CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES - JANUARY 4TH, 2022

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, January 4th, 2022, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City Utah.

Members in attendance: Mary Pearson–Chair Craig Isom, Ray Gardner, Adam Hahn, John Webster, Jennie Hendricks

Members absent: Jill Peterson

Staff in attendance: Tyler Romeril-City Attorney, Trevor McDonald, Donald Boudreau-City Planner, Jonathan Stathis-City Engineer and Onjulee Pittser, Executive Secretary.

Others in attendance: Bob Platt (Platt & Platt); Carter Wilkey; Naomi Hatch; Kendall Slack; Judy Cripps; Dave Clarke; LeAnn Leavitt; Robert Behunin; Dallas Buckner; Joel Hansen (did not sign in)

ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION LOCATION/PROJECT APPLICANT/PRESENTER

1. Regular Items

1. Approval of Minutes (December 7, 2021) (Approval)

Adam moved to approve the minutes of December 7, 2021; seconded by Councilman Isom; vote was unanimous.

2. Road Dedication
(Recommendation)
1700 West & 400 North and Pinyon Grove Cir.
Louthan/Platt & Platt

Bob Platt: This is Airport Road and the intersection of 1700 West and 400 N. It will connect the two roadways. They want to build a gym on the south property. It’s been reviewed by the City Engineers. Adam: Is the property already divided or will it cut it in half? Bob: It will go through it. The property will be divided by the road. Adam: Will that be an issue to go through the middle of property? Bob: I guess not. The owners are dedicating it.

Councilmember Isom moved to send a positive recommendation to the City Council for this road dedication; seconded by Jennie; the vote was unanimous.

3. PUBLIC HEARING
PUD - Vicinity
Greens Lake PUD
Diamond K/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation) (approx.) 615 W. Greens Lake Dr.

Bob: This is a proposed PUD for (5) 2-dwelling units off Greens Lake Drive. This is the proposed project. Diamond K is the owners of the property. This map’s been reviewed by City staff. It’s currently zoned R-2-2. It’s 5 buildings and 10 units. Jennie: At sketch review, there was a conversation about open space. Is there any and what will that be? Bob: There’s a pavilion, playground, etc. It does...
meet the open space requirements. (Mary opened the public hearing for this item.) Naomi Hatch: I live on 550 West. We’re wondering that 5 buildings with 10 units, where’s the parking space? What will it look like? Some of my neighbors are wondering about exterior will it be? What kind of parking? We live close together. On Fir Street, they’ve built 5 or 6 duplex/townhome-type units, and they are so tight together and the driveways are really shallow. There’s on-street parking and it is a zoo trying to get through there. Greens Lake isn’t really busy, but we fear there will be a lot of traffic. Where will they park? Is there room in that area to accommodate everyone that’s living there? If there are 10 units each will have about 4 people. That’s a lot of cars. Will they have tiny garages like on Fir Street? We’re not opposed to development, but not cramming people in a tiny space and not preparing for possibilities of overcrowding. There are people that speed up 550 West. I moved from Ridge Road because of the traffic in that area. We’re curious of what the plan is for speed limits and all of that. Bob: The project meets the parking requirements on the side. They’re not planning for parking on Greens Lake Drive. Jennie: What are the parking requirements? Per bedroom? Bob: Required are 41, and total is 43. Jennie: Then there has to be extra guest parking there? Dave Clark: The 41 includes the 2-guest parking. There are actually 4 extra parking spaces other than for each unit. They’re deeper parking spaces, deeper setbacks. Jennie: And this falls under the new PUD ordinance where the driveways are extended to accommodate onsite parking. Dave: Yes. Mary: This just recently changed about 6 months ago. Naomi: What is the exterior going to be? Bob: I can’t answer that, but I know the developer and the work he does is tasteful. Adam: You haven’t designed the buildings? Bob: No. (Mary closed the public hearing.)

Adam moved to send a positive recommendation to the City Council for the vicinity of the Greens Lake PUD; seconded by John; the vote was unanimous.

4. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: R-3-M to SHD (Recommendation) (2) parcels in the vicinity of 400 W. & Harding Ave. Brody Fausett/Platt & Platt

Jennie: I need to disclose that I own property within the 300-ft. vicinity of this. Bob: This property is in the SHD zoning district. It’s currently zoned R-3-M, but they’d like to change it to SHD to put student housing on the property. Craig: Is this in the airport overlay zone? Bob: Yes. Don: The zone is R-3-M. Trevor: The SHD zone is just north of it, about 3 lots away. (Mary opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.)

Jennie moved to send a positive recommendation to the City Council for zone change from R-3-M to SHD on (2) parcels in the vicinity of 400 W. & Harding Ave.; seconded by Adam; the vote was unanimous.

