

NOTICE OF MEETING  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY OF ST. GEORGE  
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

**PRESENT:** Chairman Nathan Fisher  
Commissioner David Brager  
Commissioner Roger Nelson  
Commissioner Natalie Larsen  
Commissioner Emily Andrus  
Commissioner Ray Draper

**CITY STAFF:** Assistant Public Works Director Wes Jenkins  
Community Development Director John Willis  
Assistant City Attorney Bryan Pack  
Planner III Dan Boles  
Planner II Genna Goodwin  
Development Office Supervisor Brenda Hatch

**EXCUSED:** Commissioner Vardell Curtis

**CALL TO ORDER/FLAG SALUTE**

Chair Fisher called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.  
Commissioner Brager led the led the flag salute.

1. **ZONE CHANGE AMENDMENT (ZCA) (Public Hearing)**

A. Consider a zone change amendment to the Riverfront Medical Center PD (Planned Development). The applicant is seeking approval of the second building in the Riverfront Medical Center. The applicant is proposing a three-story, 60,000 sq. ft medical office, similar to the existing building. The property is approximately 4.7 acres (9.31 acres including phase 1) and is located at 600 East Riverside Drive. Case No. 2020-ZCA-052 (Staff – Dan Boles)

Dan Boles presented the following:

Dan Boles – You can see the cul-de-sac to the north is not currently a finished road. The applicant will be required to finish that off. They will need to take care of a drainage ditch back there as well. They will need to put in a wall as well as a landscape buffer. These items will be looked at during the site plan review should this zone change go through. The parking is adequate, they are over parked by 122 stalls on the entire site. There is room for another building on the site in the front. All requirements in the code are being met. It will look very similar to the building that exists there already. This building will be slightly taller it is 44 feet, the existing building is 42 feet.

Commissioner Larsen – What does the landscape look like on the north side of the property?

Dan Boles – They are proposing trees and shrubs, we will need to make sure that they meet the code, they will also need that wall.

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 2 of 12

Commissioner Larsen – How big is that landscape and the landscape on the west side?

Dan Boles – It is 10 feet on the west.

Commissioner Larsen – Will there be an acceleration lane when they leave the property?

Dan Boles – I don't have a clear picture of that, I would have to check with Wes, Wes isn't here tonight.

Commissioner Larsen – That is a pretty fast-moving road.

Chair Fisher – On the presentation you can see a deceleration lane, but no acceleration lane.

Dan Boles – I don't see anything that would lead me to believe there is an acceleration lane. It doesn't appear to be that way.

Commissioner Draper – There is only one entrance and exit to this site, they don't enter or exit through that cul-de-sac at all, is that right?

Dan Boles – That's right. You should have received some comments from the neighbors to the north, they were concerned about that and the potential pooling of water back there.

Chair Fisher – There was that concern when the first building was developed. The neighbors were concerned because it doesn't drain. There is supposed to be some kind of drain that runs down from that cul-de-sac to what would probably be the west side of this property, isn't there?

Dan Boles – I'm not exactly sure, that will need to be vetted out.

John Willis – Typically at this stage the site plans are conceptual, if this is approved they will go through and do all the engineering. All of those things will be resolved at the next stage, which is the engineering portion of the project.

Discussion on drainage continued.

Dan Boles – They are proposing a sign that is about 2 feet taller than what is approved for this zone. They are requesting a sign that is electronic, that would not be allowed in a residential zone. So, they would like the approval of the height not the electronic part. We would need to make sure that there is a clear view triangle, that would be part of the sign permit.

Chair Fisher – I noticed that on this application it said that for the purpose of this application no sign is being reviewed, so that has changed now?

Dan Boles – Right, yes that was my mistake.

Chair Fisher – What will the height be?

Dan Boles – The height is approximately 13 feet; the applicant can shed some light on the overall height.

Chair Fisher – So you're saying the typical is 11?

Dan Boles – 10 actually.

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 3 of 12

Commissioner Draper – I think they can go to 15 ft if they've got more than a 20-foot-tall building, so you would have to look at the code really close to make sure.

Commissioner Larsen – Is it because it's next to residential?

