



HURRICANE CITY UTAH

Mayor

City Manager

Nanette Billings Kaden DeMille

Planning Commission

*Mark Sampson, Chair
Shelley Goodfellow, Alternate Chair
Ralph Ballard
Paul Farthing
Brad Winder
Kelby Iverson
Amy Werrett
Michelle Smith*

Hurricane Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

September 25, 2025
6:00 PM

Hurricane City Offices 147 N 870 W, Hurricane

Notice is hereby given that the Hurricane City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting commencing at 6:00 p.m. at the Hurricane City Offices 147 N 870 W, Hurricane, UT.

Meeting link:

<https://cityofhurricane.webex.com/cityofhurricane/j.php?MTID=me42b4eb65609e35eb0e0664c925c9dbc>

Meeting number: 2632 882 4836

Password: HCplanning

Host key: 730111

Join by phone +1-415-655-0001 US Toll

Access code: 2632 882 4836

Host PIN: 9461

Details on these applications are available in the Planning Department at the City Office, 147 N. 870 West.

6:00 p.m. - Call to Order

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

Prayer and/or thought by invitation

Declaration of any conflicts of interest

OLD BUSINESS

1. PP25-09: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary plat for Ridgecrest, a 21 lot manufactured home subdivision, located at 2680 W 200 N. Joby Venuti, Applicant.
2. LUCA25-06: Clarification on a previous recommendation to the City Council on a Land Use Code Amendment request to Title 10, Chapters 3, regarding the definition of accessory dwelling units.

NEW BUSINESS

1. PP25-14: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary plat for The Vineyards at Elim Valley, a 32 lot single family residential subdivision

located east of Jellystone Road and 3400 W. Western Mortgage and Realty Company, Applicant. Karl Rasmussen, Agent.

2. PP25-08: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary plat for Rock Hollow, a 55 lot single family residential subdivision located at 3300 S 1100 W. Teancum Properties LLC, Applicant. Karl Rasmussen, Agent.
3. PSP25-22: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary site plan for Culver's, a restaurant located at 489 W State St. State Street Properties LLC, Applicant. Rick Meyer, Agent.

Approval of Minutes:

1. March 13, 2025
2. March 27, 2025

Adjournment



STAFF COMMENTS

Agenda Date:	09/25/2025 - Planning Commission
Application Number:	PP25-09
Type of Application:	Preliminary Plat
Action Type:	Administrative
Applicant:	Joby Venuti
Agent:	N/A
Request:	Approval of a Preliminary Plat.
Location:	2680 W 200 N
Zoning:	MH/RV (PDO)
General Plan Map:	Single Family
Recommendation:	Pending
Report Prepared by:	Fred Resch III

Discussion:

The applicant is seeking preliminary plat approval for a 21-lot manufactured home subdivision located south of Sky Ridge and east of Canyons RV. This site received preliminary site plan approval in 2023. The site is zoned Manufactured Home/RV with a Planned Development Overlay.

JUC Comments

The following items will need to be addressed: The applicant has addressed these comments and their response is attached to this report

1. **Public Works:** Second access? Water loop? Show power line easement and identify
2. **Fire:** Turnaround required.
3. **Sewer:** There is a pressure sewer line from Canyons RV that runs through a few of the lots (this line is not depicted on the preliminary plat). Ash Creek met with the developer and he was made aware that as a condition of Ash Creek approval on Construction Drawings the lots where the pressure line runs through will not be able to be sold until Option 1: the pressure line is abandoned as part of Canyons RV accessing gravity sewer or Option 2: the pressure line is relocated.
4. **Water:** Need water line loop. Needs water model.

5. **Power:** Power to the project will be brought from 2600 W. The apartments that are being built now will bring a connection point to the west side of 2600 W. Must do this for capacity problems that are found currently on 2600 W. Must have an application for the project services.
6. **Streets:** No comment.
7. **Gas:** Okay
8. **Engineering:** The existing pressure sewer should be located, shown, and a preliminary relocation plan proposed (Hurricane City Code (HCC) section 10-39-7(C)(13)). Include the planned cross section for 100 North. 77' right of way (44' pavement, 2-2.5' curbs and gutters, 2-5.5' landscape strips, 5' sidewalk, and 12' trail). These roads must be improved and dedicated for the proposed corner lots (HCC 10-39-11(A)(3) see also HCC 10-39-7(B)(3)). A concept road network for the remainder parcel(s) must be shown. a preliminary plan for completing a water loop (off-site work) must be shown. Engineering doesn't see a way that doesn't require the assistance of the neighbor's(s') (HCC 10-39-7(C)(10)). The preliminary plat must show and label all easements and properties within and adjacent to the proposed plat (include document numbers for the easements)(HCC 10-39-7(B)(4)).
9. **Washington County Water Conservancy District:** Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the project adequately mitigates interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.



Vicinity Map

Staff Comments: Preliminary Plat

1. **Density:** Zoning is Manufactured Home/Recreational Vehicle with a Planned Development Overlay as part of the Canyons RV. This layout matches the approved preliminary site plan from 2023.
2. **Sewer and Water:** Will serve letters from Hurricane City Water and Ash Creek Sewer District have been provided.
3. **Water use:** To assist the Washington County Water Conservancy District (“WCWCD”) as the city’s wholesale water provider under the 2006 Regional Water Supply Agreement (“RWSA”), Hurricane City and other cities report monthly the number of number final platted lots, preliminary platted lots, lots subject to development agreements, and lots within PID taxing areas. These numbers help the WCWCD plan for future water needs and inform the WCWCD’s 20-year plan to supply water to the growing County. The 21 units contemplated by this application have not yet been reported to the WCWCD as lots to plan for, so adding these units to the monthly report will increase the number of future lots that the WCWCD will need to include in its plans for water supply and infrastructure.

Recommendation: The Planning Commission should review this application based on standards within the Hurricane City Code. At the time of writing this staff report, staff is still awaiting Water Dept. confirmation regarding applicant’s responses to their comments and concerns. An updated recommendation will be provided prior to the public meeting.

The Ridgecrest Subdivision previously received approval of the preliminary site plan for 53 lots. This submission is for the first 27 lot phase.

The second phase consisting of 26 additional lots will be submitted at a future time. The owner and developer are currently in discussions with the neighboring property owner to the south about layouts/property line adjustments that can accommodate the potential location of the future master planned 100N road. This may alter the south west corner of the subdivision, so no preliminary plat for that portion of the development is being presented at this time.

JUC Comments

Developer Responses in Red


Ridgecrest Phase 1 Preliminary Plat

1. **Public Works:** Second access? Water loop? Show power line easement and identify
 - There is a recorded emergency access easement through the property(s) to the South and East, this is the same emergency access easement used by Sky Ridge. Copy Attached.
 - Developer met with Kory in the Hurricane City water department. The water loop will connect to the Canyons RV Resort line (note added to plat) in the same Pressure Zone. Additional water notes in item 4 below.
 - Rocky Mountain Power Line Easement is now labelled on plat.
2. **Fire:** Turnaround required.
 - added to plat map, and there is also the emergency access road listed in item 1
3. **Sewer:** There is a pressure sewer line from Canyons RV that runs through a few of the lots (this line is not depicted on the preliminary plat). Ash Creek met with the developer and he was made aware that as a condition of Ash Creek approval on Construction Drawings the lots where the pressure line runs through will not be able to be sold until Option 1: the pressure line is abandoned as part of Canyons RV accessing gravity sewer or Option 2: the pressure line is relocated.
 - Pressure sewer easement added to plat
4. **Water:** Need water line loop. Needs water model.
 - Water Loop location added to plat
 - Water model will be completed
 - 1st phase was reduced in size to keep the initial line less than 600'. Future phases will require water loop to be installed.
5. **Power:** Power to the project will be brought from 2600 W. The apartments that are being built now will bring a connection point to the west side of 2600 W. Must do this for capacity problems that are found currently on 2600 W. Must have an application for the project services.
6. **Streets:** No comments.
7. **Gas:** Okay
8. **Engineering:** See attached.
 - Engineering Notes were added to plat
 - Water loop, discussed with Water Department, is in a different location than assumed on redlines.
 - 100 N is not part of this plat map, it is located completely on neighboring properties.
 - Conceptual road locations for the future phases were shown on the preliminary site plan. This plan can be uploaded with the application if needed.
9. **Washington County Water Conservancy District:** Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the project adequately mitigates interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.

10. Planning:



LOCATED IN SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 41 SOUTH, RANGE 13 WEST OF THE
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN
IN THE CITY OF HURRICANE, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH.
DEVELOPED BY: WESTERN COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE, PLLC



CURRENT ZONE: MH-RV

TOTAL AREA: 2.84 AC (62,517 SQ.FT.)

RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 21

DENSITY: UNITS/ACRES = 21/2.84 = 7.27 UNITS PER ACRE

THE DEVELOPER FOR THIS PROJECT IS
WESTERN COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE, PLLC
JOBY VENUTI
P.O. BOX 546
SANTA CLARA, UTAH 84765
(435) 632-5624

THE ENGINEER FOR THIS PROJECT IS:
ROSENBERG ASSOCIATES
JASON L. WARD
352 EAST RIVERSIDE DRIVE, SUITE A2
ST. GEORGE, UTAH 84740
(435) 673-8586


THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER FOR THIS PROJECT IS:
ROSENBERG ASSOCIATES
DAVE BLACK
352 EAST RIVERSIDE DRIVE, SUITE A2
ST. GEORGE, UTAH 84790
(435) 673-8586

THE CANYONS R.V. RESORT - PHASE #1
AMENDED & EXTENDED

332 East Riverside Drive, Suite A-1
St. George, Utah 84790
Ph (435) 673-8586 Fx (435) 673-8397
www.tracivill.com



DATE:	5/1/2024
DRAWN:	0361-24-015
DESIGNED BY:	JLM
CHECKED BY:	RMA
DATE:	05/01/24
REVISIONS	



SHEET
1.0
1 OF 1 SHEETS

Agenda Date:	09/25/2025 - Planning Commission
Application Number:	LUCA25-06
Type of Application:	Land Use Code Amendment
Action Type:	Legislative
Applicant:	Hurricane City
Agent:	N/A
Request:	Amend Title 10, Chapter 3 regarding the definition of accessory dwelling units.
Recommendation:	Recommend approval to the City Council.
Report Prepared By:	Gary Cupp

Updated discussion for 09/25/2025, relating to the code update to allow accessory buildings in front yards:

After the last Planning Commission meeting on September 11, 2025, it was discovered that the packet for the meeting did not include the latest version of the proposed update to the definition of “accessory dwelling units.” City ordinances were intended to only allow no more than (up to) two accessory dwelling units on a property, if certain conditions are met. The version reviewed by the Planning Commission on September 11 still contained an exception that currently allows the construction of additional dwelling units if they are only used by family members. Since staff cannot confirm if such a unit would indeed be used by family members, the exception is not enforceable and has created a loophole that has resulted in the construction of additional dwelling units beyond what is permitted. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the updated definition cited below. Staff’s additional proposed changes are highlighted in red strikeout text:

“Accessory dwelling unit (ADU) means a dwelling unit that is subordinate to a principal dwelling unit, located on the same lot or parcel as a principal dwelling, occupied on a long-term or short-term basis, ~~by any person not qualifying as the property owner’s family;~~ and provides sleeping, kitchen, and sanitation facilities. An ADU may be internal to, attached to, or detached from the principal dwelling. ~~Subordinate dwelling units which are used exclusively by the property owner’s family, shall not be considered ADUs.~~ Each subordinate residential dwelling unit meeting the definition of an ADU shall constitute a separate ADU, regardless of configuration, location, or means of access. No more than one ADU shall be permitted per residential lot, unless a conditional use permit is obtained and the standards of Chapter 7 of this title are met. All ADUs shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 41 of this title.”

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to the City Council.



STAFF COMMENTS

Agenda Date:	09/25/2025 - Planning Commission
Application Number:	PP25-14
Type of Application:	Preliminary Plat
Action Type:	Administrative
Applicant:	Western Mortgage and Realty Co
Agent:	Karl Rasmussen
Request:	Preliminary Plat Approval
Location:	East of the intersection of Jellystone Road and 3400 W
Zoning:	R1-15
General Plan Map:	Planned Community
Recommendation:	Table
Report Prepared by:	Fred Resch III

Discussion:

The applicant is seeking preliminary plat approval for phase 1 of The Vineyards at Elim Valley, a 32 lot subdivision within the Gateway to Sand Hollow Public Infrastructure District (PID) east of the proposed Copper Meadows subdivision. This is an update to a preliminary plat that was proposed earlier this year and was tabled. This property is at the furthest east end of Bash Parkway and is zoned Single Family Residential R1-15.


