

CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

February 1st, 2022

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, February 1st, 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, Jennie Hendricks, Jill Peterson, Ray Gardner, Adam Hahn, John Webster

Members absent –

Staff in attendance: City Attorney-Tyler Romeril, City Planner-Donald Boudreau, City Engineer-Jonathan Stathis, and Onjulee Pittser

Others in attendance: Tilton Barlow, Mike Hansen (RCC), Neal Severe, Susan Severe, Laura Henderson, Randal Cagle, Joel Hansen, Donna Childs, Teri Kenny, Sue Markham, Bob Platt, Bill Stenger, Erica Davis, Brooklyn Hargrave, Robert Ballou, James Curtis, Michael Gregg, Dallas Buckner, Ryan Talbot, Tim Watson, Sheila Shaw, Courtney Anderson, Terri Hartley, Allyse Frenner, Tenessa Soffe, Emily Meanea, Ben Barlow, Marion Allan, R. Scott Phillips, Paul Roelandt, Jeff Porter, Tom Hartnick, Jerry Munson

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 p.m.

ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION LOCATION/PROJECT APPLICANT/PRESENTER

I. Regular Items

**1 - Approval of Minutes (January 18, 2022)
(Approval)**

Jennie motions to approve the minutes from the January 18th meeting; Jill seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

2 - PUBLIC HEARING - Zone Change - (from MPD to R-2-1) (Recommendation)	approx. UT Hwy 56 & S. 4700 W.	Burgess/GO Civil
--	---	-------------------------

Dallas: This is out at the Iron West project. This parcel was originally called Leigh Farm. This was originally MPD that was done in the early 2000's. The general plan for medium density and were doing a zone change for R-2-1 for single dwelling that conforms to the general plan on this parcel. **Jennie:** MPD is an old zone that doesn't exist, right? **Dallas:** Yes. It's the predecessor to RDL. **Jennie:** The general plan calls for medium density, which R-2-1- falls under that category. Jonathan: Are these the correct parcels? **Dallas:** It's this one and the NS rectangle. It's all one tax ID connected through the sliver. On the zoning map that's the shape on the zone change. It's 4 quarter sections and this is a 660x1320 I think. **Jill:** How many lots? **Dallas:** We're going for single dwelling on R-2. It's 192 acres. You can get 8 units per acre. Looking at single family it's in the 5 range. We have a vicinity plan and it's around 400 lots after roads. It's against the Quichapa channel so there's high ground water, which is a concern there.

Mary opened the public hearing.

