The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, June 7th, 2022, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City Utah.

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

Staff in attendance: City Attorney-Tyler Romeril, City Planner-Donald Boudreau, City Engineer-Jonathan Statthis, City Engineer-Christian Bennett, and Executive Assistant, Onjulee Pittser

Others in attendance: Phil Schmidt, Tracy Walters, Alissa Hjorth, R.J. Hetticher, Laura Henderson, Glen Dietz, Eric McFadden, Kristin Cloud, Paul Hendrix, Laurel Cossett, Rod Coslett, Sonja Black, Ronald Shelley, Darlene Shelley, Jesse Carter, Bob Platt, Dallas Buckner, Dave Clarke, Ron Larsen, Mark Ren??, Steve Miller (no signature), Caroline Scholzen (no signature), Diana Francis (no signature), Wayne Francis (no signature)

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

### ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION LOCATION/PROJECT APPLICANT/PRESENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Requested Motion</th>
<th>Location/Project</th>
<th>Applicant/Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Regular Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig motioned to elect Jennie as Chair Pro Tem; John seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Approval of Minutes (dated May 17th, 2022)</td>
<td>3000 N. &amp; Minersville Hwy.</td>
<td>RCQ LLC/Premier Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray motions for approval of the minutes from May 17th; John seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Road Dedication (Recommendation)</td>
<td>3000 N. &amp; Minersville Hwy.</td>
<td>RCQ LLC/Premier Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eric McFadden:</strong> This is a 40’ section on 3000 N. that we are going to dedicate to city. This is in front of the new Tagg ‘N Go car wash. It’s part of the construction plans for that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig motions for a positive recommendation; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PUBLIC HEARING Transportation Master Plan Amendment (Recommendation)</td>
<td>between 2400 N. &amp; 3000 N. approx. 775 W.</td>
<td>Northfield Properties LC/Premier Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eric McFadden: The transportation MP was updated recently. The curved dashed purple line is the new line for Bulldog Rd. We’re proposing to go back to the old alignment, that would take Bulldog straight up and 775 W. straight up as 66’ roads previously. Christian: The proposed alignment doesn’t follow the dashed purple line. The proposed line is in conformance to the previous GP. Bulldog Rd. would extend and connect to 3000 N., and 775 would connect to 3000 N. as well. We’re getting rid of the jogged line. Craig: How do you feel about it? Christian: Staff’s ok with it, and it’s in conformance with the previous plan. Craig: How’d that get away from us? Adam: Is that going across undeveloped land? Eric: The green line is where Bulldog is now. The purple was going to bisect 4-5 different properties.

Jennie opened the public hearing; there were no comments; the public hearing was closed.

Craig motions for a positive recommendation; Adam seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

4. Minor Lot Subd. 700 South Cross Hollow Rd. Harker/GO Civil (Approval)

Dallas: This is by the Silver Silo. Currently, it’s a 3-acre parcel. Craig: What’s the southerly piece? Dallas: That’s where the Silver Silo is existing. Jennie: Is your access off Cross Hollow? Dallas: Correct. The colored line is existing, and the Silver Silo will have enough space to be comfortable.

Adam motions for approval on the minor lot; second by Craig; all in favor for unanimous vote.

5. PUBLIC HEARING
Water & Storm Drain approx. 1200 N. Lund Hwy. GO Civil
Master Plan Amendments Pointe West Subdivision Phase 1
(Recommendation)

Dallas: We’ve had some discussions with Coal Creek Irrigation and Engineering. We turned in the application based on those discussions. Since then, we’ve had more discussions, and Jonathan and I are on the same page. I’d like to withdraw this application and not proceed with the MP Storm Drain Amendment. Just leave it the way it is currently shown and keep at 42”.

This item is withdrawn.

6. PUBLIC HEARING
PUD – Vicinity 200 N. 4500 W. off Hwy. 56 Burgess/G0 Civil
(Recommendation) Iron West Townhomes PUD Phases 1 & 2

Adam: I need to disclose that I do business with the contractor. My company may be doing potential work on this in the future. Dallas: The existing 4500 West is the main entry into Iron West. It’s a minor subdivision. We’re working on the NE corner. We came through with a zone change for R-3 in the NW corner. Townhomes are detached, not 4-plexes. We’ll be doing it in 2 phases: phase 1 on the East, and phase 2 on the West; private roads throughout. It will be the minimum width for PUD roads. The roads are wider with a 45’ ROW, the equivalent of a City road. It will be owned and maintained by the PUD. There will be accesses off the future road with the twin home project. Open space, green space. Guest parking. Jennie: What kind of green space? Dallas: There’s a 35% overall ratio. The
hatching you can see that we’ve labeled those as open space, but as far as amenities, but we’ll fine tune those with the construction drawings.

_Jennie opened the public hearing; there were no comments; the public hearing was closed._

**Craig motions for a positive recommendation; second by Ray; all in favor for unanimous vote.**

7. Subd. – Vicinity (Recommendation) approx. 200 N. (Hwy 56) & 4500 W. Iron West Twin Home Subdivision

_Dallas:_ This is the South road of the townhome project. Existing from Iron West phase 1, you can see where those stubbed roads come out, connecting and putting twin homes on the South side. The townhome PUD project is on the North. **Adam:** For the record, I have the same conflict on this project.

**Craig motions for a positive recommendation; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.**

8. Road Dedication (Recommendation) 200 N. 4500 W. off Hwy. 56 Burgess/GO Civil

_Dallas:_ This was split into 2 agenda items. The area we talked about being a park in the SE corner. This would be the City park parcels. 4500 W. is a MP road. Phase 2 of Iron West ends. There are a number of easements because of the sewer lift station and drainage that’s already done through the future piece. To satisfy access and frontage for the minor lot, we’ve shown 4500 W. off the section line as a 75’ road either side. There’s a parcel on the East side and West side of the road, and the road dedication is going through there.