JUC Comments

The following items will need to be addressed. The applicant has addressed some of these comments and that response is attached:

1. **Public Works:** Need to provide ROW for 3400 W install improvements on east side.
2. **Power:** Dixie Power. Approved.
3. **Sewer:** No comment.
4. **Streets:** No comment.
5. **Water:** If this has private roads, water will need to be installed in ductile iron pipe. Water line will need to be in a looped system.
6. **Engineering:** The ability to develop and access the area east of the subdivision and below the ridge, owned by Lowe Land BL LLC, must be evaluated when the conceptual road layout is considered for approval (HCS 2.1(bullet 2)). It appears said area would be unable to secure a reasonable access from anywhere except this subdivision. If the area is developable, there should be a roadway stubbed from the subdivision or shared with the subdivision. If the area is

undevelopable, could arrangements be made with Lowe Land BL LLC to combine said area with proposed lots, a park, or common area? A second water source must be identified and constructed for this development to have a proper water loop. My office needs documented justification to vary from the standard 800' maximum block lengths mentioned in HCS 3.2.4.2(f) for neighborhood roadways. Especially when an existing driveway for the property to the south would be disrupted by this proposal. Construction plans for Flora Tech Road (3400 W) have yet to be reviewed and approved for construction (HCC 10-37-4). It seems that including the segment of Flora Tech Road that this development 'front' as a part of this preliminary plat will show that the developer will provide adequate public facilities for themselves. Off-site construction plans for Jellystone Road must be reviewed and approved (HCC 10-39-6(C)). It appears the combination of HCC 7-1-3(B) and HCC 10-37-13 disqualifies Hurricane from allowing gated communities.

7. **Fire:** Approved.
8. **Cable/Phone:** [No comments submitted.]
9. **Fiber:** No issues.
10. **Gas:** Okay
11. **Water Conservancy District:** Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the plans adequately mitigate interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.



Vicinity Map

Staff Comments: Preliminary Plat

1. The site zoning is R1-15. Almost all the lots are more than double the minimum 15,000-square-foot lot size for the R1-15 zone; therefore, it should be considered that individual lots could be legally subdivided by future property owners (i.e., lot-splits).
2. This plat includes the realignment of Flora Tech Road, on August 7th, 2025 the City Council approved the abandonment of Flora Tech Road and the current alignment has since been blocked off. Through other projects the westernmost road on this plat will connect into 3400 W at State St.
3. The plat shows a nontypical 65' street cross section. While Hurricane City Code 7-2-2 puts the authority to deviate from standard cross-sections with the City Council, staff believes that since these street sections exceed the standard 52' cross-section that would be required, it is appropriate that the Planning Commission can act as the approval authority.
4. The preliminary plat shows no connection to the property to the south, yet there is an existing driveway stubbed into Flora Tech Road on this property. This existing driveway needs to be accounted for in the development of this property. HCC 10-39-11(A)(1) states: *The arrangements of streets in new subdivisions shall make provision for the continuation of the existing streets to adjoining areas insofar as such may be deemed necessary by the Planning Commission for public requirements. New streets within subdivisions shall not preclude future access to adjoining properties.*
5. The plat shows gates on the streets, indicating this will be a gated community. HCC 7-1-3 prohibits obstructing a public right of way, which a gate would do by design, and HCC 10-37-13 prohibits building on lots only accessed by private rights-of-way which means they could not be private streets. These gates need to be removed and all streets must be public.
6. The City has received a letter from both the local sanitary sewer provider and culinary water provider indicating service availability.
7. The applicant has noted that the property isn't located in a desert tortoise take area.
8. The plat shows several open space areas, additional details are needed on how these areas will be developed and maintained.
9. **Public Facilities:** The property is isolated but has services planned for the area. The PID has submitted plans to bring services to the site and there are existing unpaved roadways to the site. Hurricane City Code states the following:

10-37-4: ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES:

Land shall be developed only where existing infrastructure is in place or will be timely provided to service proposed development. The city may require an analysis to be completed to determine whether adequate public facilities are available to service a development and whether such development will change existing levels of service or will create a demand which exceeds acceptable levels of service for roadways, intersections, bridges, storm drainage facilities, water lines, water pressure, sewer lines, fire and emergency response times, and other similar public services. The city may disapprove a proposed development if demand for public services exceeds accepted levels of service. No subsequent approval of such development shall be given until either the developer or the city installs improvements calculated to raise service levels to the standard adopted by the City. (Ord. 03-5-1, 5-1-2003, eff. 6-1-2003)

There is currently a roadway stub to the site but there is no legal access for water looping or secondary emergency access. The applicant must be required to provide a timeline for when the provision of adequate facilities will be accomplished.

8. Water use: To assist the Washington County Water Conservancy District (“WCWCD”) as the city’s wholesale water provider under the 2006 Regional Water Supply Agreement (“RWSA”), Hurricane City and other cities report monthly the number of number final platted lots, preliminary platted lots, lots subject to development agreements, and lots within PID taxing areas. These numbers help the WCWCD plan for future water needs and inform the WCWCD’s 20-year plan to supply water to the growing County. The 32 units contemplated by this application have already been reported to WCWCD as part of the Gateway to Sand Hollow PID.

Recommendation: The Planning Commission should review this application based on standards within the Hurricane City Code. Staff would recommend this item be tabled so the applicant can address the following concerns:

- The gated community and private streets cannot be permitted under our current ordinances.
- Connectivity to the property to the south needs to be provided.

**NARRATIVE FOR:
VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY**

The Vineyards at Elim Valley Phase 1 is a subdivision of 32 lots. It is located east of intersection of Jellystone and 3400 west of 1400 South (Parcels H-3-2-1402-GS2, H-3-2-north 7-4402-GS2).

RESPONSE TO REDLINES

Sheet 1 of 3:

1. The ability to develop and access the area east of the subdivision and below the ridge, owned by Lowe land BL LLC, must be evaluated when the conceptual road layout is considered for approval (HCS 2.1(bullet 2)). it appears said area would be unable to secure reasonable access from anywhere except this subdivision. if the area is developable, there should be a roadway stubbed from the subdivision or shared with the subdivision. if the area is undevelopable, could arrangements be made with Lowe land BL LLC to combine said area with proposed lots, a park, or common area?

- The area east of future phase 3 is a small area ranging from 100 to 200 feet wide before the toe of the hill leads to slopes greater than 30 percent. However, if access is needed in the future, we are willing to provide it from the south end of future phase 3.

2. If Jellystone Road and 3400 West are excluded for the subdivision boundary they will be treated as a separate project(s), see redlined sheet 3.

- 3400 West Road will be built with the development of Vineyards at Elim Valley phase-1. We plan to combine the 2 projects.

3. A second water source must be identified and constructed for this development to have a proper water loop.

- A second water source will be identified and constructed for this development and the note was added to the Existing water and sewer note section.

Sheet 2 of 3:

1. It appears the existing Flora tech road must be declared surplus and disposed of by the city council. (HCC 1-10-2) for this project. Existing Flora Tech Road appears to be a public street by use.
 - We will submit the form to dispose of the Flora Tech Road as we build the phases. Right Now, Mrs. Thompson wants Flora Tech to remain accessible as long as possible. We can make this change during the final plat process of Phase 1.

Sheet 3 of 3:

1. **Offsite construction plans for Jellystone Road must be reviewed and approved (HCC 10-39-6)).**
 - Jellystone Road plans are approved up to the intersection of 3400 West. This is being built and any grade changes will be submitted to the engineering department for review.
2. **It appears the combination of HCC 7-1-3(B) and HCC 10-37-13. Disqualifies Hurricane from allowing gated Communities.**
 - The streets will be Private Streets so we can have this gated community. We want to follow the same process that Southern Shores was granted.
3. **The city council must grant approval to deviate from Hurricane City's list of typical cross sections (HCC 7-2-2). This section is most similar to our residential local alternate cross section (which can serve up to 50 units).**
 - We had meetings with staff on the typical cross section we would like to install. We will first seek City Council approval after the planning commission approval.
4. **Fix ROW width on 65' Typical Road cross section.**
 - ROW width on 65' is fixed to 30'
5. **Construction plans for Flora Tech Road (3400 Wes) have yet to be reviewed and approved for construction (HCC 10-37-4). It seems that including the segment of Flora Tech Road that this development "front" as a part of this preliminary plat will show that the developer will provide adequate public facilities for themselves.**
 - This is correct. 3400 West Road will be built with the development of Vineyards at Elim Valley phase-1.
6. **My office needs documented justification to vary from the standard 800' maximum block length mentioned in HCS 3.4.2.2(F) for neighborhood roadways. Especially when an existing driveway for the property to the south would be disrupted by this proposal.**
 - We prefer not to construct a road between Lots 3 and 4 and instead propose using a 25-foot right-of-way with a 12 foot trail to provide access between the lots. Building roads every 3 to 4 lots takes away from the theme we want for the Vineyards.

Responses to JUC Comments

1. Public Works: Need to provide ROW for 3400 W install improvements on the east side.
- Right of Way for 3400 West is provided on the plans See sheet 1 of 3.
2. Power: Dixie Power. Approved.
3. Sewer: No comment.
4. Streets: No comment.
5. Water: If this has private roads, water will need to be installed in ductile iron pipe. Water line will need to be in a looped system.
- Water line will be ductile iron pipe and water line will be looped.
6. Engineering: The ability to develop and access the area east of the subdivision and below the ridge, owned by Lowe Land BL LLC, must be evaluated when the conceptual road layout is considered for approval (HCS 2.1(bullet 2)). It appears said area would be unable to secure a reasonable access from anywhere except this subdivision. If the area is developable, there should be a roadway stubbed from the subdivision or shared with the subdivision. If the area is undevelopable, could arrangements be made with Lowe Land BL LLC to combine said area with proposed lots, a park, or common area? A second water source must be identified and constructed for this development to have a proper water loop. It appears existing Flora Tech Road must be declared surplus and disposed of by the City Council (HCC 1-10-2) for this project. Existing Flora Tech Road appears to be a public street by use. City Council must grant approval to deviate from Hurricane City's list of typical cross sections (HCC 7-2-2). This section is most similar to our residential local alternate cross section (which can serve up to 50 units). Clarify the intended plan for the open spaces. My office needs documented justification to vary from the standard 800' maximum block lengths mentioned in HCS 3.2.4.2(f) for neighborhood roadways. Especially when an existing driveway for the property to the south would be disrupted by this proposal. Construction plans for Flora Tech Road (3400 W) have yet to be reviewed and approved for construction (HCC 10-37-4). It seems that including the segment of Flora Tech Road that this development 'front' as a part of this preliminary plat will show that the developer will provide adequate public facilities for themselves. Off-site construction plans for Jellystone Road must be reviewed and approved (HCC 10-39-6(C)). It appears the combination of HCC 7-1-3(B) and HCC 10-37-13. disqualifies Hurricane from allowing gated communities.

- See section “RESPONSES TO REDLINES” for the responses to Engineering comments for this project.
7. Fire: Approved.

8. Cable/Phone: [No comments received.]

9. Fiber: No issues.

10. Gas: Okay

11. Water Conservancy District: Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the plans adequately mitigate interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.

