Manager Robinson found this a reasonable idea but acknowledged it could be

circumvented by splitting businesses or parcels. Council Member Trower also asked whether a threshold tied to infrastructure capacity might be more appropriate, for instance, requiring connection to public sewer above a certain number of units. City Manager Robinson noted that the ordinance does contain language in Section E about sewer availability and indicated the health department generally makes determinations on septic capacity through the permitting process.

Mr. Phillips confirmed that the Iron County Health Department reviewed his plans and calculated the required septic tank size, and that he voluntarily oversized the tank for additional capacity, though he would have preferred to connect to the city sewer system had it been within a feasible distance.

After extended discussion, the Commission settled on a maximum of 10 acres per business as an acreage cap under the density limits section. Commissioner Poulson and others concurred that 10 acres was a reasonable ceiling, noting that at the density formula provided, a 10-acre maximum would yield approximately 29 units at most. City Manager Robinson confirmed the language would read that temporary workforce housing projects shall not exceed 10 acres per business.

City Manager Robinson briefly addressed Section E on required infrastructure, which calls for permanent underground utility connections for culinary water, sanitary sewer, and electricity at each designated housing space. Council Member Trower emphasized that large developments should be encouraged to connect to city infrastructure wherever possible, citing the city's ongoing nitrate concerns and noting that it takes approximately 50 years for nitrate contamination to heal. City Manager Robinson noted that the city's code already includes provisions requiring connection to city sewer if within a certain distance of the line, and that this should naturally apply here without additional language needing to be added to the ordinance. He suggested that the Utah State Department of Health's requirements, combined with existing code provisions, would cover the infrastructure issue adequately.

Commissioner Finlay made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council amending Enoch City Ordinance 12.200.206 Definitions, 12.1900.1902 Permitted and Conditional Uses in the Research/Industrial zone, and creating 12.1900.1911 Temporary Workforce Housing, with the following changes from the originally proposed amendment:

- **12.200.206 Definitions – Section I (191) Temporary Workforce Housing.**
Change “Landowner” to “Business Owner”.
- **12.1900.1911 Temporary Workforce Housing Standards (R/I-P Zone Only)**
 - B. Occupancy Requirements**
 - 1. Change “owner of land” to “owner of business”*
 - 2. Remove “number of”*
 - C. Structure and Placement**
 - Add 4. Size of Site: Each site is required to be at least 30 feet wide by 50 feet long.*
 - D. Density Limits:**
 - Remove “shall be determined during the Conditional Use Permit process” and add “not to exceed ten (10) acres per business.”*

Commissioner Poulson seconded and all voted in favor.

- 5. SET A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND ENOCH CITY ORDINANCE SECTION 14.100.150-152 (WATER), 14.200.205 (SEWER), AND 12.300.317 WATER AND SEWAGE REQUIREMENTS - to require that any utility connection be within city limits.**

City Manager Robinson explained the background of this item. The ordinance sections in question currently outline a process by which a property owner outside of city limits may connect to the city's water and sewer system. He noted that the City Council recently discussed a request of this nature and determined that if a property owner wishes to connect to the city's utility systems, the preferred course of action is annexation into the city rather than an out-of-city connection. The proposed amendments would formalize this policy direction, effectively requiring that any utility connection be within city limits. City Manager Robinson confirmed that this agenda item was simply to set a public hearing date, and that the public hearing would be held on September 8, 2026.

Commissioner Jones made a motion to set a public hearing for September 8, 2026 to consider amending Enoch City Ordinance Sections 14.100.150–152 (Water), 14.200.205 (Sewer), and 12.300.317 Water and Sewage Requirements to require that any utility connection be within city limits. Commissioner Poulson seconded and all voted in favor.

6. COMMISSION/STAFF REPORTS

Hayden White, Public Works Director

- The cemetery has been fully paved.
- The crew is currently working on Highway 91. Work is progressing at approximately 28 feet per minute, with the crew reaching Bogatini Street by the end of the current workday. The plan is to continue to the ice rink and then toward Wagon Wheel the following day. After the initial paving pass, a 2-inch cap will be applied, followed by striping and signage changes. The city also extended paving an extra half-mile onto county road for the benefit of city residents, though that segment was not within the approved city contract.
- Test pumping of the Anderson Well is scheduled for the following week. City Manager Robinson noted some anticipation about the amount of silt the well may discharge and confirmed that a trailer full of sandbags had been prepared as a precaution.
- Approximately 40 water meters remain that are not communicating with the tower antenna. Staff continues to troubleshoot these, with the goal of eliminating the need for manual re-reads once all meters are connected.
- The storm drain in the area near the Anderson Well may need to be checked for silt accumulation after test pumping. The sewer cleaning company, which typically visits in November, will be asked to address that area when they come to clean storm drains.