Dan Boles – Next to residential is the reason why they can't have electronic.

Genna Goodwin – Ray is correct based on their building they could possibly go from a 10 to a 15 based on the building.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Chair Fisher explained how to indicate if the public would like to speak on the issue.

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Tom Callister – There is 10 feet of landscaping between parking lot and the wall on the north side as well. The drainage is a concern for us coming from the neighborhood to the north. I assume we are going to be working with Jay Sandberg on the drainage. We have been working with John Willis on the sign. As far as an acceleration lane, we haven't discussed that, we figured the light going in at the elementary school will help us out with gaps for the traffic to pull out. If we did have to do that the property to the left would need to work with us as they are somewhat in front of us.

Commissioner Brager – I'm not sure how we approve a sign that hasn't been defined enough. I would be worried that we would be approving something that we don't even know if it's truly what it is. I don't think they would need an acceleration lane because of the way the road bends and the light going in.

Commissioner Larsen – Maybe you could tell how we would address the drainage issue? I'm not sure that it is the applicant's problem.

Chair Fisher – We could just put a condition on the motion that the applicant will work with the City regarding the drainage.

Commissioner Brager – Can we remove the sign from the rest of the project?

Commissioner Draper – I don't know why you couldn't leave it in there, they can't change very much from what it is if we approve the height and the square footage of what they're after. They are going to have to work with the City on the electronics, which they are probably not going to get.

Discussion on the sign continued.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Brager made a motion to recommend to City Council approval of Item 1A a zone change amendment for Riverfront Medical Center PD on 4.7 acres at 600 E Riverside Drive with the following conditions, including staff comments, the drainage for the entire property is resolved to the satisfaction with the city and that any signage complies with city code including not permitting electronic signs.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Larsen

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES (6)**

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 4 of 12

Commissioner Emily Andrus  
Commissioner Natalie Larsen  
Commissioner Roger Nelson  
Commissioner Ray Draper  
NAYS (0)

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

B. Consider a zone change amendment to the Sunbrook Storage PD (Planned Development). The applicant is requesting to allow previously approved uncovered RV storage to provide canopies for RV storage. A 30-foot buffer is proposed along affected property lines adjacent to residential zoning and the canopies are proposed to be 17' tall. This PD Amendment would affect approximately 6.03 acres of the approved PD. This property is located at 415 S Dixie Drive. Case No. 2020-ZCA-045 (Staff – Dan Boles)

Dan Boles presented the following:

Dan Boles – You can see there was parking approved, there were 3 canopies that were approved with the previous approval. They are proposing a 30-foot buffer from the residential property, with this application all of the RV parking would be covered. They are reducing the number of stalls, increasing the buffer and asking for all the parking to be covered. Should this zone change be approved we will look at the specific landscaping with the site plan review.

Curtis Cramer – The nature of our business is that we plan for what we think we are going to need but as time goes on we need to supply our customers. We have found that the uncovered parking doesn't work in this area, the sun is brutal on the RVs. That is why we are asking for the covered parking.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Glen Porter – I am concerned about the lighting and the esthetics of it, it will be right in my back yard.

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Larsen – What about the lighting back there? What are their hours?

Dan Boles – There will likely be lighting back there, the applicant may want to speak on that. Again, if this is approved we will go through that with a fine-tooth comb and we will make sure that they meet code. They can't have more than 1-foot candle at the property line.

Curtis Cramer – We just addressed this situation on the south portion. We did not put lighting on the perimeter. Only the center canopies will have lighting. We give people 24-hour access to their vehicles. We currently have 24-hour access to the existing RV parking that is there now.

Commissioner Larsen – People can't stay overnight, right? What is the height of RVs without anything above them?

Curtis Cramer – No, they can't live in them. We are going 17 feet because some have air conditioning units on top of them.

Commissioner Larsen – I was just wondering with it up against a neighborhood, if there is anything that you can do about the headlights for those houses up against there? If there is anything reasonable that we can think of that would accommodate those neighbors that back up to that fence?