**Adam motions for positive recommendation; Craig seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.**

9. Minor Lot Subd. (Approval) 200 N. 4500 W. off Hwy 56 City Park Subdivision Burgess/GO Civil

_Chris tian:_ This item will be conditional upon the road dedication. **Craig:** Do I have to add that? **Tyler:** No. It’s in the minutes. We’ll make sure that goes to City Council.

**Craig moves to approve the minor lot; Adam seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.**

10. Subd. – Vicinity (Recommendation) approx. 1600 N. 3100 W. Iron Willows Phase 3 Eves/Platt & Platt

_Bob Platt:_ This is the 3rd and final phase. This is an R-1 subdivision north of Iron Willows Phase 2 and NW of Iron Willows Phase 1. According to the plan, it’s been reviewed by the City engineer’s office. It will be good to connect Hunter Glenn through to Lund Hwy. It will create a nice corridor.

**Adam motions for a positive recommendation; second by Ray; all in favor for unanimous vote.**
11. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend
Low Density Residential to
Medium Density Residential
(Recommendation)

Lance Duffield: The overall site we’re looking at 106 acres. GP low density and a number of requests in to amend the GP to go to moderate and high density for this project with a bit of CC on the Lund Hwy. side. That’s what items 11-18 are about. Craig: Describe for us each piece. Lance: [Refer to Exhibit “A”] The olive green on the right faces Lund Hwy. The GP is calling for that to be CC zone. This is also in the airport overlay and flight path. A good part of that is in the restricted area. There’s no plan for residential in that area. Purple is proposing high density R-3 with limited densities ranging from 18 units per acre to 10 units per acre, as opposed to 28 units per acre that zoning allows. The brown area is R-2-1, about 120 single-family homes, 7,000 sq. ft. lots. The green on the lower section is proposing to do (56) 3500 sq. ft. lots that are in compliance with the new RNZ, residential neighborhood zone. We’re willing to pioneer that. We’ve talked a lot about it. We want to see how it will work. The overall proposal is that we would include this as an entire project within a development agreement, with the maximum density for the entire project at about 850 units total, around 7.9 units per acre. Jonathan and I have talked. We are sitting a bit below what our sewer capacities are, in the 8.5 to 9 units an acre.

Craig: What is this by? Lance: 800 N. is a future road I&M zoning and to the west we have 20 acres of R-2-2 that we finished mapping. Above to the north is an R-1 subdivision that’s in the dirt stage now. Beyond that is 3900 W. Don: What’s the concept plan for the R-3-M zone? Lance: Single family detached. Adam: Can you explain what that looks like for the audience? Lance: We’ve done a rough density plan that maps the 3500 sq. ft. lots. Don: That’s the RNZ zone, correct? Lance: Yes. We’ve set 4 super pads for that area, and we don’t know what we’ll do yet. We’ve taken some high density and about 16-17 acres of density at 18 units per acre adjacent to the commercial zone. Further to the west and adjacent to the R-2-1 we’ve done that at an R-3 and set a maximum density of 12 units per acre. There’s a small area of about 7 acres and 9 acres on the South side with a density of about 8-9 units per acre. We chose that because the development agreement that we’ll be proposing if we decide to move forward with the project, gives us the ability to maintain densities but change zoning. With the idea that they align with the RNZ and, if that’s successful, a rezone from R-3 to Neighborhood zone.

Adam: You said single-family detached. That’s the RNZ. But the R-3 we’re not clear about. We’re talking 4-plex and 8-plex multi-family. Lance: The highest densities are 18 units per acre would allow for condos, apartments which is as high as we’d like to do, but the areas with R-3 are really for lower zonings and for townhouse type projects. Jennie: Take us through the RNZ. Don: The RNZ aligns with 2 categories on the GP: medium and high density. That’s why they’re proposing a high density in that green area. In a high-density GP area, the RNZ allows lot sizes of single-family homes down to 3500 sq. ft. If it was medium density, the minimum lot size requires 4500 sq. ft. This zone does require single-family, no PUD type projects. The original goal was to encourage some single family detached on smaller lots. There’s not a minimum lot width requirement in this zone. Minimum lot size only. Some drivers will take away from narrow lots. The garage can’t be any more half the width of the dwelling, and setbacks are a minimum of 6’ for single story, and a minimum of 8’ for 2-story with minimum total of 20’. Jennie: That’s total? Don: That’s the total if it’s 2-story. If you keep it at single story, the minimum setback is 6’ on each side. What are you intending? Lance: We don’t know yet. Don: The front setback is a minimum of 10’ of any PUE. Typically, it will be 10’, and pushes you...
into 20’ for the total setback. The rear is 15’ for single story and 20’ for 2-story. The maximum is 2-story. It’s measured to top plate. If the proposal is within 300’ of an existing subdivision, zoned R-2, R-2-1 or RE, there’s a minimum lot size of 7,000 sq. ft. Jennie: How close is this to an R-1? Don: An existing subdivision, not a zone. The zone requires some covenants; no more than 30% of homes are rental units. Maintenance responsibilities for common areas and an open space requirement of 250’ per unit and maxes out at 3% of the total subdivision acreage. It has to be within 1,000 linear ft. walking distance to the homes. Jennie: What you described is the RNZ and that only applies to the dark green on the left. How much acreage is that? Christian: 13.2 acres. Don: Keep in mind that any change the GP will dictate how that RNZ zone is set. If you change to high density and the RNZ is approved, it’ll be down to 3500 sq. ft. lots. Adam: If it’s next to an existing subdivision. Directly west is under current development. Is that considered existing? Tyler: If it’s been platted, it would. Adam: It’s a minimum of 6,000 within 300’. Lance: In the lower left-hand corner, we have proposed a substantial detention pond about 4.5 acres somewhere to 2-2.5-acre detention pond will drain all of that project, pick up some stuff to the West and drainage towards 1600 N. That’s something we’re finding as we use up more land better storm drain control. Major rain last year a good part on the north end of the valley flooded, it’s critical. Viable program we can create 250-300 acres. Help the development in that area. Drainage is supposed to go to the West There’s a number of open drainage trenches that aren’t maintained. That’s what we’re proposing as part of this project to help mitigate some of that problem. Craig: The development agreement locked in at 7.9 acre is not on the agenda. Tyler: The development would still need an approval from Planning Commission and City Council. My advice to City Council would be to approve the development agreement at the same time of the zone change. That could set it back a few weeks. Craig: I love the idea of the mix and experimenting with the RNZ. That’s one of the ways we’re hoping to reduce home costs. I’m on board with that but not without the development agreement. Not sure how to proceed with this. approve the piece mill by rectangles, I still have concern that we don’t have anything governing the entire development. Lance: Th agreement is nearly drafted. Tyler provided us with an agreement that the City’s used before. Ours is more complex and has more clauses in it. We’ll plan on getting that to you prior to a review meeting. Tyler: There’s a couple of options. You can vote up or down on each item. The other is to table this to the next PC meeting and include the development agreement at the same time so you can consider all items. Craig: I’d like to see that as the first item. Jennie: I agree with you. If we vote on significant general land use changes, we can vote on the whole package together if there needs to be any adjustments to move things around. Craig: Are you ok with that? It seems logical and will help the cause. Lance: I am. Tyler: We still need to have public hearing.