-

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 42 SOUTH, RANGE 14 WEST, OF THE SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN; THENCE ALONG THE SOUTH SECTION LINE OF SAID SECTION 6, S88°17'53"E 41.91 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE N01°16'31"E 54.32 FEET; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DISTANCE OF 19.71 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 12.50 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N88°37'03"W, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°20'21" (LONG CHORD BEARS: S46°33'07"W 17.73 FEET); THENCE N88°18'02"W 88.00 FEET; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT A DISTANCE OF 157.65 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 100.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N01°42'07"E, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°19'37" (LONG CHORD BEARS: N46°32'18"E 141.82 FEET); THENCE N01°22'31"E 236.76 FEET; THENCE 88°37'30"E 298.30 FEET; THENCE N01°22'30"E 108.72 FEET; THENCE S88°54'43"E 539.99 FEET; THENCE S01°22'30"W 198.50 FEET; THENCE S19°41'58"E 69.53 FEET; THENCE S01°22'30"W 253.50 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 912.34 FEET; THENCE S88°48'53"E 326.70 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 260.36 FEET; THENCE S88°48'53"E 1.75 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 194.69 FEET; THENCE N88°48'53"W 1149.63 FEET; THENCE N01°11'07"E 73.80 FEET; THENCE N88°24'20"W 41.79 FEET; THENCE N01°10'31"E 1188.17 FEET; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT A DISTANCE OF 156.18 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 100.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N88°46'53"W, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 89°29'00" (LONG CHORD BEARS: N43°33'23"W 140.78 FEET); THENCE S88°17'53"E 79.79 FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A 19.50 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DISTANCE OF 30.45 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 89°28'20", (LONG CHORD BEARS: S43°33'43"E 27.45 FEET); THENCE N01°16'31"E 54.32 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA CONTAINS 1,737,952.15 SQUARE FEET OR 38.89 ACRES.

GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS

FAULTS & SURFACE FAULTING	NONE
LIQUEFACTION	H2 - HIGH2-SIMILAR IN TEXTURE TO HIGH CATEGORY, NO GROUND-WATER INFORMATION
FLOODING	ZONE X-AREA OF MINIMAL FLOOD HAZARD
LANDSLIDE HAZARD	NONE
ROCKFALL HAZARD	H - HIGH ROCK-FALL-HAZARD AREAS
BRECCIA PIPES AND PALEOKARST	NONE
CALICHE	CA - CALICHE
COLLAPSIBLE SOIL	CSA-STREAM/TERRACE ALLUVIUM >=3% CSB-STREAM/TERRACE ALLUVIUM, NO DATA
EXPANSIVE SOIL	ESL-LOW SUSCEPTIBILITY TO EXPANSION
GYPSEFEROUS SOIL & ROCK	NONE
PIPING & EROSION	PAES-SOILS SUSCEPTIBLE TO PIPING AND EROSION
SHALLOW BEDROCK	BRB-BURIED: AREAS WHERE DEPTH TO BEDROCK IS GENERALLY <10 FEET BENEATH SOIL COVER BRH-HARD: AREAS WHERE GENERALLY HARD AND RESISTANT BEDROCK VISIBLE AT GROUND SURFACE
WIND BLOWN SAND	WBSL-LOW: MIXED-UNIT GEOLOGIC DEPOSITS WITH WIND-BLOWN COMPONENT WBSH-HIGH: MODERN SAND-DUNE OR SHEET-SAND DEPOSITS
SHALLOW GROUND WATER	SGW3-MODERATELY TO FREELY DRAINING SOILS WITH SEASONAL OR TRANSIENT SHALLOW GROUND WATER

THE MITIGATION OF POTENTIAL HAZARDS WILL BE RECOMMENDED IN THE FUTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT.

GEOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

Qbv: VOLCANO MOUNTAIN LAVA FLOW (MIDDLE PLEISTOCENE)

MEDIUM- TO DARK-GRAY TO GRAYISH-BLACK, FINE- TO MEDIUM-GRAINED ALKALI BASALT (QBV) WITH SPARSE OLIVINE PHENOCRYSTS; ERUPTED FROM A VENT AT VOLCANO MOUNTAIN (QVVC) SOUTHWEST OF HURRICANE; DIVISIBLE INTO THREE SEPARATE FLOWS (BIEK, 2003A, 2003B); YOUNGEST AND MIDDLE-LEVEL FLOWS YIELDED 40AR/39AR AGES OF 0.258 ± 0.024 MA AND 0.353 ± 0.045 MA, RESPECTIVELY (SANCHEZ, 1995), IN ACCORD WITH K-AR AGES OF 0.289 ± 0.085 AND 0.303 ± 0.30 (BEST AND OTHERS, 1980) ON THE MIDDLE-LEVEL FLOW; MIDDLE-LEVEL FLOW IS DISPLACED ABOUT 240 FEET (73 M) BY THE HURRICANE FAULT AT TIMPOWEAP CANYON AND LOCALLY HAS PILLOW BASALT AT ITS BASE; THE OLDEST LAVA FLOW FLOWED ABOUT 8 MILES (13 KM) DOWN THE VIRGIN RIVER; LAVA FLOWS ARE GENERALLY 35 TO 45 FEET (11-14 M) THICK AND FORM ROUGH, BLOCKY SURFACES, BUT THE MIDDLE-LEVEL FLOW IS AS MUCH AS 170 FEET (50 M) THICK WHERE IT FILLS THE ANCESTRAL VIRGIN RIVER CHANNEL.

Qae: ALLUVIAL AND EOLIAN DEPOSITS (HOLOCENE TO UPPER PLEISTOCENE):-

MODERATELY SORTED GRAVEL, SAND, AND SILT DEPOSITED IN SMALL CHANNELS AND ON ALLUVIAL FLATS, AND WELL-SORTED, FINE- TO MEDIUM-GRAINED, REDDISH-BROWN EOLIAN SAND LOCALLY REWORKED BY ALLUVIAL PROCESSES; YOUNGER DEPOSITS (QAE) FORM ACTIVE DEPOSITIONAL SURFACES, WHEREAS OLDER DEPOSITS (QAE0) TYPICALLY FORM INCISED, INACTIVE SURFACES; AS MUCH AS ABOUT 20 FEET (6 M) THICK.

Qmt: TALUS DEPOSITS (HOLOCENE TO UPPER PLEISTOCENE)

POORLY SORTED, ANGULAR BOULDERS AND FINER-GRAINED INTERSTITIAL SEDIMENT DEPOSITED PRINCIPALLY BY ROCK FALL ON AND AT THE BASE OF STEEP SLOPES; TYPICALLY GRADES DOWNSLOPE INTO COLLUVIAL DEPOSITS AND MAY INCLUDE COLLUVIAL DEPOSITS WHERE IMPRACTICAL TO DIFFERENTIATE THE TWO; ALSO INCLUDES ALLUVIAL DEPOSITS IN THE BOTTOM OF WASHES, AND, IN THE SMITH MESA QUADRANGLE, LOCALLY INCLUDES SMALL LANDSLIDE DEPOSITS ALONG THE OUTCROP BELT OF THE PETRIFIED FOREST MEMBER OF THE CHINLE FORMATION; GENERALLY LESS THAN 30 FEET (9 M) THICK.

EASEMENT NOTE:

THE SUBDIVISION WILL PROVIDE NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS FOR THE PLACEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE. EASEMENTS WILL BE IDENTIFIED ON THE FINAL PLAT AND COORDINATED WITH RELEVANT SERVICE PROVIDERS TO ENSURE EQUITABLE ACCESS FOR ALL UTILITY AND COMMUNICATION PROVIDERS.

ALL LOTS TO HAVE 10' PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS ALONG THE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF ALL INTERNAL ROADWAYS.

PRELIMINARY STORM DRAINAGE PLAN

STORM WATER WILL BE COLLECTED IN A DETENTION BASIN LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST OF THE PROPERTY.

EXISTING WATER AND SEWER NOTE:

EXISTING 10" DUCTILE-IRON WATER PIPE AND 12" SEWER PVC W/ SEWER MANHOLE ARE LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF BASH PARKWAY AND 3400 WEST.



A SECOND WATER SOURCE MUST BE IDENTIFIED AND CONSTRUCTED FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT TO HAVE A PROPER WATER LOOP.

SITE DATA

PHASE #	# OF LOTS	AVG. LOT S.F.
PHASE 1	30 LOTS	30,727.23 S.F.

DESERT TORTOISE TAKE AREA

THE PROJECT IS NOT LOCATED IN A DESERT TORTOISE TAKE AREA. (PER RED CLIFFS DESERT RESERVE TAKE AREA 7 MAP)








OWNER(S):

WESTERN MTG & REALTY CO
6610 W COURT ST
PASCO, WA 99301

TITLE SHEET FOR:
THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1

LOCATED IN SECTIONS 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH



COPYRIGHT © 2023 PROVALUE ENGINEERING INC.

NO	REVISIONS		DATE	BY
	DESCRIPTION			

PROVALUE
ENGINEERING, INC.
ENGINEERS - LAND SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
20 South 850 West, Suite 1
Hurricane City, Utah 84737
Phone: 435-668-8307





TITLE SHEET FOR:
THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1

LOCATED IN SECTION 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

DATE	05/15/2025
SCALE	1"=200'
JOB NO.	336-016
SHEET NO.	1 OF 3

EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR:
THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1

LOCATED IN SECTIONS 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH



H-3-2-7-4402-GS2
WESTERN MORTGAGE
AND REALTY COMPANY

LEGEND

—	PROPERTY LINE	—	PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
—	ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE	— W — 10" — W — 10" —	EXISTING 10" WATER
—	EXISTING CURB & GUTTER	— SS — 12" — SS — 12" —	EXISTING 12" SEWER
—	SECTION LINE	— SD — 36" — SD — 36" —	EXISTING 36" STORM DRAIN
—	CENTER LINE	— G — G — G —	EXISTING GAS
—	EDGE OF PAVEMENT	— IRR — 8" — IRR — 8" —	EXISTING IRRIGATION
—	EXISTING OVERHEAD POWER	— T — T — T — T —	EXISTING TELEPHONE LINE
—	MAJOR CONTOUR 5'	— P — P — P — P — P — P — P — P —	EXISTING POWER LINE
—	MINOR CONTOUR 1'	—	EXISTING CURB INLET BOX
		—	EXISTING SEWER MANHOLE
		—	EXISTING SECONDARY BOX
		—	EXISTING LIGHT POLE
		—	EXISTING TRANSFORMER
		—	EXISTING VALVE
		—	EXISTING FIREHYDRANT
		—	EXISTING POWER POLE

5' SS MANHOLE B30 INCLUDE BASE FULL STACK RIM ELEV=2906.99 STA=62+51.16, -8.0' LT INV IN= 2897.07 INV IN= 2897.23 INV IN= 2897.23 INV OUT= 2896.87 DEPTH=10.13'	INSTALLED 54.16 L.F. 8" SS PVC Pipe @ 0.58%	INSTALLED 59.29 L.F. 8" SS PVC Pipe @ 0.58%
INSTALLED 43.89 L.F. 10" SS PVC Pipe @ 0.98%	INSTALLED 71.20 L.F. 36" SD HDPE SLOPE = 0.34%	INSTALLED 45.66 L.F. 18" SD HDPE SLOPE = 0.48%
INSTALLED 46.69 L.F. 18" SD HDPE SLOPE = 0.54%	INSTALLED 137.54 L.F. 12" SS PVC Pipe @ 0.46%	INSTALLED 4X4 CB-B26 TBC=1.96 NW INV=2900.20
INSTALLED 5' SS MANHOLE B29 INCLUDE BASE FULL STACK RIM ELEV=2906.17 STA=61+08.83, -7.2' LT INV IN= 2896.23 INV IN= 2896.03 INV OUT= 2896.03 DEPTH=10.14'	INSTALLED 4X4 CB-B25 TBC=2906.75 N INV=2899.98 SE INV=2899.98	

COPYRIGHT © 2023 PROVALUE ENGINEERING INC.