Staff Items

1- Consider a Development Agreement concerning property located at 2100 N. Clark Parkway. GO Civil/Tyler Romeril – Tyler Romeril: Dallas has come in a couple times wanting to rezone it. It’s a narrow strip of land adjacent to Gemini Meadows. After the 2nd request, it was given a negative recommendation and it’s yet to go to City Council for determination. I had a council member reach out to me regarding a development agreement that will restrict the density on this property. The main section of importance is paragraph 3, developer obligations. It binds the developer to only be able on
residential portion of this property to put in multifamily dwellings in compliance with the R-3-M zone, based on the assumption that the R-3-M is approved. It would be limited to 11 units per acre. It cannot exceed 2 stories in height. Any residential units cannot be construction within airport approach zone. The developer has to comply with all City ordinances and procedures. This agreement purpose is not to have a bunch of units slammed in as much density as we can. It’s meant to allow R-3-M, but limit the density to lower the impact on the neighbors. Craig: Are we talking about this tomorrow night? Dallas: We bumped the zone change to the next meeting. The Man Cave Commercial PUD is on for City Council tomorrow night. When we brought this through for the zone change I talked about doing a development agreement, as a separate item, and had Tyler prepare that with what we are willing to concede. We’ll have those be on the same meeting. Mary: This agreement limits the number of units, right? Tyler: Yes. Mary: That’s why it was declined before. John: The last time we talked if it doesn’t go through this way it defaults to industrial zoning? Dallas: It’s currently zoned R-2-2, but because of the shape it’s not feasible economically to build a single loaded road. We have to have the underlying lot sizes for each one. It’s currently zoned R-2-2, but if R-3-M gets shot down with the agreement, it’s likely we’ll have to come back a 3rd time to zone it I&M-1. Mary: They wouldn’t leave it R-2-2? Dallas: Because of the airport approach zone (AZ), there’s only 60-ft. from the property line that you can build a house. If you have a 20-ft. rear setback and you have 40-ft. depth and you have to have a 9,000 sq. ft. lot for a duplex. By the time you figure out that, it’s not really doable. Mary: Are we looking for a recommendation? Tyler: Yes. Adam: Have both parties agreed upon the development plan? Dallas: I spoke with DeAnn Tippets, the owner. I had a clarification on it and Tyler made that and sent it to her this afternoon. She had a couple minor corrections. The paragraph he went through, we’re on the same page. Jennie: It looks like 68.75 units can be put there, is that correct? Dallas: We have this scaled in for future on the Man Caves vicinity plan that will be on City Council tomorrow night. We treat the zone as a front setback for buildings. Townhome units and space them out along there. The length of it is challenging. We’ll figure out the utilities, detention basins. Carter: Do the houses have to go behind the dotted line? Dallas: Yes. Craig: I like the idea of the agreement and the confirmation density. Dallas: Our plan hasn’t changed. This is a more concrete way than going through a vicinity plan. We’re hoping to agree to the development agreement we can push that through. Jennie: Would you do anything with the airport approach zone? Dallas: What we plan on is this be an R-3-M a private road that runs along the southside that have driveways in the approach zone. It’s a single frontage road all the way down. The Commercial PUD every 500-ft there’s connecting roads for fire. It will be 2 separate PUD’s as far as residential and commercial. Jennie: Is the one on the other side I&M? Dallas: Yes. For the original zone change, we broke this piece into two, and the I&M was approved now we brought forward a commercial PUD on that piece. Jennie: The higher density would become a buffer zone between the commercial & residential. Carter: So, the garages for these units can come in front of the line. Dallas: Initially that’s what we proposed but the City Council wasn’t too crazy about that. That’s what we added to the agreement as well. Originally, they were detached garages in the approach zone, but with this agreement nothing residential dwelling inside the approach zone. It’s a typical townhome unit. Have the garage as part of the main floor.

Craig moves for a positive recommendation; second by Jennie; the vote was unanimous.

2- Discussion on Planning Commission Tours

Staff
Jonathan: As we’re starting a new year, I wanted to see if there was any interest with the Planning Commission in doing tours again. Kit had done that in the past. I wanted to bring it up for you all. I’m fine either way. Craig: Is it an imposition on you? Jonathan: No. Mary: I think Jill used to go on the tours occasionally. I do a little tour myself when I get the agenda. Jennie: For me, I don’t think we need to do it every single meeting. Sometimes it was very helpful. We went to Iron Horse that one time, and that was extremely helpful. Mary: Maybe if a tour is desired, the group can reach out you, or if there’s something really important, you can reach out to the group. Jennie: Just send the department an email if you want a tour. Mary: Does that work for you? Jonathan: Yes. That’s fine. We can do a set time. Mary: We will reach out to you, or you will reach out us if there is something we need to be informed of.

3- General Plan Review Update

Don: We had a meeting Dec. 9th. There was a lot of public input. I spoke with the consultant today. We’ll be going through the comments this week. I think the text is good. We’ll shoot for February here. Mary: I’ve been reading the notes and comments on the website. There wasn’t much more than there was a few months ago. Don: In February, we’ll get in front of this body and onto City Council.

4- Approve 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Jonathan: It’s the same as last year. The 1st and 3rd Tuesdays of each month. Mary: Are we meeting on Dec. 20th? Jonathan: That’s up to you. This is just for your information.

The Commission unanimously agreed to the printed scheduled for Planning Commission meetings in 2022.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.