Jeff Porter: I live adjacent to this project. We're to the west in Thorley Ranch on the border of the proposed change. Is it presently medium density? **Mary:** It's MPD, but the general plan calls for medium density. **Jeff:** The concern at Thorley Ranch is we have 10-acre, 5-acre, and 2.5-acre parcels with homes there. We're concerned about higher populations close to a rural parcel setting. It would be nice to move it to a higher density. It used to be 2-3 homes per acre. **Mary:** You mean lower density. **Jeff:** That's right. The gentleman before mentioned for medium on this zoning it would be as many as 8 homes per acre. **Mary:** It could be. **Jennie:** That's the max on it. **Mary:** Dallas mentioned it was 5 homes. **Dallas:** The medium density allows 8 units per acre, but generally you'll only get close to that by doing twin homes. We're requesting R-2-1, single family dwellings, it's one lot per 7000 sq. ft. That doesn't account for the lots with master planned roads running through there. The actual density would be closer to 4-5 range per acre. **Jeff:** I just wanted to make the point to have it would be nice to set aside for the less populated. I realize the master plan calls for the medium density. **Mary:** What zones are bordering that? Thorley Ranch goes into the County. **Jonathan:** It's R-2-1 to the East. It's the MPD zone from the County line over. **Mary:** With the general plan designates it as medium use. **Jonathan:** From the general plan it's all medium density from the County line going east. **Tom Hartnick:** I also live in the Thorley Ranch estates. My concern is that the existing subdivision to the east like 300 homes now it's 400+ homes here. Where are the roads and where's the water supply coming from? We're in a shortage now. There was a water meeting at the college where they said they were trying to do a pipeline. Now there's more houses going in and we're on a private community well that our taxes pay for. We pay taxes for water conservancy. A main road is coming into 100 S. going into 5600. That will bring so much traffic in rural community. I met with someone at the City and there were semi-trucks come through and they put up signs for no commercial trucks at the entrance to each road to keep the trucks from coming in. I live near the 400-acre parcel and it's a right-of-way road. I have to maintain it with gravel and keep it smooth. We have trucks going down there at 3:00 a.m. We moved there to be in a rural area. This close hosing will not make it rural and bring more traffic to our area. I want to know where the roads will be to enter and exit that community and if they're designed. **Dallas:** Designed, no, but the existing roads will be tying into Thorley Ranch. The City has master planned roads. The green line is Center Street, and that's planned to go through Thorley Ranch per the City's master plan. **Tom:** The green line goes right through his property. **Dallas:** We'll have construction drawings to figure out where it will go. There'll be an "S" curve that ties into one of the Thorley Ranch roads. **Tom:** It will bring so much traffic through that subdivision. Why can't you do a road going out to 56? **Jonathan:** There is another master planned road at 4500 West to 56, and a portion of that has already been built with the Iron West subdivision. It will continue south, and Center Street continues west. Dallas is correct. The road will veer to the south and line up with 100 St. The county belt route is at 5700 West. **Tom:** On Hwy. 56, there are no signs to tell truck traffic to go to 5700 West to get onto I-15. A lot of truck traffic is hitting there and some of them aren't from this area. They don't know the roads. The roads are not marked properly on 56 for any traffic that hits 5700 West. It was designed to be a bypass for commercial traffic. Now we have more traffic coming through there. It's a concern for everyone. **Jonathan:** Hwy. 56 is a UDOT road. We'll talk to them and see if they're willing to put up signs for truck traffic to direct them to that route. **Tom:** Once this subdivision is done, we'll have to pay for sewer, sidewalks, etc. Will the City pay for that when it's annexed in? **Mary:** Is it planned to be annexed? **Jonathan:** It's in the annexation declaration boundary. The property owner petitions the City to annex. It's not the other way where they force someone to annex. It could, but it's not typical. It would be up to you and your surrounding property owners. **Tom:** Who would pay for the upgrades and utilities? **Jonathan:** It will be up to the property owner. If you wanted to annex, you'd need to bring those improvements up to City standards at your own expense. **Tom:** If it was reversed, who would pay that? **Tyler Romeril:** It would depend on different things. The City can't forcefully make someone take your property if you didn't pay

for the improvements. If you're developing, we could say that. **Tom**: I don't want to get hit with an SID where you have to update water lines, and do all these things. We didn't move there to get a SID. **Tyler**: Those agreements are voluntarily entered so the property owners can get there over time. **Tianacum Schepp**?: I'm a resident of Thorley Ranch. I'm not sure on this zone change. Are we requesting to rezone higher density than it is now or zone less? **Mary**: They're requesting to zone to the density that is outlined in the general plan. They're not increasing density. **Don**: Its master planned for the zoning proposed. **Schepp**: So there's not an increase in density at all. **Tyler**: There's no current zone on this property. **Schepp**: They're requesting an initial zone. **Mary**: The general plan recognizes it as the zoning they're requesting. **Schepp**: This is for single family dwellings? **Don**: Yes. The minimum lot size is 7,000 sq. ft. per lot. **Schepp**: It puts it in higher density. As the city gets larger, a lot more ranchers want to move away from the city. My concern is that you're not having a high population in the middle of nowhere. Not infringing on people that want to be rural. **Mary**: Good question, and that's my question to them. Everything going east is in the same zone.

Mary closed the public hearing.

Adam motions for a positive recommendation for the Zone Change from MPD to R-2-1 on property located at approx. UT Hwy. 56 & S. 4700 W.; Jennie seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

3 – Subd. – Vicinity (Recommendation)	Diamonti Subdivision 3325 W. – S. of SR-56	Diamonti/Platt & Platt
--	---	-----------------------------------

Bob Platt: This is a proposed industrial subdivision. Highway 56 is to the north. There's an existing trucking dock operation in the NW corner. There are some vacant parcels. 3325 W. is improved at the top portion. This is the proposed roadway. There's an existing county flood channel. Center Street is proposed in this area. **Adam**: Is this in the airport approach zone? **Jonathan**: Yes. **Bob**: It's not all going to be developed in one phase. The first phase may end in the middle area. **Jonathan**: The master plan was changed a few years ago to bring Center Street up to the north. It doesn't follow along where the sewer lines are. The green line is a master planned road. It comes close to the south boundary of this proposed subdivision. I wanted to see if any portion of this falls on the proposed subdivision. **Bob**: Since it was just brought to my attention today, I can't answer that now, but we'll get to the bottom of it.