Jennie opened the public hearing.

Steve Miller: On the 800 N. going through Monte Vista subd. Along 800 N. and 3900. As residents not within the 300 ft. road that’s chip seal and county road. Does the city adopt a county road.? Tyler: No. That’s operated and maintained by the County. Steve: We have a 10-year plan with the sewer system. We can tie onto the sewer lines within 10 years. Will this hinder that? The road is not wide enough to put this development there. As a citizen of Monte Vista, we need to look at that before we jump into a big plan. We have a lot of traffic. Will the entrances be off of 800 N.? How much traffic will there be? I understand development and I get it, we need to know what we’re looking at for traffic. We have children in the neighborhood. I think it’s fortunate that I know people to tell me what’s going on. We’re blind on this. These are questions that I want to address. The road is not set up for what you want to do. Caroline Scholzen: The overlay doesn’t show any access roads. Where are they proposing to access? Tyler: This is just a zone change. There are some At vicinity when they actually put lines
on the map. This point in time is purely a zone change, if this is approved. The developer goes into the next phase and does the vicinity. **Lance:** The primary entrance is off Lund Hwy. **Caroline:** On the North or the South? **Lance:** It’s on the East off of Lund Hwy.; the green area to the right. There’s a 66’ ROW that will come in and go back to the West. We’ve also redeveloped this piece that’s in final approval. Approving 800 N. along the side and has an entrance into the back area. Along with one road through the subdivision. It carries traffic and utility into the project. **Caroline:** How will this affect the property owners to the South? **Lance:** We won’t have any access coming out other than the corner. **Steve:** There’s one entrance off of 800. **Lance:** approved map for the corner? That’s all approved. We’re improving our half of 800 N. within the city, and new c/g/s. 3900 going east. To the corner. **Steve:** We have a 20-acre subdivision entrance to this property at the corner. **Lance:** That’s unimproved property to the east of you. **Caroline:** Our family owns the property below you. The 72 acres we own I understand is in the County. Are you going through County and annexing that piece into the City? **Lance:** It’s already in the City. Lund Hwy. is in the City. Caroline: When was this annexed? **Adam:** We don’t have those records. Caroline: If he puts the high density on the south. **Jennie:** There’s no access to your property through there. **Adam:** With any development comes traffic. 800 N. is a MP road. What size is that? Caroline; is that goes into Monte Vista. **Lance:** 800 N. is the north. **Adam:** 800 N. would be widened to 66’ wide. **Steve:** That stays as County. **Tyler:** It may be widened for this property. **Steve:** At the subdivision is where I’m talking. **Adam:** Where the improvements end is where the property ends. They won’t improve beyond the scope of their project. **Steve:** We still get traffic on a County road. **Lance:** We are improving this piece. **Adam:** With a different project. **Caroline:** For the high density, there’s only a 10’ setback in that new zone? **Don:** In the new zone it’s a 20’ front yard setback. **Lance:** 15’ for 1-story, and 20’ on the back 2-story. Caroline: Some of these subdivisions have low setbacks you can’t get a car up to the garage. The back end is sitting in the street. **Don:** In that zone it is the 20’ for the parking up to the garage the house pushed back to 25’. **Lance:** Don and I had this discussion how parking and driveways are going to work. Prior engineering exercise to property widths are 50x70 just a model. The 2-story houses will be wider. It hasn’t gone through the process. **Don:** You’ll need to provide some site plans to make sure it works out. **Steve:** The apartments that were approved on Lund past Equestrian park on the road. That’s what we do not want to see on 800 W. I ask you consider make sure in the subdivision not on roads. **Laura Henderson:** I think these discussions do warrant having a development agreement. **Mike Adamson:** I own property around this. We have an R-1 subdivision there. They approved the one to the south as R-2 and R-2-1 putting 64 lots in there. High density there and all the other sections. The impact on Monte Vista, Equestrian Pointe another on 3900 West side R-2-1 on the front of it. Next to Equestrian will be Thunderbird talking about more high density between Lund and 3900. Pick places. On the MP we have places if own property I can do what I want. I make money on high density this hurts me financially. We have to stop this. There’ll be 1,000 extra cars in and out of there. Road not talking about there that enters new zone and coming off Lund. 60’ ROW coming in there. That’s 2 access points for 800 cars. That will devalue a lot of these areas around it. to run this stuff is too much. R-3 toward Lund that’s a great thing. When we did the subdivision R-1 we need more.