Curtis Cramer – Currently we don't have any customers that comes and goes in the night. Our current customers come in the day, those 45-foot motor homes are tough in the daylight to maneuver, let alone trying in the dark.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson made a motion to recommend for approval to City Council Item 1B a zone change amendment include staff's 8 conditions.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Draper

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES (6)**

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

**NAYS (0)**

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

C. Consider a zone change amendment to the Black Ridge Cove PD (Planned Development). The applicant is requesting to change the approved elevations of the buildings and signage. This PD is approximately 9.46 acres (total parcel is 18.77 acres) and is located generally at 900 South 700 West, North-East of Indian Hills Drive. Case No. 2020-ZCA-048 (Staff – Dan Boles)

**THIS ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA**

D. Consider a zone amendment to the Gateway Commons Commercial PD (Planned Development). The applicant is proposing a new building on a 2.58-acre site located in the PD-C (Planned Development Commercial) zone. The building would be approximately 41,000 sq. ft and would have retail, office and warehousing uses. The property is located on the south-east corner of Gateway Dr. and Cottonwood Springs Drive and the applicant is Gary Tyler with Hughes General Contractors. Case No. 2020-ZCA-047 (Staff – Dan Boles)

Dan Boles presented the following:

Dan Boles – There is residential zoning to the west, but it is in the Hillside ordinance. They are requesting access from Gateway Drive. There is a requirement that we have 15 feet of landscaping on each street side, which they are meeting. They would have a hard time putting in the required 6-foot wall, they have some topography issues. There is an elevation change and right of way, we don't want a wall in the right of way. They would need to put the wall at the bottom which wouldn't do anything for anyone. We thought that we would let you see what to decide with that. They meet the required parking as well as the 5% landscaping required in the parking. They will need to refine the landscape plan. The landscape and photometric plan will be reviewed in more detail if the zone change should be approved. The building will be concrete, it will have colors and pop outs. I would suggest that the signage be eliminated from this application and be evaluated with the entire site.

Commissioner Brager – The wall required is a 6-foot wall, what is the maximum they can go?

Dan Boles – 6 feet is the maximum.

Chair Fisher – How big is the elevation change?

Dan Boles – The applicant can speak to that.

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 6 of 12

Commissioner Nelson – If that area across the street were zoned open space would they need the wall?

Dan Boles – No they would not.

Chair Fisher – How steep is the slope?

Dan Boles – I'm not sure but it looks pretty steep just driving by.

John Willis – It's pretty steep and it's a pretty consistent steepness. If you could develop it at all you would be fairly limited on what you could do with the property based on the hillside, if you could develop it at all.

Jeff Mathis – The major issue we are dealing with is the whole privacy fence. I just went to the Washington County web site and they have contours on it. The slope base on that map would be 42%, in my experience with hillside you can't build on over 40%. There is one little spot that would be about 50 to 60 feet that could be developed which is at a 15% slope. The wall need to be probably 12 feet tall to have an effect.

Commissioner Nelson – Would you not want to do the wall at all?

Jeff Mathis – Yes, that is correct. There is an existing retaining wall along Cottonwood, to even build the wall we would need to tear that out and then rebuild it further back and build a wall on top of it.

Commissioner Draper – So I am assuming you would landscape it nicely, so it looks good there?

Jeff Mathis – Yes we do plan to landscape that area. Jeff showed a site plan and describe where and how they plan to landscape.

Chair Fisher opened the public meeting.

Chair Fisher closed the public meeting.

Chair Fisher – For the record we will indicate that multiple opportunities, multiple vehicles for speaking on this issue have been provided through Zoom, the chat feature, on the phone, in chambers and the lobby. There is no one that would like to speak to this issue.

David Brager – I think the wall should be eliminated, and I also agree that the signage should be eliminated as a condition.

Chair Fisher – I think on the motion you would indicate that what they have presented in the site plan aside from the sign would be recommend for City Council for approval with the condition that the requirement for the 6-foot wall can be eliminated. I would probably add to that indicating that there is already because of the slope and elevation change would be indication for eliminating the wall if that is what you are inclined to do.

Discussion on walls continued.