Councilman Isom motions for a positive recommendation on vicinity for the Diamonti Subdivision; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

II. Staff Items

1. PUBLIC HEARING - (Recommendation)	Comprehensive Update to the Transportation Master Plan	Jonathan Stathis/ Avenue Consultants
---	---	---

Thomas McMurtry (telephonic). **Jonathan**: He's with avenue consultants. He's the lead consultant on the Active Transportation master plan and Transportation master plan. **Thomas**: A lot of planning we do when we're working with the Transportation Master Plan and Active Transportation Master Plan are for planning and getting ahead of growth. A lot of growth is planned. *{Refer to Presentation}* the study area included all of Cedar City, Enoch and parts of Iron County. We're anticipating planning for about 67,000 people by 2050. That's a 40% growth, which is really significant. We started this study for our vision and goals. Asked the steering committee to help us come up with a vision to guide the document. They would like to see outcomes of transportation studies.

John: One thing that's not addressed is if the airport in the center remains adequate through the years. We saw in St. George that it didn't. They had to relocate. Does our airport support future growth?

Thomas: Jonathan is better to answer that than I am. Aviation is not included in transportation master plans. We did look at the airport master plan as part of our project and how the road wraps around the north and if they had a runway extension. I remember looking at that project and wondering if it has enough room for what the airports master plan includes. **Jonathan:** They do have a separate plan and they're in the process of starting an update. Any future improvements would be included in the airport master plan.

Mary opened the public hearing.

Joel Hansen: I'm a developer. I've been working on a development and what we heard previously about transportation and the residents concerned. I've been working on a parcel of property that South Mountain Drive goes through the middle of for a number of years. We've been involved since Eagle Ridge. We built South Mountain Dr. as a master planned road. 95% of our problems come from the residents complaining about traffic coming through their neighborhood. This road that's proposed as a major arterial collector is something as a development group, we have a problem with. With Iron Horse development a lot of traffic will be coming through there. We've tried to keep our community a nice quiet neighborhood and when we start putting 80+ right-of-way roads in residential developments, it has a huge impact on my ability to develop my property that I would like to. This isn't something I just started. I've worked on this for 17+ years now. It's a major concern. Development in the valley and this is a quiet neighborhood if it doesn't have a major arterial collector going through it. It changes everything for us. The Estates I've started can't be a closed loop neighborhood anymore. It runs right through the middle of a residential neighborhood. It's not the first time it's been proposed. I've fought this more than once. There's a lot of benefits to a lot of people to have the road put in, but not me. We've been putting 2 miles of master planned road at our expense. It's a detriment to all the property surrounding it. To put it like that is a real problem. I don't see a lot of residents going north, but a lot of other residents going south to get on the freeway. I would like to propose to take a serious look at this. What are the major arterial collectors slated as widthwise? **Jonathan:** It's a 66' right-of-way. **Craig:** Where is the road coming from? **Joel:** It comes over top. That's the master planned road there. I would encourage the use of that road instead of building a new road. We have other phases we're doing and that's a major issue for us. It's not a wide-open space that doesn't have anything developed and nothing planned for future. **Mary:** I believe we had Tim come through a few months ago with a similar concern. This master planned road has been in the works for how long? **Jonathan:** This is a new road. **Mary:** We looked at a different map that had all the different roads through South Mountain. We are aware that the folks there are upset having so much traffic. What's the solution to that? It will put more traffic on South Mountain. **Jonathan:** It will push it to South Mountain and Westview Drive. **Joel:** My partners & I had a meeting with the City, and Kit pulled out the master planned road and said if you buy that property, you'll have to put a road through the middle of it. It was on the map then. There's not much we can do about it. We built it and we paid for it. This hasn't been there since the new proposal. That's the problem I have with it. **Mary:** What's the next step with his concern after this meeting? **Jonathan:** We could meet and talk to see if there's any other solutions. Thomas, I will need to talk to you about this. **Thomas:** We can set a meeting with Mr. Hansen. **Joel:** I'm happy to go through it more. **Mary:** You can set a time to meet with Jonathan and the consultants. **Mayor Green:** My concern is traffic on Main Street and any way to go North and South besides Main Street. There is a natural way that the City has been dealing with starting at the north interchange. Wedgewood Lane coming off the overpass it goes straight down through Nichols subdivision. At the end there are some gaps that go to Fairway