**Jennie closed the public hearing.**

**Ray:** The general land use plan calls for low density residential, and here we are again changing that. **Adam:** I’m with you, Ray. We talked about spot zoning and the There’s not a single bit of R-3 on the map. That’s spot zoning if we do this. maybe it works. High density in the middle of all the low future doesn’t work. **Jennie:** Do we want to vote and make recommendations, or wait for the development agreement? **Ray:** I’d like to see the agreement and how it addresses this issue.
Ray motions to table this item until the development agreement is completed; Craig seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

12. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: MPD to R-2-1
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.

13. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend
Low Density Residential to
High Density Residential
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.

14. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: MPD to RN
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.

15. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend
Low Density Residential to
High Density Residential
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.

16. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: AT to R-3-M
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.

17. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend
Low Density Residential to
Central Commercial
approx. 800 N. Lund Hwy.
Plum Creek/Platt & Platt
(Recommendation)

This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.
18. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: AT to CC (Recommendation)
aprox. 800 N. Lund Hwy. Plum Creek/Platt & Platt

*This agenda item was discussed with item #12 and tabled until the development agreement is completed.*

19. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend Central Commercial to High Density Residential (Recommendation)
aprox. 250 S. Cross Hollow Rd. Armbrust & Brown/Platt & Platt

**Dave Clarke:** This matches into 250 S. south is the Swiss air b&b. The townhomes from DR Horton are south of there. This was zoned MU, which at the time MU allowed more high density. In order for them to continue townhomes there’s an offer that the top piece is under contract for apartments. 11 acres to the north. The 2-acre piece was purchased by Rally Stop for a gas station, which fits in the MU. 250 S. is a MP road. 66’ ROW. **Jennie:** What’s that going to connect to? **Dave:** It’s North of Old Sorrel. Once it crosses Westview Drive and becomes Center Street going West. **Jennie:** Which one is the minor lot? **Dave:** The whole piece is 27-acres the piece is dedicated sold and under construction. Road on Armbrust but part of the sales contract this owner participate in the road. Armbrust dedicated that road. Dividing it into 11-acres and 16-acres. The zone change is for the whole piece, excluding the road that was dedicated and the Rally Stop piece. **Christian:** For the minor lot, according to our files, the deeds have not been submitted yet. **Dave:** They were sent to Armbrust in Chicago, and we don’t have signed deeds back yet. I think you can still approve it. **Jennie:** We’ll handle 19 & 20 together.

**Jennie** opened the public hearing for items #19 & #20.

**Paul Hendricks:** I live in Sunset Canyon subdivision across the street. No high-density housing across the street area he didn’t point out I believe is the Diamond Z Arena that’s used during the summer for rodeos or other agriculture gatherings. I don’t believe a lot of apartments would like listening to loud noises. It’s easily heard inside my home down the street. When they do anything at night, the lights stay on late. The light projects all the way to my house. High-density apartment complexes aren’t a good fit for this area. There’s already going to be 180 units from DR Horton on the South. A separate subdivision with another 52 units. Townhomes provide better housing. 230+ units is sufficient in that area to provide low-cost housing and keep the area without too much high-density housing. Cross Hollow Road hasn’t been finished. We’re already adding 200 cars and a few hundred more cars. Traffic will not get better on the street. Keep Cedar City a small-town rural area. It’s hard to have apartment complexes next to a rodeo arena. It doesn’t make sense. In Sunset Canyon subdivision along the back end, most of the people do not agree with having apartments with million-dollar houses. It’s not like having townhomes. Last year when it flooded in July, we were the first subdivision to get flooded and a lot of water came down Cody Drive and filled up houses in the subdivision. And most of those people were ok. For the single-family homes with basements, they had a space to live above. If they do apartment complexes, I don’t know what the planning is for them, if they pre basement and get flooded, will we have 40-50 families out of a home? It says this is in a flood zone. Just something to consider. **Becky Holland:** My major concern is Cross Hollow. It’s already a road that’s used for people that don’t want to use main street. They speed like no other. There’s a lot of semis and it’s...
connected to I-15 by Cross Hollow. I would love to see a light on Cross Hollow. Assuming there would be a light that would come at Cody Drive. There are a lot of buses to the middle school. Now you’re waiting for traffic. There’s a lot of kids who drive ATVs on that road. I was shocked when they tripled the size of the RV park and townhouses right next to it. They’re transient, and they’re not invested in our community. They’ll be looking into my back yard. I don’t know where planning was if improve other housing that’s an RV lot in the middle of the townhouses. Is Cross Hollow planned to be 6-lane road? Jonathan: It’s MP for a 100’ ROW with two travel lanes each direction. It’s currently one lane. Craig: When it’s developed there will be 2 on each side and one in the middle. Becky: High-density needs to be considered. Diamond Z Arena holds major events, and they park along the side of the road. It’s dangerous. We knew eventually it would be developed, but it needs to be slowed down. I read in the paper where I-15 has the cross over, they’re taking it down by Walmart because of the bottleneck it creates. That’s a major part of the flow of the whole city. Long term that needs to be considered rather than further away. This is a through way. Craig: I don’t remember what was planned. I understand it’s a function of the change. Dave: The proposed plan is to put apartments on the 11-acre piece. This is major corridor/arterial designed to carry more traffic. Now people don’t want an R-1 house backing up to the road or next to the arena. It fits the use. It was zoned MU which allowed R-3 development at the time. Consider the 11-acres and commercial unit going there. It’s not 70/30, it is 20% of that portion of it. 10% of the overall development. MU vs. R-3 and commercial. Mr. Armbrust said to do all of it. This was their intent. They had MU in their GP. Townhomes on the South and apartments on the North. Because the area is MU, would this be similar more like spot zone or other high-density residential surrounding? Don: Something south to DR Horton that’s on the GP is high density. Mayor: I had a meeting with Steve and the Armbrust family. This is on a busy road and their intent is to be able to build so they can sell. The rest to the West is R-1 space with tops of the hills showing and trails. In dealing with this property, it is on this busy road and they’re trying to use it for the best value. You probably can’t sell R-1.