REVISIONS	
NO	DESCRIPTION

PROVALUE
ENGINEERING, INC.
ENGINEERS - LAND SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
20 South 850 West, Suite 1
Hurricane City, Utah 84737
Phone: 435-668-8307

PRO VALUE
ENGINEERING

No. 191090
KARL BRADLEY
RASMUSSEN
5/15/25

TITLE SHEET FOR:
THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1
LOCATED IN SECTION 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

DATE	05/15/2025
SCALE	1"=80'
JOB NO.	336-016
SHEET NO.	2 OF 3




CURVE TABLE					
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS	CHORD DIST.	CHORD BRG.	DELTA
C1	156.18'	100.00'	140.78'	N43°33'23"W	89°29'00"
C2	30.45'	19.50'	27.45'	S43°33'43"E	89°28'20"
C3	19.71'	12.50'	17.73'	S46°33'07"W	90°20'21"
C4	157.65'	100.00'	141.82'	N46°32'18"E	90°19'37"
C5	31.56'	20.00'	28.39'	N46°23'23"E	90°24'33"
C6	31.27'	20.00'	28.18'	S43°36'37"E	89°35'27"
C7	156.91'	100.00'	141.30'	S46°08'12"W	89°54'10"
C8	157.58'	100.00'	141.78'	S43°46'07"E	90°17'13"
C9	104.65'	182.50'	103.22'	N75°10'02"E	32°51'16"
C10	87.63'	150.00'	86.39'	S74°51'33"W	33°28'15"
C11	68.64'	117.50'	67.67'	N74°51'33"E	33°28'15"
C12	20.71'	20.00'	19.80'	N88°24'09"E	59°19'29"
C13	20.92'	20.00'	19.98'	N28°09'31"E	59°55'48"
C14	25.37'	20.00'	23.70'	N21°47'27"E	72°39'57"
C15	67.80'	117.45'	66.86'	N74°39'16"E	33°04'35"
C16	31.06'	150.00'	31.00'	N64°03'20"E	11°51'50"
C17	55.50'	150.00'	55.18'	N80°35'11"E	21°11'52"
C18	55.50'	150.00'	55.18'	S9°24'49"E	21°11'52"
C19	31.45'	20.00'	28.31'	N43°51'48"W	90°05'50"
C20	31.32'	20.00'	28.21'	N46°13'53"E	89°42'47"
C21	31.52'	20.00'	28.36'	S43°46'07"E	90°17'13"
C22	31.32'	20.00'	28.21'	S46°13'53"W	89°42'47"
C23	31.42'	20.00'	28.28'	S43°48'53"E	90°00'00"
C24	31.42'	20.00'	28.28'	S46°11'07"W	90°00'00"
C25	31.42'	20.00'	28.28'	S43°48'53"E	90°00'00"
C26	31.42'	20.00'	28.28'	S46°11'07"W	90°00'00"
C27	29.66'	20.32'	27.10'	S51°49'46"E	83°38'08"
C28	18.04'	140.47'	18.03'	N88°21'15"E	7°21'30"

LINE TABLE		
LINE	LENGTH	DIRECTION
L1	52.64'	S1°11'07"W
L2	52.36'	S1°11'07"W
L3	34.52'	S88°24'20"E
L4	54.90'	S88°24'20"E
L5	19.13'	S88°19'17"E
L6	0.89'	N88°54'43"W
L7	32.50'	S1°03'57"W
L8	32.50'	S1°06'36"W
L9	12.06'	S88°54'43"E
L10	11.95'	N88°54'43"W
L11	32.50'	N88°54'43"W
L12	32.50'	N88°54'31"W
L13	34.76'	N19°41'58"W
L14	34.76'	N19°41'58"W
L15	35.00'	S88°24'20"E
L16	25.00'	S88°48'53"E
L17	32.50'	N1°11'07"E
L18	32.50'	N1°11'08"E
L19	25.00'	N88°48'53"W
L20	25.00'	S88°48'53"E
L21	32.50'	N1°11'06"E
L22	32.50'	N1°11'07"E
L23	25.00'	N88°48'53"W
L24	25.00'	S88°48'53"E
L25	37.48'	S0°20'18"W


LINE TABLE		
LINE	LENGTH	DIRECTION
L26	32.50'	S1°11'07"W
L27	26.78'	S20°00'45"E

PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR: THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1

LOCATED IN SECTIONS 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH



LEGEND	
	RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE
	ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE
	SECTION LINE
	CENTER LINE
	SECTION CORNER AS DESCRIBED
	EXISTING EDGE OF PAVEMENT
	ROAD ACCESS



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 42 SOUTH, RANGE 14 WEST, OF THE SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN; THENCE ALONG THE SOUTH SECTION LINE OF SAID SECTION 6, S88°17'53"E 41.91 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE N01°16'31"E 54.32 FEET; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DISTANCE OF 19.71 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 12.50 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N88°37'03"W, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°20'21" (LONG CHORD BEARS: S46°33'07"W 17.73 FEET); THENCE N88°18'02"W 88.00 FEET; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT A DISTANCE OF 157.65 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 100.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N01°42'07"E, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°19'37" (LONG CHORD BEARS: N46°32'18"E 141.82 FEET); THENCE N01°22'31"E 236.76 FEET; THENCE 88°37'30"E 298.30 FEET; THENCE N01°22'30"E 108.72 FEET; THENCE S88°54'43"E 539.99 FEET; THENCE S01°22'30"W 198.50 FEET; THENCE S19°41'58"E 69.53 FEET; THENCE S01°22'30"W 253.50 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 912.34 FEET; THENCE S88°48'53"E 326.70 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 260.36 FEET; THENCE S88°48'53"E 1.75 FEET; THENCE S01°11'07"W 194.69 FEET; THENCE N88°48'53"W 1149.63 FEET; THENCE N01°11'07"E 73.80 FEET; THENCE N88°24'20"W 41.79 FEET; THENCE N01°10'31"E 1188.17 FEET; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT A DISTANCE OF 156.18 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 100.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF N88°48'53"W, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 89°29'00" (LONG CHORD BEARS: N43°33'23"W 140.78 FEET); THENCE S88°17'53"E 79.79 FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A 19.50 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DISTANCE OF 30.45 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 89°28'20", (LONG CHORD BEARS: S43°33'43"E 27.45 FEET); THENCE N01°16'31"E 54.32 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA CONTAINS 1,737,952.15 SQUARE FEET OR 38.89 ACRES.

REVISIONS		DATE	BY
NO	DESCRIPTION		

PROVALUE ENGINEERING, INC.
ENGINEERS - LAND SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
20 South 850 West, Suite 1
Hurricane City, Utah 84737
Phone: 435-668-8307



TITLE SHEET FOR:
THE VINEYARDS AT ELIM VALLEY PHASE 1

LOCATED IN SECTION 6 & 7, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

DATE	05/15/2025
SCALE	1"=80'
JOB NO.	336-016
SHEET NO.	



STAFF COMMENTS

Agenda Date:	09/25/2025 - Planning Commission
Application Number:	PP25-08
Type of Application:	Preliminary Plat
Action Type:	Administrative
Applicant:	Teancum Properties LLC
Agent:	Karl Rasmussen
Request:	Approval of a Preliminary Plat.
Location:	3300 S 1100 W
Zoning:	R1-10
General Plan Map:	Planned Community
Recommendation:	Approve subject to staff and JUC comments.
Report Prepared by:	Fred Resch III

Discussion: This is a preliminary plat application for Rock Hollow, a proposed 55-lot single-family subdivision. A preliminary plat for this development was previously approved in 2021, but those approvals have since expired. The property is located along 1100 W and south of 3000 S. The site is zoned Single Family Residential R1-10.

JUC Comments

The following items will need to be addressed:

- 1. Public Works:** No comment.
- 2. Fire:** Approved.
- 3. Sewer:** Offsite sewer is needed for this project to connect to live sewer. An offsite line will need to be installed from Sediment Lane west to 1500 West and north along 1500 West to existing sewer in 3000 S. Preliminary offsite plans also show a line running west from Lava Rock Lane, and north to Sediment Lane. Offsite sewer installation is not eligible for a pioneering agreement.
- 4. Water:** Need water model. Needs looped water line.
- 5. Power:** Will need to fill out an application. We will charge a design fee. Power dept will redesign the project according to the application. The overhead power line on 1100 W will remain overhead.

6. **Streets:** Ensure road dedications are correct.
7. **Gas:** No gas in the area at this time.
8. **TDS:** [No comments submitted.]
9. **Infowest:** No comment.
10. **Engineering:** A master planned storm drain alignment impacts this property. Sediment Lane must have a continuous approach to 1100 West (HCS 3.2.2(1st bullet)). Existing water in 1100 West must be relocated to match the alignment of the plat's east boundary and alignment of the 12' trail, 6.5' landscape strip, 2.5' HD30-7 curb & gutter, and 32' of paved road constructed with the subdivision (HCC 10-39-11(A)(3)). The construction plans must show existing conditions within and across 1100 West (i.e. fences, drive aisles, and utilities) better (HCS 3.2.4.17(c)). Ideally, 'off-site' power (to the north) would be relocated to its proper alignment (1100 West's west side)(HCS 2.2.9(D) from 3000 S by coordinating with the Hurricane City Power Department and the neighboring development (Horseman's Edge) (HCS 2.1(bullet 1)). 'On-site' buried power must be placed in 1100 W's west public utility easement. Applicant should maintain a consistent cross section on Lava Rock Lane (a 45' cross section). If a typical alignment can't be coordinated with the neighboring property owner, the alignment given by the south property line could possibly work (HCS 3.2.4.13). The applicant should show that the proposed southeast intersection is compliant in the construction plans (< than 15° skew, HCS 3.2.4.2(B)). The Rock Hollow off-site sewer construction plans and this plat can't coexist. Include updated off-site sewer plans in the construction plans for this subdivision. Proposed storm drain basins must have public drainage easements minimum.
11. **Washington County Water Conservancy District:** Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the project adequately mitigates interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.

**NARRATIVE FOR:
ROCK HOLLOW**

Rock Hollow is a subdivision of 55 lots. It is located approximately at 3300 South 1100 West in Hurricane. (Parcel #H-3394-B-1-A).

811

NOTICE

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LOCATION, PROTECTION, AND RESTORATION OF ALL BURIED OR ABOVE GROUND UTILITIES SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THE PLANS.

DESERT TORTOISE TAKE AREA

THE PROJECT IS NOT LOCATED IN A DESERT TORTOISE TAKE AREA. (PER RED CLIFFS DESERT RESERVE TAKE AREA 7 MAP)

SITE DATA

TOTAL ACRES	746,009.46 SQ. FT.	17.13 ACRES
PHASE 1	242,765.41 SQ. FT.	5.57 ACRES
PHASE 2	173,711.32 SQ. FT.	3.99 ACRES
PHASE 3	329,532.73 SQ. FT.	7.57 ACRES
TOTAL STORM BASIN	42,867 C.F.	2 BASINS
TOTAL LOTS	55 LOTS	746,024.17/55=13,564.07

LEGAL DESCRIPTION


COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 42 SOUTH, RANGE 13 WEST, OF THE SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN; THENCE S00°42'49"W ALONG THE SECTION LINE 1068.14 FEET; THENCE N89°09'30"W 48.35 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A 1155.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DISTANCE OF 407.59 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 20°13'09", (LONG CHORD BEARS: S15°11'26"W 405.48 FEET); THENCE S25°18'00"W 566.93 FEET; THENCE N64°47'58"W 32.32 FEET; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT A DISTANCE OF 53.56 FEET, HAVING A RADIUS OF 125.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF S25°30'48"W, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 24°32'58" (LONG CHORD BEARS: N76°45'41"W 53.15 FEET); THENCE N89°02'04"W 335.50 FEET; THENCE S00°42'49"W 100.00 FEET; THENCE N89°02'04"W 201.00 FEET; THENCE N00°42'49"E 985.05 FEET; THENCE S89°02'04"E 955.05 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA CONTAINS 746,011 SQUARE FEET OR 17.13 ACRES.

FND BRASS CAP
NW COR SEC 22
T42S R13W SLB&M

**PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR:
ROCK HOLLOW**

LOCATED IN SECTION 21, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH



GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS

FAULTS & SURFACE FAULTING	NONE
LIQUEFACTION	H2 - HIGH2-SIMILAR IN TEXTURE TO HIGH CATEGORY, NO GROUND-WATER INFORMATION L2 - LOW2-SIMILAR IN TEXTURAL CHARACTERISTICS TO LOW, NO GROUND-WATER INFORMATION
FLOODING	ZONE X - AREA OF MINIMAL FLOOD HAZARD
LANDSLIDE HAZARD	NONE
ROCKFALL HAZARD	M-MODERATE ROCK-FALL-HAZARD
BRECCIA PIPES AND PALEOKARST	NONE
CALICHE	CA - CALICHE
COLLAPSIBLE SOIL	CSC-FAN ALLUVIUM, HOLOCENE HCS-AREA OF KNOWN HIGH COLLAPSE SOILS
EXPANSIVE SOIL	ESL-SOILS WITH LOW SUSCEPTIBILITY FOR EXPANSION ESM-SOILS WITH MODERATE SUSCEPTIBILITY FOR EXPANSION
GYPSIFEROUS SOIL & ROCK	GSB - GYPSUM-BEARING SOILS, CONCEALED
PIPING & EROSION	P&ES-SOILS SUSCEPTIBLE TO PIPING AND EROSION
SHALLOW BEDROCK	BRB-BURIED: AREAS WHERE DEPTH TO BEDROCK IS GENERALLY ≤10 FEET BENEATH SOIL COVER BRH-HARD: AREAS WHERE GENERALLY HARD AND RESISTANT BEDROCK VISIBLE AT GROUND SURFACE
WIND BLOWN SAND	WBSL-LOW: MIXED-UNIT GEOLOGIC DEPOSITS WITH WIND-BLOWN COMPONENT
SHALLOW GROUND WATER	SGWS-MODERATELY TO FREELY DRAINING SOILS WITH SEASONAL OR TRANSIENT SHALLOW GROUND WATER

THE MITIGATION OF POTENTIAL HAZARDS WILL BE RECOMMENDED IN THE FUTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

STORM WATER CAN BE LOCALLY RETAINED AND CONTROLLED USING RETENTION BASINS. THIS IS THE METHOD TO HANDLE STORM WATER.