Drive. If you start at Wedgewood Lane, at the first of Fairway Drive is a mobile home park. That road is a planned road in the mobile home park. I think Fairway Drive was considered to be the road north and south. Instead of going around, you go through the property and get onto 100 East. Some have already been planned to include the Forest Service building across 100 East. Mr. Tong has a piece of property and there's a round through the drive-in theater. Then there's a gap that the City owns that takes it and comes onto Paiute Drive. It passes through the tribe and across the bridge by the ball fields. It feeds you onto 200 S. that goes all the way down to the church on the corner. It goes to the water tank. We have walking trails. I think there's an arterial route there that goes 2 blocks off Main Street and to the south interchange. I raised this question in April. I'd like to see that we don't have to buy much property or asphalt road to have a road that goes to the Leavitt apartments or 300 East to the water tank. I think if we work with what we already have, we'd have a good road. We have a bridge over Coal Creek that's wide with a walking path on both sides. It's got curb/gutter. I would like to see an alternative to Cedar City's Main Street and massive amount of traffic. When Paul Bittmenn talked to the forest service building across 100 East, we own the property north of that building give you enough parking to buy out the parking and cut a road through there. **Jonathan:** I think that's a great idea. **Thomas:** Almost everything he suggested is already in the plan. Those connections on the north and south through the golf course. **Randy Cagel:** intersection of 3000 N. and 2300 West. The current master plan shows 3000 North dipping south and going into 2800 North. This changes it and ties into 3000 North. It will go out to the future beltway. I support the change I just wanted to point that out because it may cause confusion to the land use plan. I want to support having a trail down Coal Creek Wash and down Steven's ditch would be a nice addition to valley. **Jonathan:** Part of the reason 3000 N. is angling it to the north is the solar farm was built further west and in order to go around it, the road needs to go to the north. **Paul Roelandt:** I live in Cross Hollow Hills subdivision. I see our community as quiet residential neighborhood. South Mountain has the same feeling. Tackling Westview and compromise a new elementary school down Westview means lots more kids and trails along both sides of the road. It's the same issue with the high school folks with the new high school on South Mountain. Consider the speed limit down through that area. Maybe limit it to 35. Have a school cross walk something we see needs to be avoided. Limit any large trucks going down the road. It's a better route than going through the area. Is a 3-lane adequate for what it's going to be? 75' wide road to stay smaller than it is and the community supports that. I support what South Mountain is doing. Bringing all the traffic to the area. We need to put it somewhere, but it makes it difficult. More houses to the west of that whole area. 5-6,000 homes approved and some of the other areas. Keep residential areas residential. Thru traffic is a problem. **Jonathan:** The current master plan Westview Drive has a 100' right-of-way; reduce that to 75' on Westview. The City has been acquiring rights-of-way for 100' wide road. It's a change in direction from what the City's doing. **Randy:** I've heard there has been some issues with eminent domain on some of those properties, and it should be looked into. Some landowners know this was a done deal. The idea of putting in a 100' wide with an elementary and new homes doesn't seem the way to go. We already have the loop around the area. **Tyler:** The City has not used eminent domain to acquire any property along Westview Drive.

Mary closed the public hearing.

Mary: We've told Mr. Hansen to come and talk to you about one area. Mayor Green about the alternative pathway on east side. Good comments about the size of roads. In making a motion, how we do address that? **Jonathan:** This is one of the steps in the process, then it goes to City Council for final approval and adoption. I think a motion can be made that those items be addressed. **Tyler:** That's fine.