Jennie closed the public hearing.

Jennie: I’m curious to see how much other commercial is available there. Don: It shows up dark brown on the zone map, but it’s still the MU. Jennie: And it got changed to CC? Don: On the GP, yes. Ray: Why would CC not be a good idea here? Traffic and noise? Don: Some were changed with the last GP with the anticipation of more rooftops, potentially more commercial. Jennie: The brown is high density residential or has that not been updated? Don: That’s where DR Horton is, and the townhomes are cady corner. Jennie: How much of the CC are we talking about? Dave: This whole piece. The GP that was approved ignored the existing zoning which was MU. They took into account that the townhomes are in the process, and the GP said that’s R-3 and ignored that it was MU. The property owner might want to continue the high-density along the highway. Jennie: The Rally Stop will be in the middle of potential residences. Craig: Along this busy street, the only thing that will fly is high-density or commercial. The other on the east side is in already previous to any of this discussion. Adam: High-density make sense, and it adds the buffer. Create from 100’ wide road. I wouldn’t want my single-family home there. I get what Paul is saying about lights and noise with the arena, but what else do you put there? People that are buying and living next to it accept that. I don’t see what else you put there. Leaving it undeveloped doesn’t make sense.

Adam motions for positive recommendation for the zone and general land use changes; Craig seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.
20. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change: MU to R-3-M (Recommendation) approx. 250 S. Cross Hollow Rd. Armbrust & Brown/Platt & Platt

This agenda item was discussed and voted on with item #19.


Adam motions to approve the minor lot subdivision; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.


Dave: This is dividing commercial from residential. This segregates the part that was zoned commercial from the part that was zoned R-2-1. We’re following the existing zoning boundary.

Craig motions to approve the minor lot subdivision; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

23. PUBLIC HEARING
PUD - Vicinity South of Rudd Road Leavitt Land/Red Engineering
Hollow (Recommendation) Marigold PUD

Ron Larsen: This comes in and ties into Cove Drive by the middle school. The plan is to do single-family, slab on grade homes. There are 14 of them in this area. It’s similar to the Crestline ones that are built north of here. 2 car garage, 2 car drive in front. Craig: Is this part of the RDO? Ron: Yes. It’s zoned MU. Originally it was going to be townhomes, but they changed to single-family homes, which the R-2 density can be done in MU. It’s across the street from the dirt parking area by the ball fields.

Jennie opened the public hearing; there were no comments; the public hearing was closed.

Craig motions for a positive recommendation on the PUD vicinity; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

24. PUBLIC HEARING
General Land Use Amend approx. 2000 S. Scenic Dr. Leavitt Land/3 Peaks Engineering
Low Density Residential to Middleton
Medium Density Residential (Recommendation)

Ron: The property here is zoned AT, which was annex transition years ago. The GP shows this to be low density along the frontage road to the freeway. We’re proposing to do R-2 along the frontage and R-1 in the back. The triangular piece is owned by the Francis’, and they’ve been talking to Don to add to this if they want R-1 also. It’s not on this map, but we can add it in if that’s what you want us to.

Don: The issue is with the notices. They have 2 or 3 at best. Ron: SITLA already knew that was
happening. **Tyler:** That would need to be on the agenda. **Ron:** Right, because the low density to medium density and zone changes from R-2 to R-1.