THERE ARE NO IRRIGATION FACILITIES.

PROPERTY CAN BE SERVED BY HURRICANE CITY WATER, AND ASH CREEK SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT.

THERE ARE NO WELLS, SPRINGS OR SEEPS ON THIS PROPERTY.

OWNER PLANS TO ALLOW PLACEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLACEMENT OF UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE ON AND ALONG ALL RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND EASEMENTS.

PROPERTY IS ZONED AS RM-2: MULTI-FAMILY - 10 UNITS PER ACRE

LEGEND

—	PROPERTY LINE
---	ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE
---	CENTER LINE
---	SECTION LINE
---	SECTION TIE
---	PHASE LINE
---	10' PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
---	EXISTING EDGE OF PAVEMENT
---	PROPOSED 8" SEWER LINE
---	PROPOSED SEWER MAIN
---	EXISTING WATER MAIN
---	PROPOSED SEWER MANHOLE
---	SECTION CORNER AS DESCRIBED

GEOLOGICAL NARRATIVE:

Qbr: REMNANTS LAVA FLOW (LOWER PLEISTOCENE)

DARK-BROWNISH-BLACK TO DARK-GRAY, MEDIUM-GRAINED BASANITE WITH SMALL OLIVINE PHENOCRYSTS; ERUPTED FROM A DEEPLY ERODED VENT ATOP THE HURRICANE CLIFFS AT THE "THREE BROTHERS," ABOUT 5 MILES (8 KM) SOUTH OF HURRICANE; DISPLACED BY THE HURRICANE FAULT ABOUT 1450 FEET (440 M); YIELDED PREFERRED 40AR/39AR PLATEAU AGES OF 1.06 ± 0.03 MA (1.07 ± 0.08 MA ISOCHRON) AND 0.94 ± 0.04 MA (0.94 ± 0.05 MA ISOCHRON) (HAYDEN, 2004A) AND AN ANOMALOUS 40AR/39AR PLATEAU AGE OF 1.47 ± 0.34 MA (1.12 ± 0.50 MA ISOCHRON) (LUND AND OTHERS, 2001, 2007A); TYPICALLY ABOUT 40 FEET (12 M) THICK.

Qoe: ALLUVIAL AND EOLIAN DEPOSITS (HOLOCENE TO UPPER PLEISTOCENE)

MODERATELY SORTED GRAVEL, SAND, AND SILT DEPOSITED IN SMALL CHANNELS AND ON ALLUVIAL FLATS, AND WELL-SORTED, FINE- TO MEDIUM-GRAINED, REDDISH-BROWN EOLIAN SAND LOCALLY REWORKED BY ALLUVIAL PROCESSES; YOUNGER DEPOSITS (QAE) FORM ACTIVE DEPOSITIONAL SURFACES, WHEREAS OLDER DEPOSITS (QAOE) TYPICALLY FORM INCISED, INACTIVE SURFACES; AS MUCH AS ABOUT 20 FEET (6 M) THICK.

Qafy: YOUNGER ALLUVIAL-FAN DEPOSITS (HOLOCENE)

POORLY TO MODERATELY SORTED, NON-STRATIFIED, SUBANGULAR TO SUBROUNDED, BOULDER- TO CLAY-SIZE SEDIMENT DEPOSITED AT THE MOUTHS OF STREAMS AND WASHES; CLAST COMPOSITION RANGES WIDELY AND REFLECTS ROCK TYPES EXPOSED IN UPSTREAM DRAINAGE BASINS; FORMS BOTH ACTIVE DEPOSITIONAL SURFACES (QAF1 EQUIVALENT) AND LOW-LEVEL INACTIVE SURFACES INCISED BY SMALL STREAMS (QAF2 EQUIVALENT) UNDIVIDED HERE; DEPOSITED PRINCIPALLY AS DEBRIS FLOWS AND DEBRIS FLOODS, BUT COLLUVIUM LOCALLY CONSTITUTES A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE DEPOSITS; SMALL, ISOLATED ALLUVIAL FANS ARE TYPICALLY LESS THAN A FEW TENS OF FEET THICK, BUT LARGE, COALESCE FANS, AS IN THE NEW HARMONY BASIN, ARE PROBABLY AS MUCH AS 200 FEET (60 M) THICK.

CURVE TABLE

CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS	CHORD DIST.	CHORD BRG.	DELTA
C3	308.51'	1155.44'	307.59'	S12°43'53"W	15°17'54"
C5	59.97'	1029.00'	59.96'	S18°08'27"W	3°20'20"
C6	84.94'	200.00'	84.31'	S13°07'58"W	24°20'04"
C7	63.87'	151.00'	63.39'	S76°55'01"E	24°14'06"
C8	36.10'	85.00'	35.83'	S76°52'02"E	24°20'04"
C9	36.10'	85.00'	35.83'	S76°52'02"E	24°20'04"
C10	3.62'	200.00'	3.62'	S88°30'55"E	1°02'17"
C17	31.33'	20.00'	28.22'	N44°09'37"W	89°44'53"
C18	31.50'	20.00'	28.35'	S45°50'23"W	90°15'07"
C19	59.85'	32.50'	51.74'	N36°16'53"W	105°30'21"
C20	61.60'	791.54'	61.58'	N18°13'28"E	4°27'32"
C29	39.18'	25.00'	35.29'	N70°11'44"E	89°47'27"
C30	48.94'	177.00'	48.78'	S72°49'47"E	15°50'29"
C31	32.08'	20.00'	28.75'	S34°47'41"E	91°54'40"
C32	43.80'	177.50'	43.69'	S18°13'50"W	14°08'21"
C33	29.23'	20.00'	26.70'	N49°05'41"E	83°44'31"
C34	70.20'	222.50'	69.91'	N16°15'42"E	18°04'35"
C35	39.91'	20.00'	33.61'	N31°52'02"W	114°20'04"
C36	22.92'	20.00'	21.69'	N58°07'58"E	65°39'56"
C37	39.91'	20.00'	33.61'	N31°52'02"W	114°20'04"
C38	22.89'	20.00'	21.66'	N58°10'37"E	65°34'38"
C39	95.05'	1006.50'	95.01'	N22°40'59"E	5°24'39"
C40	31.33'	20.00'	28.22'	S44°09'37"E	89°44'53"

CURVE TABLE


CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS	CHORD DIST.	CHORD BRG.	DELTA
C41	31.50'	20.00'	28.35'	S45°50'23"W	90°15'07"
C42	31.33'	20.00'	28.22'	S44°09'37"E	89°44'53"
C43	119.95'	1154.97'	119.89'	N8°03'20"E	5°57'01"
C44	31.50'	20.00'	28.35'	S45°50'23"W	90°15'07"
C45	31.33'	20.00'	28.22'	S44°09'37"E	89°45'16"
C46	122.44'	1154.93'	122.38'	N14°04'04"E	6°04'27"
C48	32.16'	20.00'	28.81'	N63°10'37"E	92°08'39"
C49	31.01'	18.93'	27.65'	S27°00'47"E	93°52'24"
C52	30.38'	20.66'	27.72'	N65°23'12"E	84°14'54"
C53	32.17'	20.00'	28.81'	S24°40'37"E	92°08'52"
C54	64.72'	65.00'	62.08'	S36°06'42"E	57°02'52"
C55	33.93'	65.00'	33.55'	S79°35'22"E	29°54'28"
C56	9.13'	95.00'	9.13'	N88°12'40"E	5°30'32"
C59	31.42'	20.00'	28.28'	S44°02'04"E	90°00'00"
C60	31.41'	20.00'	28.28'	N45°57'46"E	89°59'40"
C61	73.20'	1161.53'	73.18'	S23°12'08"W	3°36'38"
C62	5.49'	799.14'	5.49'	S25°18'00"W	0°23'38"
C64	31.50'	20.00'	28.35'	N45°50'23"E	90°15'07"
C66	5.49'	1051.50'	5.49'	N25°09'01"E	0°17'57"
C67	33.88'	65.00'	33.49'	S72°03'34"W	29°51'40"

OWNER / DEVELOPER

TEANUC PROPERTIES LLC
887 COYOTE GULCH CT STE C
IVINS, UT 84738

PROJECT LOCATION

VICINITY MAP
N.T.S



REVISIONS	DATE	BY

PROVALUE
ENGINEERING, INC.
ENGINEERS - LAND SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
20 South 850 West, Suite 1
Hurricane City, Utah 84737
Phone: 435-668-8307



PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR:

ROCK HOLLOW

LOCATED IN SECTION 21, T42S, R13W, S.L.B.&M.
HURRICANE CITY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

DATE	9-8-2025
SCALE	1"=60'
JOB NO.	784-001
SHEET NO.	



STAFF COMMENTS

Agenda Date:	09/25/2025
Application Number:	PSP25-22
Type of Application:	Preliminary Site Plan
Action Type:	Administrative
Applicant:	State Street Properties LLC
Agent:	Rick Meyer
Request:	Preliminary Site Plan Approval
Location:	489 W State St.
Zoning:	HC
General Plan Map:	Commercial
Recommendation:	Approve subject to staff and JUC comments.
Report Prepared by:	Fred Resch III

Discussion:

The applicant has filed a preliminary site plan for a proposed Culver's restaurant location. This will be on the site of the former Ace Hardware building just north of the Hurricane High School football field. The current building on site is planned to be demolished. A new building and other site improvements are proposed. The site is zoned Highway Commercial (HC).

JUC Comments

The following items will need to be addressed:

1. **Public Works:** No comment.
2. **Power:** Will need to fill out an application. Current transformer is only good for 400 amps at 120/208V. Distance from transformer to building should be kept to within 150'. We will charge a design fee if different from what is currently available.
3. **Water:** Okay.
4. **Street:** No comment.
5. **Sewer:** [No comments submitted.]
6. **Engineering:** Cross access with the Washington County School Board of Education is encouraged (parking lot to the west). City staff can help facilitate conversations. School board president David Stirland seemed amicable to the idea. Fencing on the property's south boundary must be depicted in future submissions. Does the demolition of the existing building impact fenced areas? The site must have an ADA route from the public right of way. It appears the

7. **Fire:** Approved.
8. **Gas:** Add gas on State Street (SR9) and proposed meter location.
9. **Fiber:** No comment.
10. **Water Conservancy:** Washington County Water Conservancy District hereby acknowledges that based on the information provided, the project plans adequately mitigate interference with district facilities and property interests. The District reserves the right to rescind this acknowledgement if additional information becomes available. The district has not determined whether water will be available for this development and does not hereby make any guarantee of water availability. In addition, the development must conform with applicable district requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees.



1. **Land Use:** The proposed use is a permitted use in the Highway Commercial zone.
2. **Parking Requirements:**

Restaurant, fast food	1 space per 100 square feet of gross floor area
-----------------------	---

67 parking spaces are proposed, which meets the code requirements for a 4,300-square-foot building. Room for stacking for five drive through spaces appears to be provided as well.

3. **Landscape:** Hurricane City Code requires that a landscape buffer of 10' wide shall front each right-of-way; the site plan does show this area has been provided. A full landscaping plan meeting the following requirements will need to be provided with the final site plan:

Sec. 10-32-5. Required landscaping.

A. General requirement. Landscaped areas may include trees, shrubs, vegetative, organic and inorganic ground cover and other organic and inorganic materials identified in an approved landscaping plan. All required landscape areas shall be occupied by plant material or ground cover.