Councilman Isom makes a positive recommendation that all comments are on the record and will be considered as this moves forward to Council; Jennie seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

2. PUBLIC HEARING - Comprehensive Update to the Active Transportation/Trails Master Plan **Jonathan Stathis/
Avenue Consultants**
(This item was discussed with item #1). **Thomas**: One thing to point out is the last 2 slides show the active transportation plan. It's a dedicated chapter within the transportation master plan. There's value in that for folks thinking about it to be able to find everything in one document or website. We've had some discussion over the last few weeks about the trails master plan, and if we can incorporate a few other things. Typically, the active transportation master plan focuses on movements in the city, hard surface trails, bike lanes. Trails, master plans will incorporate parks, bike paths. I don't know how you want to proceed or combine those. Our Active Transportation Master Plan is ready to go to make any edits needed. **Jonathan**: I'd recommend to keep our trails master plan in place. It deals with more recreation. I don't want to throw out the Trails Master Plan, because we want to finish those trails. I recommend overlaying the Active Transportation onto our Trails Master Plan and continue to work on completing those trails we've started. **Thomas**: Active Transportation is ready for review to move forward.

Mary opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Mary closed the public hearing.

Craig: It's a work in progress, and I like the other plan to overlay with what we have.

Councilman Isom moves for a positive recommendation to merge the 2 plans; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING - Comprehensive Update to the General Plan **Donald Boudreau/
Rural Community
Consultants**
(Recommendation)

Mary: This is a big milestone for us. **Don**: We've dealt with the general plan at every PC meeting. Utah law requires every city to have a general plan, and contains transportation, land use, and housing. It's not zoning not the law of the land, but a guide or vision to where we want to go. It's zoning's job to implement zoning for the future. Last one was in 2012. During that time, we've faced unprecedented growth pressures. We've amended the plan 20 times just in the last year. Many requests are related to higher density. Construction land costs increase, we have the challenge of road capacities, water changes in character in neighborhood and lack of housing. Address these issues and get us in the right direction. It won't be perfect, and amendments are proposed in the future. Growth is inevitable in every city especially when the city is desirous to live in. Changes are coming. I hope it's a step in the right direction. Future challenges will come through zoning ordinance, that staff, commission and council have to work on. **Mike Hansen**: I agree with what he described that. It's an advisory document. Shall have one. You need to be careful with general plan. If you get too specific and try to solve every problem in a general plan it turns into a regulatory document. There's a risk that you can go off the rails. A couple of things you need to know. Rationale for land use, but under statute before major capital investments have a tie to the community saying they want to do this. We had an implementation perspective when we put it together. This one has the most content as far as chapters. If you look at where the city was in 2012, this clarifies things from a policy perspective exorbitantly. Making changes to future land use map but not as many. Special thanks to community members. We had great public interaction. There were over 1,000 touch points with community members. That's unheard of. This project has been going on for 1 ½ years. We did a big advertisement for this hearing. Half are positive comments. We think we're getting close to where it needs to go. Thanks to steering committee.

Community members to donate their time. Great work. Thanks to the Vision 2050 committee and transportation consultant taking care of that chapter. If you're not familiar with a general plan, it needs to be adopted by City Council, but under Utah law PC has to come up with a draft of some kind. Looking at how Cedar City operates, I assume City Council will hold a public hearing. There will be another hearing if you can't participate in this one. On the right side red shaded areas are recommended change to those areas. If you wanted to comment, another app to drop a pin on parcel and make a comment.

Don: Do you want to cover those changes on the map? Slides about public participation. **Mike:** A general plan has more power if you keep it general. Lose ability as a legislative body to make a decision. {Refer to presentation} We've had the www.cedarcityplan.org up and people can tie into it. We had newspaper, social media. Reports on how things are going. 506 people took first survey. That was a great response for a general plan. 205 folks went through SWAT survey. One where they have to type out paragraphs and finish it. We pulled a lot of information off the SWAT surveys. Cedar City is a great place and will continue to be with good choices. More folks will come. Top 3 things are water, traffic, and housing. Housing is a very big deal. **Mary:** Thanks for the work that you've done starting this project not much attraction from the community. I'm hoping to have more people get involved and I'm impressed to hear those numbers are good. **Mike:** Themes are quick to see in Cedar City. We we're hearing surprises for a community this size is great. Comment map. If the PC wanted to say public hearing, open another opportunity to log in, drop a comment. See what neighbors are saying. **Don:** That map is just since the changes became live. Previous map heat map this is just on what's proposed.