Ryan Robinson, City Manager

- **Transportation Expo:** The Five County Association of Governments is hosting a transportation expo on September 17th from 1:00 to 6:00 PM at Best Western in Cedar City. Several cities in Iron County will have booths to highlight their transportation projects. Commission members were invited to attend. City Manager Robinson indicated he would send out the flyer to interested parties.

- **Tree Removal Ordinance:** The tree removal ordinance edits approved at the last Planning Commission meeting were subsequently adopted by the City Council. City Manager Robinson noted that the first enforcement letter has already been sent to a property owner requesting tree removal.
- **Pitting Annexation:** The City Council accepted an annexation petition for further study. The parcel involves approximately 677 acres on the northeast side of the city. City Manager Robinson explained that the parcel had previously gone through an annexation process that was approved contingent upon execution of a development agreement, but the agreement was not completed in time. The process is now starting again. A 30-day noticing period is underway, and the matter will return to the City Council in October.
- **Public Comment Section:** City Manager Robinson raised the question of whether the Planning Commission should continue to include a public comment section on its agenda. He noted that most public comments received at planning commission meetings either pertain to items already on the agenda—which have a designated discussion period—or to matters that properly belong before the City Council. He stated there is no state code requirement for a public comment period at the planning commission level. Several commissioners expressed comfort with removing the section, provided that there remains a clear avenue for the public to address agenda items during the appropriate portions of the meeting. City Manager Robinson confirmed that removing the public comment section would not limit the public's ability to speak on agenda items and that the chair retains discretion to allow public input. He indicated he would research the matter further before any formal change.
- **Impact Fees:** Council Member Trower reported that several businesses—including Pizza Hub and a new coffee establishment—have raised concerns about their impact fee classifications. The current code has only two fee categories (fast food and quality restaurant), and some businesses do not fit neatly into either. After consulting with Cedar City and conducting research, the City Council determined that impact fees for these businesses would be handled on a case-by-case basis administratively, with businesses engaging their own engineers to work with city staff and engineers on a determination. City Manager Robinson noted that a meeting on this topic was scheduled for the following morning.
- **Sports Complex Bond:** Council Member Trower reported that the City Council has initiated the paperwork for a bond to fund the proposed sports complex. Cruz and Associates, represented by Marcus Keller, presented to the council on the plan and various financing options. The City Council is expected to adopt bond parameters at the second meeting in September, though the decision to actually issue the bond has not yet been made.
- **Committee Appointments:** Council Member Trower reported several new committee appointments: Catherine Ross and Bob Tingey were added to the Reese Across America committee; Peterson Ross was appointed to the Water Board, replacing a departing member; and Celeste Lyman was added to Parks and Recreation.

- **Flock Cameras:** Chairman Correa noted that residents had asked him about the flock camera at the roundabout, specifically whether the city had paid for it. City Manager Robinson clarified that the city has two flock cameras—one at the roundabout and one on Highway 91—and both are city-owned. He noted the cameras have experienced vandalism and that video of at least one incident exists, though the perpetrator wore a ski mask and used the cover of darkness. City Manager Robinson stated that staff has discussed posting the video along with a reward offer for information leading to identification of the individual. He also noted that the city has discussed having the Police Chief provide a report to the public on how the cameras work and what safeguards are in place to prevent misuse.

Commissioner Poulson

- He noted that he would not be present at the next Planning Commission meeting. He also offered a broader observation for the Commission to consider: when applicants present artist renditions or detailed plans during zone change or conditional use applications, those representations do not bind the applicant to build exactly what was shown. He referenced the MCM development as an example, where the original presentation looked significantly different from what is currently being constructed. He noted that while applicants stay within the rules, the Commission should be mindful that presentations are aspirational. City Manager Robinson agreed, adding that they need to follow all requirements in our code. He echoed that this dynamic is especially present during annexation discussions, where future development is often described in favorable terms but is ultimately governed by whatever code standards apply at the time of permitting.

6. ADJOURN – Commissioner Poulson made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Jones seconded and all voted in favor.



Lindsay Hildebrand, City Recorder

09/10/2026
Date