Commissioner Nelson – I will make the point that I recommend eliminating that privacy wall altogether, just because of the angle of it, it will just trap all the weeds and debris and garbage. I think it will look way better being landscaped above and then that retaining wall, then landscaped below.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Brager made a motion to recommend approval for Item 1D zone amendment to Gateway Commons Commercial PD at the southeast corner of Gateway Drive and Cotton Springs

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 7 of 12

Drive with two conditions; first, that any signage is eliminated from this proposal and second that the existing retaining wall be retained on the north section of Cottonwood Springs Drive and that a second retaining wall attached to the first is constructed per plan and that no privacy wall or fence is required as a result of having these two retaining walls.

SECOND: Commissioner Larsen

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES (6)

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

NAYS (0)

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

2. **ZONE CHANGE (ZC) (Public Hearing)**

A. Consider a zone change the property currently is unzoned. The property owner is requesting the property be zoned RE 37.5 (Residential Estate Lots, 37,500 sq. ft minimum lot size) to match the current zoning on the adjacent property. The property is generally located along Pioneer Road at approximately 3200 South and is approximately 0.98 acre. Case No. 2020-ZC-043 (Staff – Dan Boles)

Dan Boles presented the following:

Dan Boles – This is more of a zoning designation; the property is currently not zoned. The general plan calls for Low Density Residential. They want to add this to their lot so that they will have enough square footage to split the lot in half.

Commissioner Draper – If they split this in half will they be consistent with the other lots in that area?

Dan Boles – Yes, they will match what is required for the zone.

Commissioner Draper – There won't be access off of Pioneer Road, is that correct?

Stuart Bringhurst – That is correct.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Chair Fisher – For the record we will indicate that multiple opportunities, multiple vehicles for speaking on this issue have been provided through Zoom, the chat feature, on the phone, in chambers and the lobby. There is no one that would like to speak to this issue.

Commissioner Andrus – It makes sense.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Draper made a motion to recommend approval of item 2A a zone change to

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 8 of 12

RE 37.5 on the item currently before us with the condition that they have no access coming off of Pioneer Road.

SECOND: Commissioner Nelson

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES (6)

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

NAYS (0)

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

B. Consider a zone change from R-1-10 (Single Family Residential, 10,000 sq. ft lot sizes) to PD-R (Planned Development Residential) on approximately 10.05 acres located along the north side of White Dome Drive. This PD proposes 91 townhomes units (one duplex, three 3-plexes, and seventeen 4-plexes). Case No. 2020-ZC-051 (Staff – Genna Goodwin)

Genna Goodwin presented the following:

Genna Goodwin – This is an attached product, 91 units. The density is 8.99, this project will require two amenities. They are proposing a child play area and pickleball courts. They are required to provide guest parking; they are providing the amount required by code.

Commissioner Andrus – Is the playground and the pickleball all in that same area?

Genna Goodwin – Yes.

Commissioner Brager – So with this being done in phases then they will need to provide the amenities before it is 50% complete?

Genna Goodwin – Yes and staff will monitor that.

Brett Burgess – It is a townhouse project with kind of a modern, midcentury modern feel.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Chair Fisher – Opportunity to comment was afforded through the zoom chat feature, the zoom video conference using the reaction button and \*9 on the telephone as well as in Council Chambers to address this issue and no one has asked to speak.

Chair Fisher – I like this project, I like the idea and the presentation elevations. I'll be interested to see how it turns out; I think it will be good.

MOTION: Commissioner Larsen made a motion to recommend approval of Item 2B a zone change from R-1-10 to PD-R as presented by staff.

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 9 of 12

SECOND: Commissioner Andrus

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES (6)

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

NAYS (0)

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

C. Consider a zone change from R-1-10 (Single Family Residential, 10,000 sq. ft lot sizes) to PD-R (Planned Development Residential) on approximately 21.01 acres located along the north side of White Dome Drive. This PD proposes 175 detached single-family units. Case No. 2020-ZC-050 (Staff – Genna Goodwin)

Genna Goodwin presented the following:

Genna Goodwin – This is in between the nature preserve and the project we just looked at. They are proposing 1752 dwelling units, it will require 3 amenities. These units also have double car garages, they are providing the required guest parking.

Discussed garages and parking.

Chair Fisher – Do you know what the setbacks are between buildings?

Brett Burgess – I think it will be 7 feet.