Mary: Is it reflected from public comments? **Don:** Yes. **Mike:** You can make a comment of why or why we aren't doing something. These are consensus comments. Housing is a problem before you draw that where's parks, transportation, changes holistically. Our earlier draft in October didn't fly. Public clammer just because they don't love it doesn't mean it should be in the plan. We do listen to all the comments. We feel confident about these changes. We see the SW corner having more commercial and higher density housing. Rate growing 5-year is a realistic window. Not make it 20-year plan. The giant white blocks are RDO's. We didn't want the community to think they could be changed. The City has a binding agreement. Port 15 is a strategic area development for the city that's off path, but it won't be for long. There's a great deal of interest and economic development out that way. We were sensitive across the street you have rural estates and something putting heavy use in there. We did a bit of buffering. The idea is where main transportation corridors are to keep density and reduce density over as you go away from that infrastructure corridor. We tried to forecast where the growth will go. In incorporated island in city limits. We were sensitives to those folks choosing not to be in the City and tried to maintain those areas with what we think will work out there. Air space is something you can't underestimate the importance see some of these changes. That's highest best use for some of those parcels.

Mary opened the public hearing.

Randy Cagel: With the realignment going up to 3200 North and proposed commercial at 2800 is not appropriate for commercial since the road is not going through. It's moved to realigned with the roads coming in. 3000 N 2300 W at intersection on the east side of 2300 we support the developer and doing what we ask putting that into rural estate residential. There's a vacant parcel proposed for commercial, but the rest is proposed for ranch estate. It's fine for commercial, all the homes are 1-acre along 2300, but it's inappropriate to change the master plan on those in the area of Melling Drive and the rural ranch estate. Line is not appropriate if it's not going to be there. I would request from Melling Drive up to 3000 be rural estate or split in half N to S. Put low density residential and the rest as rural. **Laura Henderson:** Thanks to Mike Hansen and Don, the City staff. General plan updates during committee. Spent hours to work through this we had great help. One of the things the group was trying to look at is placemaking what made sense in certain areas. Looking at the north end and south end and what would

fit there. We had some good guidance. As the process goes through, people need to realize that there was a lot of time spent. We were aware of developers and their needs. When an area zoned for something when they buy properties, that's in their minds. Not asking for zone change. **Bob Ballou:** I live in the Fiddlers Canyon area in the Nichols subdivision. **Don:** That's not online. (*referring to community petition*) **Bob:** Did the PC see that? **Don:** No. **Bob:** There's a spot off Fenwick Way and there was a parcel there designated to be changed from low density to medium density. We decided that we should make everyone on the street know that this was there. You did a wonderful job in promoting public involvement. I moved here 3 years ago from the Carson Valley. These 2 areas are similar. There's a high demand for growth. In that spot, generated 35 comments were placed on that. We circulated a petition in the neighborhood to keep that property as low density housing. I was thrilled to meet with Don and see that had been removed. It was good to take our input in and keep it as designated. **Tim Watson:** I'm representing a local community member. I talked with Mike last week and we were able to talk about various areas that were brought up by some of my clients. Over the last 10 years I've presented to this commission. General plan or zone change. This is a general plan not an exact plan. There are distinct lines that they shouldn't be distinct. A lot of areas in town and get as feathered as we can. Kind of blurring the lines. I would hope the PC looks at that as part of the general plan. There may be parts of town that steering committee may not have been able to look at those areas. High density master planned as medium density. If we consider this as general plan and use feathering concept take that into consideration. Not dissolve but remove those distinct boundaries make transition between residential areas that are more smooth instead of definite. Take that into consideration and provide feedback or direction to these final weeks of the general plan. It can help with future projects or existing communities in transition of being removed and brought back to better condition. **Jennie:** I am 100% on board with feathering and having transition areas into lower density makes sense. But when you translate that into the general plan and engineers, planning commission that say something. That creates some subjectivity that makes heartache for people. If not have these stark lines and do more transitional feathering what does that look like on the general plan? **Tim:** You said there's subjectivity with the current plan with the way it sits. You have comments from the public or steering committee. Some areas work better with others in the next 5 years. Don't wait 10 years to readdress this. What does it look like? **Jennie:** How do you make citizens and encourage development enterprise and business? That's what we balance. What does that look like with feathering? **Mary:** He talked about that. We all agree to the concept, but when it comes to us, it will put us in the same position. Every time we do that, we'll have to explain that. **Jill:** Jeff Porter was asking for this. 20 acres and now 7,000 foot lots. **Mike:** In the general plan that talks about feathering density. It's an ordinance that you will have to come up with. **Mary:** We are supposed to use a feathering concept. **Mike:** It would be a zoning solution. This area of SF residential is 3500 acres of the exact same land use. We recommend that you'll not want the same thing. There's a huge area of potentially the same thing. We love our neighborhoods, and we recognize we need different housing. I don't have good examples help you research. It's a start to get a policy in there and talk to the developers. We had some hypotheticals. **Mary:** With communities that do the feathering, do they have it in an ordinance? **Tyler:** my suggestion would be my experience if we feather 90% of the requests are going to be R-2-1 or R-3-M. My suggestion is to have clear lines. Not to follow lots. Propose feathering, do an RDO and match and do an agreement. **Mary:** You're suggesting on the general plan to have zoning reflect the feathering concept. **Tyler:** Not zoning, the general plan. **Jennie:** Is this something that we could tweak the RDO to reflect those kinds of feathering things? I don't think it does now. **Tyler:** Joel Hansen's property does. There's R-2-1 on that RDO. **Jennie:** RDO is a vastly underutilized tool. The Iron Horse project is a well-planned development. It's what developers could look to. Was there something in the RDO that required that or something? **Tyler:** The developer wants to have flexibility on how to use that. What the PC could do when someone comes in for changes on a larger piece of property, look at the RDO and allow feathering and bind it by ordinance to be bought out