B. Landscaping adjacent to a public street. Except for approved driveways and pedestrian walkways, a landscaped area of ten-foot minimum shall be provided adjacent and parallel to the frontage of a public street as follows:

- 1. A ten-foot wide landscaped area on any commercial development.*
 - 2. At least one tree and three shrubs shall be planted for every 35 feet of street frontage in a required landscaped area. Such trees and shrubs may be clustered, provided that no tree shall be within five feet of another.*
 - 3. The slope of any earth berm shall not exceed a vertical to horizontal ratio of one to two and shall be treated with suitable ground cover to prevent soil erosion.*
4. **Access:** As noted in the Engineering comments above (JUC #6), connectivity and shared access between this site and the High School should be considered through the design process. Staff has had discussions with the applicant and the school district and there may be some opportunity there.
 5. **Site Conditions:** The lot is flat; thus, staff does not have concerns about slopes on the property.
 6. **No Vested Rights.** It should be noted that pursuant to Hurricane City Code 10-7-10 (D)(2)(b): *A preliminary site plan is not intended to permit actual development of property pursuant to such a plan but shall be prepared merely to represent how the property could be developed. Submittal, review, and approval of an application for a preliminary site plan shall not create any vested rights to development.*

Recommendation: The Planning Commission should review this application based on standards within the Hurricane City Code. Staff recommends approval subject to staff and JUC comments.



BUSH & GUDGELL, INC.

Engineers • Planners • Surveyors
205 East Tabernacle
St. George, Utah 84770
(435) 673-2337 (ph.)
(435) 673-3161 (fax)

September 9, 2025


RE: Preliminary Site Plan Application – Culver's

To whom it may concern


With this preliminary site plan application we are requesting preliminary approval of a new Culver's restaurant in Hurricane. The proposed restaurant will be located on the site where Ace Hardware used to be (parcel H-260). The proposed project includes construction of a 4,300 square foot restaurant location with a drive through. The current parking lot has two entrances. We propose to close one of them to help reduce access points to State Street. The site is currently zoned highway commercial and general planned as general commercial.

We feel that this development will be in great harmony with the adjacent properties, and will be a great asset to the city. Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,






Rick Meyer, PE
Bush and Gudgell



VICINITY MAP

SCALE: 1" = 1000'



SITE DATA TABLE	
GENERAL PLAN	GENERAL COMMERCIAL
ZONING	HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL
AREA	1.08 ACRES (H-260)
BLDG SQ FT	4,300 SQ FT (9%)
PARKING	
REQ'D @ 1/100 SF	43
PROVIDED	67
ADA REQ'D	3
ADA PROVIDED	3
LANDSCAPE AREA	8,810 SQ FT (19%)

OWNER/DEVELOPER

STATE STREET PROPERTIES LLC
KIM TOWNES
(253) 227-7895
KIM@SHAKESPEAREDEV.COM

ENGINEERING CONTACT

BUSH AND GUDGELL, INC.
205 EAST TABERNACLE #4
ST. GEORGE, UT 84770

RICK MEYER
(435) 673-2337
RMEYER@BUSHANDGUDGELL.COM

BUSH & GUDGELL, INC.
Engineers - Planners - Surveyors
205 East Tabernacle Suite #4
St. George, Utah 84770
Phone (435) 673-2337 / Fax (435) 673-3161
www.bushandgudgell.com



DATE: SEPT 2025
DRAWN: TEL
APPROVED:
SCALE: NOTED
JOB NO. 251180

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN
CULVER'S HURRICANE
LOCATED IN HURRICANE, UTAH

**Hurricane Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2025**

Minutes of the Hurricane City Planning Commission meeting held on March 13, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 147 N. 870 West Hurricane UT, 84737

Members Present: Mark Sampson, Paul Farthing, Brad Winder, Kelby Iverson, and Amy Werrett.

Members Excused: Michelle Smith, Shelley Goodfellow, Ralph Ballard

Staff Present: Planning Director Gary Cupp, City Planner Fred Resch III, City Attorney Dayton Hall, Building/Planning Clerk Karri Richardson, City Engineer Representative Jeremy Pickering, Water Department Representative Kory Wright, Power Department Representative Scott Hughes, and Councilman Kevin Thomas.

6:00 p.m. - Call to Order

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance led by Amy Werrett.

Prayer and/or thought by invitation given by Brad Winder.

Paul Farthing motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Brad Winder seconded the motion. Unanimous.

Declaration of any conflicts of interest – none.

Public Hearings

1. A Zone Change Amendment request located at 1485 W 400 S from RA-1, residential agriculture one unit per acre, to RA-0.5, residential agriculture one unit per half acre and R1-15, single family residential one unit per 15,000 sqft. Parcel number H-3-2-4-1416.

Laura Penrod Smith, representing the neighbor to the west, stated that they intend to pursue the same zone change for their property and are therefore in support of the request.

2. A Land Use Code Amendment to Title 10 Chapter 15 regarding Planned Commercial standards.

No comments

NEW BUSINESS

1. ZC25-06: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Zone Change Amendment request located at 1485 W 400 S from RA-1, residential agriculture one unit per acre, to RA-0.5, residential agriculture one unit per half acre and R1-15, single family residential one unit per 15,000 sqft. Parcel number H-3-2-4-1416. Tonya Beutler, Applicant.

1 Tonya Beutler explained that she was thinking of the future and would like to rent or sell the smaller
2 parcel closer to the road, while leaving the flag lot to build a house for her own use later. Brad Winder
3 asked if that meant two different zoning designations for two different lots. Mrs. Beutler confirmed,
4 stating the back lot would be RA-0.5 to allow for keeping animals.

5 Paul Farthing asked about fire truck turnaround, and Tonya responded that a semi could turn around
6 there. Kelby Iverson inquired whether there was an ordinance on flag lots, and Gary Cupp confirmed
7 there was, noting that if they did the lot split, they would need to conform. However, this request was
8 only for a zone change.

9
10 Dayton Hall asked if the dimensions of the lot had been reviewed to ensure it would meet flag lot
11 standards, and Fred Resch III confirmed that they had. Mr. Iverson asked if this was the area with
12 rural/residential zoning. Mr. Cupp clarified that was located further west.

13
14 *Amy Werrett motioned to approve ZC25-06 subject to staff and JUC comments. Brad Winder seconded*
15 *the motion. Unanimous.*

16
17 **2. AFP25-02: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of an amended**
18 **final plat for Hurricane Views Plat B Lots 3 and 4, located at 2107 W 320 S. Andrew Kay,**
19 **Applicant.**

20 Andrew Kay presented his request for an amended final plat for Hurricane Views Plat B Lots 3 and 4,
21 located at 2107 W 320 S. He explained that a ravine had gone through the property and, to save costs, it
22 was originally designated as common area. However, during construction it had been filled in with
23 excess dirt. The amendment would adjust the lot lines so this space could be included in the lots instead
24 of being maintained as common area.

25
26 Mark Sampson asked staff whether this area served as drainage or if it appeared stable. Gary Cupp
27 stated he had reviewed the site and it looked consistent with the rest of the area. No drainage study had
28 been completed, but there were no concerns. Mr. Sampson asked if any analysis had been done prior to
29 approving it as open space. Mr. Cupp replied no, explaining it had simply been designated as space for
30 the HOA to maintain, and no development was proposed.

31
32 Paul Farthing expressed concern that the area had been approved as open space but was later
33 changed without approval. Mr. Cupp stated that it was considered in their review, but no issues had
34 been identified. Kelby Iverson noted that often subdivisions are developed with common space, and later
35 requests are made to change it for development.

36
37 Amy Werrett asked whether this change would make lot 4 bigger and lot 3 smaller. Mr. Kay explained
38 that lot 3 would get much larger while lot 4 would get a little larger. He added that the land had existed in
39 this condition even at the time the development was first created.

40
41 Mr. Cupp claimed that the land was not designated as open space, park, or drainage, just an area for
42 the HOA to maintain. He asked rhetorically if the applicant had come in originally with this request, would
43 the process or answer be different, suggesting it would not. Mr. Iverson added that when HOAs are
44 tasked with maintaining land, situations like this could actually help ensure the land continues to be
45 maintained.

46
47 *Kelby Iverson motioned to approve AFP25-02. Paul Farthing seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

48
49 **3. PP25-07: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a preliminary plat**
50 **for SkyRim Townhomes, a 132 unit townhome development located at 290 N 3320 W. Brad**
51 **Brown, Applicant. Reeve & Associates, Agent.**

1 Brad Brown explained that this request covered only the townhome portion of the development, which is
2 similar to the concept previously presented several times. He stated they were ready to move forward
3 with the plat. He acknowledged the staff review raised concerns that they were not at this point yet, but
4 he believed they were close enough to proceed.
5

6 Paul Farthing questioned whether the streets would be private or public, noting that typically the City
7 requires public roads. Fred Resch III explained that while public roads are required in most cases, there
8 are some different situations. Mr. Farthing expressed concern that with small private roads there would
9 not be enough room for resident parking or emergency vehicles. Mr. Brown responded that while there
10 would be some private alleyways, the main roads would be public, and discussions had been held with
11 fire on what they wanted to see.
12

13 Jeremy Pickering added that one of the conditions was that the roads paralleling 290 N would be public.
14 Mr. Farthing asked about visitor parking, and Mr. Brown confirmed there would be, pointing out the
15 locations. Gary Cupp added that the project met the parking requirement, with driveways provided for
16 each unit.
17

18 Amy Werrett raised the question of whether adequate public facilities could be provided, asking
19 specifically about power. Mr. Cupp explained that the issue was they had not yet obtained the
20 easements or power to the area. Mr. Brown noted he had spoken with Scott Hughes about power.
21

22 Mr. Hughes clarified that the discussion Brad referred to took place years ago, and while at that time it
23 was indicated that once a contract was signed and money paid, the infrastructure would be built within a
24 reasonable timeframe, things have since changed. The complication now was determining who would
25 build the system—the power department or the contractor. He added that in his view, they could still
26 keep the contract with Brad.
27

28 Dayton Hall asked if servicing the lines would require an extension, and Mr. Hughes confirmed it would.
29 Mr. Hall then asked if an extension application had been submitted. Mr. Hughes responded he did not
30 believe so, as their earlier discussions predated the ordinance change. Mr. Hall also asked if the
31 easements needed to come off 2800 had been recorded. Mr. Brown replied they had not but explained
32 they had done a lot of due diligence with the engineer to ensure the paths and design were ready.
33

34 Mr. Huges commented that while he did not like going back on what was previously discussed, even
35 under the old arrangement, it required approvals, easements, and money in place first. Mr. Hall agreed
36 with Planning Department staff that it was premature to approve the request, and the issues identified in
37 the staff report needed to be addressed first.
38

39 Mark Sampson asked if there would be opposition to tabling the item until the issues were resolved, and
40 Dayton said no. Mr. Brown asked whether it should be continued or tabled. Mr. Sampson explained
41 tabling was more appropriate, as the issues could take longer than two weeks to resolve. Kelby Iverson
42 asked for clarification between denial, tabling, and continuing. Mr. Hall explained that denial meant the
43 applicant could reapply but would need to pay another fee, and while some applications have time limits,
44 this one did not. A continuation meant it would automatically roll to the next meeting, while tabling meant
45 it would return once the conditions had been met.
46

47 Mr. Farthing acknowledged that a lot had already been accomplished, and Dayton agreed, but reiterated
48 it was not ready yet. Brad Winder noted there were many concerns raised by different departments that
49 could be resolved before approval. Mr. Sampson concluded that the Commission did not want to
50 approve something with too many unresolved issues and determined the request would be tabled.
51

1 *Brad Winder motioned to table PP25-07 until JUC and staff comments were resolved. Paul Farthing*
2 *seconded the motion. Unanimous.*
3

4 **4. HIL25-01: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council**
5 **on an exception to the sensitive lands ordinance for a retaining wall located at 760 S 1480 W.**
6 **Kendra Eliot, Applicant. Terry Spinks, Agent.**

7 Terry Spinks requested an exception to the sensitive lands ordinance for walls that exceed 16 feet. Mark
8 Sampson asked if staff's recommendation was positive. Gary Cupp explained that based on their
9 analysis, the request met the criteria for an exception. He stated that although staff was not pleased this
10 work was done without review or building permits, the review after the fact showed it still met the criteria.
11 He noted that when similar situations arise, staff evaluates them as if they had been submitted correctly
12 from the start, and their recommendation would have been the same.
13