Chair Fisher – And from what I remember they could down to 3 feet.

John Willis – That is correct.

Brett Burgess – I appreciate the attached product getting approved. I have been working with Elaine from the Nature Preserve on a few things. We are hoping the park on the north and even the one on the south will have access to the Nature Preserve. We do have adequate open space. Part of the reason for the high density here is that the stuff on the bottom right is slated to be PD-C, so it is kind of a feathering from that to the detached product.

Commissioner Brager – With the number of units you have will you be building your amenities with phase 1?

Brett Burgess – I know that we will get them in as soon as it is required and maybe even before that.

Chair Fisher – Genna isn't there some requirement as to a certain number, once you reach a certain number of units the recreation area, amenity will have to be in?

Genna Goodwin – It is a percentage in the code, and we will watch it as each phase comes through the site plan review.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 10 of 12

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Chair Fisher - For the record we will indicate that multiple opportunities, multiple vehicles for speaking on this issue have been provided through Zoom, the chat feature, on the phone, in chambers and the lobby. There is no one that would like to speak to this issue.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Andrus made a motion to recommend approval of this zone change from R-1-10 to PD-R for South Desert PD as proposed.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Nelson

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES (6)**

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

**NAYS (0)**

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

D. Consider a zone change from R-1-10 (Single Family Residential, 10,000 sq. ft lot sizes) to PD-R (Planned Development Residential) on approximately 16.56 acres located on the south side of White Dome Drive. This PD proposes 128 detached single-family units. Case No. 2020-ZC-049 (Staff – Genna Goodwin)

Genna Goodwin presented the following:

Genna Goodwin – This one is also a detached product 128 units are proposed. The density is about 7.73 per acre. This project will also require 3 amenities. Again, they would like to do a kid's playground equipment area, a pickleball/basketball area and an exterior social area. It's the same design, so the two car garages and they do meet the guest parking, 43 were required and 44 are provided. This will have a similar look to the last zone change.

Chair Fisher opened the public hearing.

Chair Fisher closed the public hearing.

Chair Fisher – For the record we will indicate that multiple opportunities, multiple vehicles for speaking on this issue have been provided through Zoom, the chat feature, on the phone, in chambers and the lobby. There is no one that would like to speak to this issue.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson made a motion to recommend approval of Item 2D a zone change from R-1-10 to PD-R south of White Dome Drive including staff comments.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Larsen

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES (6)**

Chairman Nathan Fisher

Commissioner David Brager

Commissioner Emily Andrus

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 11 of 12

Commissioner Natalie Larsen  
Commissioner Roger Nelson  
Commissioner Ray Draper  
NAYS (0)  
Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

3. **MINUTES**

Consider approval of the minutes from the October 27, 2020 meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Draper made a motion to approve the October 27, 2020 meeting minutes.  
SECOND: Commissioner Andrus  
ROLL CALL VOTE:  
AYES (6)  
Chairman Nathan Fisher  
Commissioner David Brager  
Commissioner Emily Andrus  
Commissioner Natalie Larsen  
Commissioner Roger Nelson  
Commissioner Ray Draper  
NAYS (0)  
Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval

4. **CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS – November 19, 2020**

*The Community Development Director will report on the items heard at City Council from the November 19, 2020 meeting.*

1. ZCA - Desert Color
2. GPA – Desert Garden Cove
3. GPA – St. George Rehab Facility
4. ZC – Rilassante at Divario (PA-3)
5. PP – Rilassante at Divario (PA-3)
6. PP – Breckenridge Estates
7. PP – Johnson arch ph. 2
8. PP – Bloomington Vacation Villas Amended

5. **ADJOURN**

MOTION: Commissioner Draper made a motion to adjourn at 6:59pm  
SECOND: Commissioner Nelson  
ROLL CALL VOTE:  
AYES (6)  
Chairman Nathan Fisher  
Commissioner David Brager  
Commissioner Emily Andrus

Planning Commission Agenda

November 24, 2020

Page 12 of 12

Commissioner Natalie Larsen

Commissioner Roger Nelson

Commissioner Ray Draper

NAYS (0)

Motion Carries unanimous recommend approval