by somebody. **Jennie:** Increase visibility. Redevelopment overlay 100-acre developments and develop pods this portion we want to do R-2-2 duplexes and in this one we'll do others. Lower density but allow higher density in certain portions. **Don:** There is language in the general plan that talks about larger parcels rezoned or RDO we should take a look at not having 540 acres of the same thing. It's a good tool, but it does allow you to say what density is planned for, but we can mix and match that. It encourages developer to take open space not in everyone's yard and consolidate that public open space and amenities. We need to do is the zoning implementation of goals and policies not in the plan. **Jennie:** We've talked a lot about taking on some of these pieces. **Don:** It's a good place to start. **Terri Kenney:** The way it started it was a beast. Now it's a caged beast. We're pleased with it. It looks to me like it could be easily tweaked and serve different needs. Dave Clarke mentioned he was hopeful through ordinances to come up with some method served needs of residents and developers facilitate this feathering idea next against an R-1 - a street or 2 and going into another type of development. Tammy made some comments to see in St. George where it's beautifully meshed. Higher density winds into lower density. It could facilitate a lot of different kinds of housing. Keep the community beautiful. **Randy Cagel:** Feathering transitional zoning. Rezoned in neighborhood from the ranch estate out there. The city shows as master planned residential. The densest for density is residential. Change the ordinance to break medium residential or change the master plan to have 2 designations. You have way too much medium density residential in this city and if you allow everyone the request, it will be a mess. **Laura:** A lot of developer's default to R-3 because they get the most flexibility. We talked about feathering and residents ask why medium density slammed against a single-family residential area. Steering committee has affected us at some point. It gradually works for more people than either or. We're getting down to one's person's rights are more important than another person's rights. Feather we can get there. I agree with Randy. Relook at some of our zones. **Don:** There's a lot of challenges. Once we get into the zoning ordinance and implement this plan these things will come to light and make progress. We don't want them there. It's always going to be a transition and line between zones, and not always in a positive way. If we use tools like the RDO and master plans moving forward we can make more sense of blending the density of the community. The challenges come through the ordinance. The text becomes a document that sits on a shelf. It needs to support where we want to go. **Jerry Munson:** There were 270 people that signed the petition. We're not against development. We went to the developer and asked him to do something else. His comment to us was it bothers his bottom line. They want to build twin homes across the street from us. We ask that they build single-family residences off the street and do their development in the middle. They'll come to you for the final plan. They tell us they don't know how many houses will be there. We've asked you to try and help us because we're on a 1-acre lot. It's easy if you build a few blocks in.

Mary closed the public hearing.

Adam motions for a positive recommendation based on the consultants and comments made tonight and potential changes in the document; Jennie seconds; all in favor for unanimous decision.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.


Onjulee Pittser, Executive Assistant