14 Paul Farthing asked why permits had not been obtained. Mr. Spinks explained that the owner had
15 purchased the lot from the developer, who constructed the original walls. The owner wanted the walls
16 extended to avoid having a walk-out, and the excavator mistakenly believed no additional permit was
17 needed, assuming it was covered under the original wall approval. Staff became involved afterward.
18

19 Mr. Farthing pointed out that Aaron Earl had raised concerns that the wall heights reported were not
20 accurate. Mr. Cupp clarified that the wall heights as built did conform to what had been approved. Mr.
21 Sampson asked who verified the height of the wall, and Gary responded that it was certified by an
22 engineer's stamped letter.
23

24 Kelby Iverson asked what would happen if the request was not approved, noting that tearing the walls
25 down would likely cause more damage than leaving them. Mr. Cupp said staff considered the intent of
26 the sensitive lands ordinance and determined that the construction did not conflict with its purposes. The
27 walls had been certified by engineers as constructed. Mr. Iverson stated that unless there was another
28 agenda at play, the request should be approved.
29

30 Mr. Earl asked if a permit had been applied for initially, would the applicant have been subject to
31 additional investigations and reports. Mr. Cupp answered that those studies had already been completed
32 with the subdivision approval, so they would not have been repeated. Mr. Earl insisted that the
33 information could not be accurate and said surveying should have been required beforehand. Mr. Cupp
34 responded that because the work was done without permits, staff had no opportunity to require it, but
35 engineers did certify the construction as built.
36

37 Dayton Hall reminded the Commission that they were only considering the exception and the four criteria
38 required by ordinance, not questions of retaliation or penalties. Mr. Farthing concluded that the request
39 did meet the criteria.
40

41 *Kelby Iverson motion a recommendation of approval of HIL25-01. Brad Winder seconded the motion.*
42 *Unanimous.*
43

44 Mr. Sampson encouraged Mr. Earl to go to City Council next week and make a comment.
45

46 **5. FSP25-09: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a final site plan**
47 **for LakeView Townhomes Phase 1, a 38 unit townhome development located at 4640 W Dixie**
48 **Springs Dr. The Hollows LLC, Applicant. Logan Blake - DSG Engineering, Agent.**

49 Brett Burgess presented the final site plan review for the townhomes, stating that they had met the
50 requirements given to them. He explained that the streets would be public and the homes would have
51 driveways with garages, and he expressed hope for approval.

Amy Werrett asked about the overall density, noting the figure of 414 units and questioning how this project would impact that number. Mr. Burgess replied that he did not have the exact information on hand but explained that when they increased units in this area, they had decreased them in Lakeside and Sedero, keeping the overall total within the approved 1,770 units. Fred Resch III confirmed that this phase should meet the density approvals and noted that the City has allowed density to be shifted between phases within the development.

Mrs. Werrett also asked about the trees and common areas shown on the plans and who would maintain them. Mr. Burgess explained that the Lakeview Townhomes would have their own HOA responsible for maintaining those areas.

Paul Farthing motioned to approve FSP25-09 subject to staff and JUC comments. Amy Werrett seconded the motion.

Mark Sampson asked what the number of units citywide was prior to this approval for townhomes. Mr. Resch responded that, based on the preliminary count, the number was about 25,000 units, including these.

Motion carries unanimously.

6. LUCA25-01: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Land Use Code Amendment to Title 10 Chapter 15 regarding Planned Commercial standards.

Gary Cupp explained that, based on direction from City Council, there is concern with the current requirement of 20% commercial and 20% residential in Planned Commercial zones, with the remainder flexible. The Council feels that a 20% commercial minimum is far too low for a commercial zone, so the proposed change would raise it to a 70% commercial minimum.

Mark Sampson asked how the 20% threshold was originally set. Fred Resch III said it was established in 2022, because at that time the Planned Commercial zone did not require any mixed use at all—it could have been 100% commercial or 100% residential. The 20/20 standard was adopted to ensure some mix while giving developers maximum flexibility.

Paul Farthing asked what kind of flexibility this new proposal would allow and referenced an example in St. George where apartments are built above commercial space. Dayton Hall responded that, as currently drafted, there is no flexibility—70% commercial would be required. Council kept receiving applications at the minimum 20% commercial level and wanted to raise the standard.

Councilman Kevin Thomas noted that the old ordinance allowed too much flexibility, so at the time the 20/20 compromise made sense, but it resulted in mostly housing-heavy projects with minimal commercial. The goal now is to encourage more commercial and less residential in Planned Commercial zones.

Mr. Resch said he shares Paul's concern that requiring 70% commercial could make it difficult for projects like the St. George example. Mr. Cupp added that he likes the flexibility of the 20/20 system, but agreed that 20% minimum commercial is too low. Mark recalled that Cedar Pawn was developed at 50/50. Mr. Resch clarified that, technically, Cedar Pawn is 100% commercial since they are short-term rentals, but if they were long-term it would be a 50/50 mix.

1 Kelby Iverson suggested something like 70% commercial with the possibility of a variance, but not less
2 than 50%. Mr. Hall clarified that Planned Development Overlays (PDOs) govern Planned Commercial
3 zones, and site plans are approved legislatively with the council during the zone change process.
4

5 Mr. Cupp added that council also expressed concerns about building height in commercial zones, so the
6 ordinance has been adjusted to cap height at 35 feet. Mark recalled long discussions about hotels. Mr.
7 Hall clarified that hotels in highway commercial were never entitled to 55 feet by right; they were only
8 allowed to apply for conditional use permits to exceed 35 feet.
9

10 Mr. Farthing suggested a 50% commercial minimum, with higher requirements left to City discretion. Mr.
11 Iverson asked Councilmember Thomas if council had discussed flexibility. Kevin said he didn't recall
12 70% specifically being discussed, but one councilmember had been vocal about that figure. Mr.
13 Sampson recommended giving more flexibility, somewhere around 50–60%.
14

15 Councilman Thomas asked whether the percentage applies to total square footage across the site or
16 each floor. Mr. Resch confirmed it applies either way—vertical or horizontal. Mr. Sampson asked for
17 examples of mixed-use areas. Mr. Resch pointed to Sky Rim as a good example. Mr. Sampson
18 questioned why this has become an issue now. Mr. Farthing explained that it arises when large tracts of
19 land are proposed heavily one way or the other.
20

21 *Kelby Iverson motioned a recommendation of approval of LUCA25-01 to the City Council with the*
22 *change that it be 50% commercial, 20% residential, and 30% flexible and the approval of the other red*
23 *lines made by the City Attorney, Dayton Hall, and planning staff. Paul Farthing seconded the motion.*
24 *Unanimous.*
25

26 **Planning Commission Business:**

27 **1. Discussion on allowed uses in agricultural zones**

28 Gary Cupp brought up an issue with a general (farm) store that was built in an RA zone. The store is
29 currently operating without a business license and was constructed without a building permit. By code,
30 farm stores are limited to selling products produced on their own land, but this store has been selling
31 additional items. He asked the commission to discuss whether the ordinance should be expanded to
32 allow more flexibility in what farm stores can sell.
33
34

35 Mark Sampson asked how this compares to the pecan store. Mr. Cupp explained that farm stores
36 cannot sell items not produced on their own property, and this business would need to reduce its
37 offerings accordingly. Mr. Sampson then asked about procedures for illegal short-term rentals. Fred
38 Resch III said the process involves issuing warnings, then citations, and ultimately court if violations
39 continue.
40

41 Kelby Iverson questioned whether the same standards apply to farmers—for example, if he sells hay
42 from his land. Karri Richardson clarified that products produced on the land can be sold as an
43 agricultural use, but making and selling non-agricultural items like jewelry would require a business
44 license.
45

46 Mr. Cupp asked whether the city should expand what farm stores can sell. Mr. Sampson asked about
47 Cherry Hills Farm. Mr. Cupp said it is a grandfathered use, but if it shut down and reopened, it would
48 have to comply with current regulations.
49

1 Mr. Iverson raised a concern: if farm stores are allowed to expand, would that eliminate the need for
2 business licenses for non-farm items like jewelry? Mr. Cupp confirmed they would still need a business
3 license.

4
5 Councilman Kevin Thomas suggested a percentage approach, requiring a certain portion of sales to
6 come from farm-produced goods and allowing a smaller portion of sundries. Mr. Iverson supported the
7 idea of allowing agricultural properties to pursue ag-related ventures but agreed it should be limited to
8 what they produce, with only a small portion of supplemental items.

9
10 Mr. Sampson asked what other communities are doing with farm stores. Mr. Cupp said more research is
11 needed. Paul Farthing suggested requiring 80% farm/agricultural products and allowing the rest to be
12 supplemental. Councilman Thomas said he likes the concept of farm stores overall. Mr. Cupp concluded
13 by saying staff would bring forward a draft code amendment for consideration.

14
15 **2. Discussion on the Planned Development Overlay ordinance.**

16 Gary explained that this item was tabled last November so staff could do some fine tuning. That work
17 has now been completed, and the item will be coming back to the commission within the next meeting or
18 two. This update was mainly to alert the commission that it is returning soon.

19
20 The commission briefly discussed upcoming conferences. The ULCT Conference is scheduled for
21 October 1st and 2nd, and the APA Conference will take place May 7th–9th. The discussion focused on
22 who would be attending each.

23
24 **Approval of Minutes:**

25
26 **1. July 25, 2024**

27 No corrections made. Mark Sampson noted that two members had not been present at the previous
28 meeting and asked if they could still vote. Dayton Hall explained that even if they were not at the
29 meeting, members are encouraged to vote as long as they review the material and see nothing wrong
30 with it.

31
32 *Kelby Iverson motioned to approve the minutes from July 25, 2024. Brad Winder seconded the motion.*
33 *Unanimous.*

34
35 *Paul Farthing motioned to adjourn. Brad Winder seconded the motion. Unanimous.*

36
37 **Adjournment at 7:40pm**

**Hurricane Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2025**

Minutes of the Hurricane City Planning Commission meeting held on March 27, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 147 N. 870 West Hurricane UT, 84737

Members Present: Mark Sampson, Paul Farthing, Shelley Goodfellow, Ralph Ballard, Brad Winder, Kelby Iverson, Michelle Smith, and Amy Werrett.

Members Excused:

Staff Present: Planning Director Gary Cupp, City Planner Fred Resch III, City Attorney Dayton Hall, Building/Planning Clerk Karri Richardson, City Engineer Representative Jeremy Pickering, Water Department Representative Kory Wright, Power Department Representative Scott Hughes, and Councilman Kevin Thomas.

6:00 p.m. - Call to Order at 6:03pm

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance led by Michelle Smith

Prayer and/or thought by invitation given by Kevin Thomas

Paul Farthing motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Brad Winder seconded the motion. Unanimous.

Declaration of any conflicts of interest – Michelle Smith declared that her daughter works for Interstate Homes.

OLD BUSINESS

1. ZC24-07 PSP24-21: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Zone Change Amendment and Preliminary Site Plan request from NC, Neighborhood Commercial to R1-8 (PDO), Single Family Residential R1-8 with a Planned Development Overlay, located at 2230-2254 W 600 N. Parcel H-3-1-29-2213, H-3-1-29-2214. 317 Sycamore LLC, Applicant. Beau Ogzewalla, Agent.

Fred Resch III explained that this item had been tabled about a month ago because access agreements with neighbors had not yet been obtained. He noted those agreements have now been secured. Brad Winder asked for clarification on where the access would be located. Mr. Resch showed that the access would extend from 600 North to the back of the property. Mr. Winder then asked if the safety concerns related to the golf course had been resolved. Beau Ogzewalla responded that they had not been contacted directly by the golf course but had designed the layout to avoid issues. He added that they had communicated with residents who expressed concerns, and after providing answers, they had not received further inquiries.

Mr. Winder reminded Beau that one concern had been the open area along the fairway, asking whether there would be protective screens to prevent golf balls from hitting people. Beau said that since this plan was still somewhat preliminary, screens could be considered if needed, though their preference would

1 be not to install them for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Resch clarified that the commission was only reviewing
2 the zone change and preliminary site plan at this stage—a broad overview. City Council may still
3 condition approval on installing screens. Dayton Hall emphasized that if the City wanted to impose
4 conditions outside the ordinance, now was the time to do so. Mr. Ogzewalla stated they would accept
5 screens as a contingency if required. Mark noted that a standard of protection could be required as a
6 condition.

7
8 Amy Werrett asked if the road inside the development would be public. Mark Sampson confirmed that it
9 would. Michelle Smith asked who would be responsible for constructing the future road. Mr. Resch
10 explained that the developer would be required to install a water line for fire safety if the eastern
11 development did not progress at the same rate. Mrs. Smith followed up, asking if the developer was
12 responsible for building the main access. Mr. Resch confirmed they were and Mr. Sampson reiterated to
13 Beau that responsibility for developing the accesses rested with them. Mrs. Smith also asked whether
14 there would be enough turnaround space for fire access. Mr. Sampson replied that the Fire Department
15 had approved the plans. Mrs. Smith mentioned that Public Works had concerns about the roads not
16 meeting standards. Mr. Resch clarified that was related to the previous design, when the roads were
17 private. They have since been changed to public, with standard cross sections.

18
19 Mr. Hall pointed out that although agreements for access easements had been reached, easements had
20 not yet been recorded. He said the commitment was sufficient to move forward with the zone change but
21 clarified that final approval would require easements to be dedicated. Mr. Ogzewalla added that since
22 they planned to acquire the land to the west, no agreement would be needed on that side.

23
24 Discussion shifted to the issue of fencing or netting along the golf course. Paul Farthing noted that
25 nowhere else in Sky Mountain were such screens erected except by private owners. Mr. Winder pointed
26 out that no other areas had walkways and benches placed so close to the fairway. Mr. Ogzewalla
27 agreed that adjustments could be made if needed. Mr. Farthing felt that most residents would object to
28 tall netting anyway.

29
30 Shelley Goodfellow asked how tall the proposed units would be. Mr. Ogzewalla said they had no designs
31 yet but expected them to be two stories. Mrs. Goodfellow asked if they would be five-plexes. Mr.
32 Ogzewalla replied they could be four- or five-plexes depending on code allowances. Mrs. Goodfellow
33 said the proposed density was consistent with the area and would not adversely impact nearby
34 properties. She felt the project was harmonious, would bring utilities and access improvements to
35 neighboring properties, and would adequately provide facilities.

36
37 Mr. Sampson asked whether any consideration had been given to what would go on the commercial
38 portion. Mr. Ogzewalla replied that it had not yet been determined. Ralph Ballard remarked that Sky
39 Mountain had opposed every proposal in the past. He questioned liability, asking whether golfers were
40 responsible if they hit people or property. Mr. Hall explained that liability was a gray area, but because
41 this was a zone change request, the City had the opportunity to impose conditions such as screens. Mr.
42 Ballard disagreed that all liability should fall on the developer. Mr. Sampson compared it to skiing, where
43 participants assume liability for accidents but Mr. Hall said there was no similar waiver for golf.

44
45 Mr. Winder asked if the City itself could be liable if open space were required and someone were
46 harmed there. He noted that the slope of the land placed the townhomes below the fairway. Mr. Farthing
47 responded that if he hit someone in a City park while playing baseball, the City would not be liable,
48 suggesting the same principle applied. Mrs. Goodfellow added that the real issue seemed to be the trail
49 location. Mr. Ballard acknowledged that stray balls would inevitably go into the area, but said that
50 shouldn't stop the project from moving forward, as long as it was fair.

1 Mrs. Smith then asked if the commission could approve only the zone change without the preliminary
2 plat. Mr. Ballard explained that the preliminary plat was tied to the zoning, so one could not be approved
3 without the other. Mr. Hall confirmed, adding that while the plat could later be amended with commission
4 approval, the zone change and preliminary plat had to be approved together.

5
6 *Shelley Goodfellow motioned a recommendation of approval of ZC24-07 and PSP24-21 to the City*
7 *Council based on the standards being met and subject to staff and JUC comments.*

8
9 Mr. Ballard added that the City Council would ultimately review and determine whether screens should
10 be required and who would be responsible for installing them. Mrs. Goodfellow stated that she believed
11 the distance between the development and the golf course was sufficient, and that people who choose
12 to live on a golf course frontage property assume some level of risk. She also noted that the screens
13 would likely be unsightly. Mr. Ballard emphasized that the commission should consider the concerns
14 raised by the gentleman at the previous meeting, who had threatened to sue if someone were injured.
15 Mrs. Goodfellow responded that she felt the threat was likely empty but acknowledged it could still be
16 raised with the City Council.

17
18 *Paul Farthing seconded the motion on the table. Unanimous.*

19
20 It was noted that the issue of screens would be discussed at the City Council. Mr. Ogzewalla stated that
21 they are okay with moving the trail if needed. Mr. Sampson recommended that Beau attend the City
22 Council meeting in person or have a representative present to address any questions or concerns.

23
24 **2. LUCA24-08: Discussion and consideration of a recommendation to the City Council**
25 **on a Land Use Code Amendment to Title 10 Chapter 23 regarding Planned Development Overlays**
26 **and Title 10 Chapter 11 and Chapter 17 regarding the Public Facility zone.**

27 Fred Resch III explained that this process started with planning for the Civic Center masterplan. As part
28 of that, changes were needed since the PF zone does not allow government offices, and the
29 amendment to allow a PDO would enable mixed uses. He clarified that the intricacies of the change are
30 not specifically because of the Civic Center, but rather to make the code cleaner, clearer, and to tighten
31 responsibilities on decision-making about what is allowed. It was a general cleanup for PDOs and an
32 opportunity to make necessary changes while the code was open. Dayton Hall clarified which edits were
33 from whom: Fred and Gary in blue, Dayton in red.

34
35 Shelley Goodfellow asked if there were any other major changes beyond adding government buildings
36 to the PF zone. Mr. Hall responded that this version holds the developer more tightly to the site plan
37 approved with the zone change, and any changes beyond minor ones would need to go back for
38 approval. He noted that minor and substantial examples are detailed in the draft. Brad Winder stated
39 that when they first looked at this, there were concerns about the Civic Center not being publicly noticed
40 enough and opposition to apartments. Mr. Hall stated that the purpose of the zone change is to allow a
41 PDO on a PF zone so that what the City Council is considering would be allowed; they are not deciding
42 on the design, but the amendment makes the Civic Center with a housing component possible.

43
44 Mr. Winder expressed concern that the density bonus could be an issue. Mark Sampson asked if the
45 commission is willing to send a recommendation and noted that it could be sent back for changes. Mr.
46 Hall confirmed that it could. Mr. Winder wanted to check if the 15% density bonus aligns with
47 surrounding areas, but Dayton noted that it is already adopted in a different code. Mr. Resch clarified
48 that the Water Wise landscape category is a density bonus criterion, and if requirements are met under
49 Title 10 Chapter 52, the bonus is applicable. Ralph Ballrd asked if this applied to a PF PDO and Mr. Hall
50 explained that a PDO allows City Council to pick and choose what can be in a zone; the change simply

1 allows it to be applied to PF zones as well. Mr. Winder asked if this would negate the purpose of zoning
2 and Mr. Hall said the preliminary site plan governs the zone going forward.
3

4 Mr. Sampson and Amy Werrett discussed the HOA and limitations under Part A, and Mr. Sampson
5 recommended aligning with new state regulations. Mrs. Werrett asked whether the changes allow the
6 city to be a landlord. Mr. Hall confirmed with Mr. Resch adding that the city already has that ability.
7 Michelle Smith raised concerns about conflict of interest and Mr. Hall explained that state statute permits
8 cities to act in this capacity. When asked if the city could sell or lease land for housing development, Mr.
9 Hall said yes and the arrangement could offset costs of building new City and Police buildings. Mrs.
10 Goodfellow expressed concern that PF zones are intended for narrow uses and that giving the city this
11 ability could be problematic as government grows. Paul Farthing noted that the city could already do the
12 development without this change, with Mrs. Goodfellow agreeing but emphasizing the city would then be
13 held to the same standards as private developers.
14

15 Kelby Iverson emphasized that while the staff argument is valid, citizens may not favor this change. He
16 noted that private parties would be accountable through the PDO, but the city must be accountable to
17 citizens. Ralph Ballard suggested hearing from the public. Mac Hall commented that while the PDO
18 ordinance is mostly acceptable, it should not be the city using it for itself; it should be for private
19 developers. Madox expressed concern about traffic on 870 W and the lack of studies. Mr. Farthing noted
20 that utilities like power and gas are run by private entities, while Mr. Ballard agreed the PDO could
21 provide opportunity. Mr. Farthing added that the PDO imposes requirements and a density bonus, not a
22 free hand to the government. Mr. Ballard cautioned against allowing the government to bypass citizen
23 input.
24

25 Mr. Hall summarized that removing the ability to place a PDO on a PF zone would make the PDO
26 unusable there. Mr. Farthing reminded the commission that only a few citizens are concerned, and
27 elected officials represent the public. Mr. Winder raised traffic concerns at SR 9. Mr. Hall said that with a
28 zone change application, all traffic and related information would be reviewed like any other application.
29 Mrs. Goodfellow suggested that everything else in the amendment looked acceptable. She proposed
30 sending a recommendation without the PDO on PF portion. Mr. Iverson agreed that adjustments could
31 be made without the PDO and further discussion could take place with the zone change.
32

33 *Amy Werrett motioned a recommendation of approval of LUCA24-08 to the City Council with the*
34 *adjustment or amendment to take out the PDO for Public Facility zones. Brad Winder seconded the*
35 *motion. Roll call. Shelley Goodfellow, Brad Winder, Amy Werrett, Michelle Smith, Ralph Ballard, Kelby*
36 *Iverson, and Mark Sampson – aye. Paul Farthing – nay. Motion carries.*
37

38 Paul Farthing noted the reason for his nay vote. Voicing that the city is not the first to do this and sees
39 no problem with it. He doesn't believe the city is going to become a major developer; this is simply a way
40 to generate revenue to help pay for the project. He added that while some assume the public sector is
41 completely inept, that is not the case.
42

43 Councilman Kevin Thomas expressed that he is a bit baffled. He questioned why a consultant was even
44 hired for a masterplan when the city could just sell the property and let a developer do whatever they
45 want, which would likely achieve similar density. He emphasized that the main concern seems to be the
46 apartments, which are not required. He also clarified that the city is not trying to maximize profit, will not
47 proceed without traffic studies, and does not intend to compete with private businesses. If citizens
48 prefer, the city could simply sell the property and build only the City and Police facilities. He stated that
49 the goal is to save citizens money, and while they had assumed affordable housing was desired, it is not
50 mandatory. He doesn't understand the logic that seems to concern everyone else.
51

1 Mr. Iverson asked if the city could proceed without the PDO, and Kevin confirmed that they could. He
2 questioned why the process couldn't just be made clean and straightforward since the site plan still gets
3 approved.

4
5 Mrs. Goodfellow raised a cautionary point, noting that future City Councils may not have the same
6 perspective, and this change could give them an advantage to act in ways contrary to current intentions.
7

8 **NEW BUSINESS**

9 10 **1. CUP25-08: Discussion and consideration of a possible approval of a metal building** 11 **and building of greater height located at 800 W State St. Coral Cliffs Entertainment, Applicant.** 12 **Chase Stratton, Agent.**

13 Fred Resch III stated that the maximum height in this zone is 35 feet, but the proposed building is 40
14 feet. He noted that the building will be constructed with metal. Two conditional uses are being requested.
15

16 Chase Stratton added that the cinema has a similar peak at its sign, and the new building has a peak at
17 the entrance that is slightly higher. However, the average peak height of the roof is 36 feet. He explained
18 that when viewed next to the movie theater, the new building does not look out of place.
19

20 Shelley Goodfellow asked if there was a reason for the additional height. Mr. Stratton explained that
21 there is a second-story storage area, but most of the height is for aesthetic purposes.
22

23 *Kelby Iverson motioned to approve CUP25-08. Paul Farthing seconded the motion. Unanimous.*
24

25 **Planning Commission Business:**

26 27 **1. Election of a new chairperson and appointment of a new alternate chairperson**

28 Mark Sampson is elected chair by popular vote.
29

30 *Brad Winder motioned to make Shelley Goodfellow vice chair. Paul Farthing seconded the motion.*
31 *Unanimous.*
32

33 *Paul Farthing motioned to adjourn. Shelley Goodfellow seconded the motion. Unanimous.*
34

35 **Adjournment**