**Jennie opened the public hearings for items 24-26.**

**Glen Dietz:** I appreciate the notice for this agenda item. I have many concerns about this. The first is property value. I’ve invested everything in that home value of your investment is end at the property. When I bought, I knew that whole area was RA, and I was happy with that. That’s what I liked about the neighborhood and investing my money to be surrounded by. I understand things change. I’m concerned about property value being next to a higher density zone that was not in existence when I spent my investment. Scenic Road is another entrance behind the south of the Home Depot and another access to Saddleback. That will help alleviate some traffic. We’ve discussed before that there’s a lot of traffic on that road onto Taba. Improvements were done in 2020. There’s a limited amount of access. How many units? **Ron:** 60-70 lots, including R-1. **Glen:** R-2 single unit and R-2 unit. **Ron:** This is R-2 single. **Adam:** Where do you live? **Glen:** Adam: that’s R-2-1. That that neighborhood is R-2-1 to the left to Talon Pointe. That’s for comparison. **Glen:** This area my view is going to change. The infrastructure is it MP to have anything in widening that road or improving? Joggers and bicyclist on that road, there’s no shoulder. **Ron:** It’s a MP 75’ road, but currently it’s only about 28’ of asphalt. Have to put c/g/s also have the 10’ sidewalk safer road than it is now. People go fast. **Don:** How big are the lots? **Ron:** 8,000 minimum. Down to maybe 75’ frontage. **Don:** The R-2-1 is a minimum of 7,000 and 10,000. **Ronald Chell:** If you’re increasing the road through here, are these R-1 lots in the upper NW corner? **Ron:** Yes. **Ronald:** I have no argument of it being R-1, but I object because we live to the NW corner and did not receive a notification to let us know about this meeting tonight. Am I correct? **Tyler:** Were the notices checked? **Don:** I reviewed the notices. We spoke to the Patchett’s today at 3:00, and they said they did not know anything about it. My concern is the traffic through there. I’m pleased to hear that Scenic Drive will be properly developed. It’s too small now for the amount of traffic. As growth continues traffic will get worse. There’s no connection from Scenic Drive and onto South Mountain. That does not go through the homes where people are backing up into street. I’m hesitant to see any more development. We have the Iron Horse behind us coming in and all that is planned, and people are already building. It’s just further congestion without a solution to the problem. I think we need to brake until the traffic is dealt with. Adding more lots means more people and more cars. I encourage you to consider that we’re not ready to proceed with this type of development. **Tyler:** The PC has a few choices. You can table the matter to the next PC meeting, or you can make a recommendation that’s subject to staff confirming the notices were put out. If not, need to be and come to next PC meeting. **Mark:** I did get a notice. I don’t have a problem with the development, but I do with the traffic. Iron Horse is being developed. It’s not a big change to the way traffic will flow. It will change in the area, but not much. We’re glad that’s being done. As I’ve seen the process, I’m grateful for Iron Horse for having a plan before decisions are made. When you buy property and the other is zoned a certain way, the commission comes in and changes that zoning and the MP changes, it’s hard for homeowners to handle. I know you do your best in making those decision. I get concerned about houses across the street. I’d hate coming back and saying they shouldn’t have been put there. I’d like you to consider that. You’re just putting them down the road and you just said that was not a good spot down on Cross Hollow. I’m ok with infrastructure and roads and how they should be. **Diana Francis:** We’re really unhappy, because we were going to be secluded, and now, we’re not going to be. You could make the lots bigger and not so many houses. So, this matches others around the area. The traffic is crazy. Consider a light by Home Depot or the liquor store. It’s so dangerous. You put signs up for truckers not to park there and that’s helped a lot. You can’t see when
they do park there. **Ronald:** The Middleton’s haven’t sold to Iron Horse. My guess is that because it’s zoned like you’ve zoned it here that you will eventually zone Middleton home the same way. **Ron:** Tammy Middleton ends up with the house and doesn’t want it. She wanted to keep her acreage. We’ve shown roads stubbing into it so it’s not secluded later. ?: When Tammy sells that would change. **Ron:** That would stay R-1. **Tracy Delnegro:** When these high-density subdivisions are considered by council are there studies done to make sure there’s enough water for that high-density? **Jonathan:** This is not a high-density proposal. **Tracy:** For all the subdivisions that are high density, has water been considered? **Jonathan:** Looking at the water rights available the developments have to bring water rights into the City. This subdivision has to bring in water rights or pay the fee. **Tracy:** So, it’s paper water. **Tyler:** In our water acquisition ordinance that land used for equal to water bringing by deed or a water acquisition fee. It’s tailed whether it’s high-density or low-density. **Craig:** This is not part of the RDO on top? **Ron:** No, it’s not. It’s about 45 acres. The two sisters are splitting it and Laurel owns one piece and is selling it to the developer. It’s not part of the RDO or SITLA. The reason she wanted to go to R-2 is to make lots that can be sold. You can’t sell 600,000 homes there. 150’ deep lots. There will be sound walls along the back. You can’t sell big lots next to the freeway. Smaller lots allow you to do more economical homes and hopefully that will sell. **Diana:** I tend to disagree with that that are homes down there. They have no wall to get rid of their noise. **Ron:** Many of those are up over the hill. **Diana:** No, they’re not. They’re lower by the freeway.

**Jennie** closed the public hearing.

**Jennie:** Items #24-26 are asking for zone changes and land use.

**Craig** motions for a positive recommendation for items #24-26; Adam seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

**25. PUBLIC HEARING**

Zone Change: AT to R-2-1
(Recommendation)
approx. 2000 S. Scenic Dr.
Middleton
Leavitt Land/3 Peaks Engineering

*This item was discussed and voted on with item #24.*

**26. PUBLIC HEARING**

Zone Change: AT to R-1
(Recommendation)
approx. 2000 S. Scenic Dr.
Middleton
Leavitt Land/3 Peaks Engineering

*This item was discussed and voted on with item #24.*

**27. Minor Lot Subd.**

(Approval)
approx. 200 S. Scenic Dr.
Middleton Minor Lot
Leavitt Land/3 Peaks Engineering

**Ron:** This is what splits the property for the two sisters. There’s approx. 15 acres with the house and the rest of it is the other that will be subdivided. **Adam:** the little all planned? **Ron:** There are (2) 16” water lines into the house. That’s the road. Another waterline crosses over and will work an easement across the property or reroute into the road, whichever works best. There’s some power easements into the houses that are part of the development. **Christian:** The minor lot subdivision will be subject to the zone changes that are approved by City Council.
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Adam motions to approve the minor lot subdivision subject to the zone changes being approved by City Council; Craig seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

28. Subd. – Vicinity
(Recommendation)

approx. 2000 S. Scenic Dr.
Middleton Subdivision
Leavitt Land/3 Peaks
Engineering

Ron: This the layout that’s proposed. That lot wouldn’t be allowed change to make it a bigger lot. The lots aren’t all 8,000. The rest are 9,000+. The homes they want to build will fit within 75’ and R-1 requires 90’. The waterline will be in the public road. We’ll cut it off in the NE corner cut it off and tie into the road. Christian: Are there temporary turnaround? Ron: Yes. He forgot to put them on there. Adam: Do those turnarounds stay on Tammy’s property? Ron: Yes. They can turn around and go out.

Adam motions for a positive recommendation for the subdivision vicinity; Ray seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Onjule Pittser, Executive Assistant
COUNCIL AND IS HEREBY ORDERED FILED FOR RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE; THAT THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE CITY I, MARY PEARSON, CHAIRPERSON OF THE CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT WAS EXAMINED AND ACCEPTED BY ME. THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT OF EAST 3000 NORTH STREET (PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY) MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEDAR CITY CORPORATION PURSUANT TO TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, ALL CORNERS ARE SET AND FOUND AS SHOWN. THE BASIS OF BEARING FOR THIS SUBJECT PARCEL AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT. THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY IS TO RETRACE AND MARK ON THE GROUND THE PLAT. AND THAT THIS PLAT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. I, TYLER ROMERIL, CITY ATTORNEY FOR CEDAR CITY CORPORATION, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT IT IS THEIR INTENTION TO CREATE STREETS AND EASEMENTS FOR APPROVAL BY SAID COMMISSION AND IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL. NARRATIVE

DESCRIPTION

BEGINNING AT A POINT 435.17 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, SLB&M TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY CAST 19.12' S 00°00'00" E 21.20' TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN.

COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE; THAT THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE CITY I, MARY PEARSON, CHAIRPERSON OF THE CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT WAS EXAMINED AND ACCEPTED BY ME. THIS ROAD DEDICATION PLAT OF EAST 3000 NORTH STREET (PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY) MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEDAR CITY CORPORATION PURSUANT TO TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, ALL CORNERS ARE SET AND FOUND AS SHOWN. THE BASIS OF BEARING FOR THIS SUBJECT PARCEL AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT. THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY IS TO RETRACE AND MARK ON THE GROUND THE PLAT. AND THAT THIS PLAT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. I, TYLER ROMERIL, CITY ATTORNEY FOR CEDAR CITY CORPORATION, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT IT IS THEIR INTENTION TO CREATE STREETS AND EASEMENTS FOR APPROVAL BY SAID COMMISSION AND IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL. NARRATIVE

DESCRIPTION

BEGINNING AT A POINT 435.17 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, SLB&M TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY CAST 19.12' S 00°00'00" E 21.20' TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 SOUTH, RANGE 11 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BULLDOG ROAD ALIGNMENT
BETWEEN 775' NORTH FROM 775 W TO BULLDOG ROAD FROM 2530 NORTH TO 2400 N
66' ROW WIDTH

PROPOSED NEW ROAD ALIGNMENT TO FOLLOW THE EXISTING BULLDOG ROAD BETWEEN 2400 N & 3000 N 66' ROW WIDTH

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 2675' NORTH FROM 775 W TO BULLDOG ROAD 60' ROW WIDTH

775 W FUTURE CONNECTION FROM 2530 NORTH TO 2400 N (66' ROW WIDTH)
- Reduce 42" MP storm drain to 30" within clouded area shown.
GENERAL PLAN AND ZONE CHANGE MAP FOR
IPP
WITHIN SECTION 5, T. 36 S., R. 11 W., SLB&M
CEDAR CITY, IRON COUNTY, UTAH

CURRENT GENERAL PLAN: LOW DENSITY
PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN: MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY

PROPOSED B-2 ZONE
BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 5, T. 36 S., R. 11 W., SUBB, THEN N89°59'25"E ALONG THE SECTION LINE 1425.38 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SECTION, THEN N89°59'25"E ALONG THE SOUTH LINE 663.44 FEET TO THE SOUTH CORNER OF SAID SECTION, THEN N89°59'25"E ALONG THE SOUTH LINE 1424.93 FEET TO THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE 663.44 FEET, THENCE N89°58'40"E 1001.72 FEET TO THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE 663.44 FEET, THENCE N89°56'30"E CONTINUING ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 664.88 FEET, THENCE S89°56'30"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION LINE, THENCE S89°56'22"E ALONG THE 1/16 LINE 2658.88 FEET TO THE 1/4 SECTION L...
MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FOR

AMBRUST & BROWN

WITHIN THE NE1/4 SECTION 17, T.35 S., R. 11 W., SLB&M, CEDAR CITY, IRON COUNTY, UTAH

FILE:

PLAT ASSOCIATED WITH PARENT PARCEL: (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

JONATHAN STATHIS
CEDAR CITY ENGINEER

I, DAVID M. CLARKE, PROFESSIONAL UTAH LAND SURVEYOR NUMBER 343641, DO HEREBY CERTIFY ALL MEASUREMENTS AND DESCRIPTIONS ARE CORRECT AND HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS LICENSING ACT AND HAVE COMPLETED A SURVEY IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 58, CHAPTER 22, PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS LICENSING ACT.

RECEIPT NO.:

PLAT FILE #:

SCALE:

CORP DORNIER INVESTMENTS LLC
CEDAR CITY

CORNER

B-1644-0000-0000

1/4  CORNER

56.93 ACRES

125 SOUTH STREET

UTAH P.L.S. #343641

DAVID M. CLARKE

PROJECT LOCATION

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

NOTE:

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED MIXED USE. THE PURPOSED ZONE IS COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED USE CONDITION.

1. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN PLATE ZONE 7 X DAMARIS, AREAS OF SPECIAL HAZARDS. IT IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY FINAL NUMBER 1104-7-01, UTILITY ESTABLISHMENT LINE (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

3. HOLDING AS THIS PROPERTY CONTAINS SUSPECT AND MODERATELY SUSPECT EROSION ZONES SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4. AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FALLS UNDER THE AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT ZONE AND SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A PERMITS MAY BE REQUIRED.

5. CITY WATER AND SEWER IS AVAILABLE TO THIS PROPERTY IN CROSS HOLLOW ROAD. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT EXISTS ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

6. A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

PROJECT LOCATION

NOTE:

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED MIXED USE. THE PURPOSED ZONE IS COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED USE CONDITION.

1. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN PLATE ZONE 7 X DAMARIS, AREAS OF SPECIAL HAZARDS. IT IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY FINAL NUMBER 1104-7-01, UTILITY ESTABLISHMENT LINE (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

3. HOLDING AS THIS PROPERTY CONTAINS SUSPECT AND MODERATELY SUSPECT EROSION ZONES SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4. AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FALLS UNDER THE AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT ZONE AND SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A PERMITS MAY BE REQUIRED.

5. CITY WATER AND SEWER IS AVAILABLE TO THIS PROPERTY IN CROSS HOLLOW ROAD. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT EXISTS ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

6. A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

PROJECT LOCATION

NOTE:

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED MIXED USE. THE PURPOSED ZONE IS COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED USE CONDITION.

1. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN PLATE ZONE 7 X DAMARIS, AREAS OF SPECIAL HAZARDS. IT IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY FINAL NUMBER 1104-7-01, UTILITY ESTABLISHMENT LINE (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

3. HOLDING AS THIS PROPERTY CONTAINS SUSPECT AND MODERATELY SUSPECT EROSION ZONES SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4. AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FALLS UNDER THE AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT ZONE AND SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A PERMITS MAY BE REQUIRED.

5. CITY WATER AND SEWER IS AVAILABLE TO THIS PROPERTY IN CROSS HOLLOW ROAD. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT EXISTS ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

6. A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

PROJECT LOCATION

NOTE:

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED MIXED USE. THE PURPOSED ZONE IS COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED USE CONDITION.

1. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN PLATE ZONE 7 X DAMARIS, AREAS OF SPECIAL HAZARDS. IT IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY FINAL NUMBER 1104-7-01, UTILITY ESTABLISHMENT LINE (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

3. HOLDING AS THIS PROPERTY CONTAINS SUSPECT AND MODERATELY SUSPECT EROSION ZONES SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4. AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FALLS UNDER THE AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT ZONE AND SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A PERMITS MAY BE REQUIRED.

5. CITY WATER AND SEWER IS AVAILABLE TO THIS PROPERTY IN CROSS HOLLOW ROAD. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT EXISTS ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

6. A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

PROJECT LOCATION

NOTE:

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED MIXED USE. THE PURPOSED ZONE IS COMMERCIAL WITH A MIXED USE CONDITION.

1. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN PLATE ZONE 7 X DAMARIS, AREAS OF SPECIAL HAZARDS. IT IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY FINAL NUMBER 1104-7-01, UTILITY ESTABLISHMENT LINE (ZONE CHANGE DESCRIPTION)

3. HOLDING AS THIS PROPERTY CONTAINS SUSPECT AND MODERATELY SUSPECT EROSION ZONES SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4. AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION FALLS UNDER THE AIRPORT ENCROACHMENT ZONE AND SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A PERMITS MAY BE REQUIRED.

5. CITY WATER AND SEWER IS AVAILABLE TO THIS PROPERTY IN CROSS HOLLOW ROAD. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT EXISTS ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.

6. A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG CROSS HOLLOW ROAD.
The property is located in Section 32, T.36S., R.11W., SLB&M.

The property contains 84.82 acres of land.

The property is located in Flood Zone C, areas of minimal flooding.

The property is zoned CC and R2-1 and follows the proposed planning commission approval.

Currently no city sewer is available to this property. Plans to expand the city sewer system are presently being designed.

Currently no city water is available to this property. Plans to expand the city water system are presently being designed.

Soils normally suspect to hydrocompaction.

Soils area: This property contains moderately suspect soils and does not normally suspect to hydrocompaction.

Airport disclosure: This minor lot subdivision falls outside of the Cedar City Regional Airport influence zones.

Currently no city sewer is available to this property. Plans to expand the city sewer system are presently being designed.

Currently no city water is available to this property. Plans to expand the city water system are presently being designed.

No public utility easements are being retained as part of this minor lot subdivision. Easements shall be done as they are finished and developed.
### PARKING DESIGN / CALCULATIONS

- **EXISTING SYSTEM:**
  - **EXISTING SYSTEM CONNECTS INTO CEDAR CITY'S SEWER SYSTEM.**
  - **EXISTING WATER SYSTEM CONNECTS INTO BLACKSTONE P.U.D. PH 1**.
  - **EXISTING SYSTEM FLOWS TO AN EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL ALONG CROSS HOLLOWS ROAD.**

- **EXISTING:**
  - **BEDROCK AT SHALLOW DEPTH OR COARSE SEDIMENTS CONTAINING LOW PERCENTAGE OF FINE MATERIAL.**
  - **SN: SOILS NOT SUBJECT TO HYDROCOMPACTION PROBLEMS. TERRAIN UNDERLAIN BY MATERIAL.**
  - **HYDROCOMPACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY MAP. (DATED FEB, 2021) LOMR MAP. (UPDATED 7/19/2019)***

- **PROPOSED SYSTEM:**
  - **THE PROPOSED SYSTEM WILL CONNECT TO THIS EXISTING SYSTEM.**
  - **THE EXISTING STORM DRAIN SYSTEM IS LOCATED IN RUDD ROAD AND ALONG THE EAST (TO THE NORTH).**

### WATER PRESSURE IN THE AREA IS 40 PSI.

### ZONING USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ZONING USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>M-U ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>M-U ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>M-U ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>M-U ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>M-U ZONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL NOTES

- **RDO PLAN SHOWS Pod 1:**
  - **DENSITY: 113 LOTS / 32.1 ACRES**
  - **TOTAL PROPOSED LOTS:**
  - **TOTAL AREA:**
  - **TOTAL = 42 BEDROOMS MAXIMUM (USED 3 PER UNIT)**

### OWNER / DEVELOPER

- **THE PROPERTY IS OWNED BY THE UTAH STATE INSTITUTIONAL TRUST LANDS ADMINISTRATION AND IS BEING MANAGED AND DEVELOPED IN PARTNERSHIP WITH**

### SUBDIVISION

- **MARIGOLD P.U.D.**
  - **TOTAL = 42 BEDROOMS MAXIMUM (USED 3 PER UNIT)**
  - **TOTAL = 42 BEDROOMS MAXIMUM (USED 3 PER UNIT)**

### PHYSICAL DESIGN

- **EXISTING 24" Ø STORM DRAIN MAIN**
  - **EXISTING SYSTEM FLOWS TO AN EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL ALONG CROSS HOLLOWS ROAD.**
  - **EXISTING SYSTEM CONNECTS INTO CEDAR CITY'S SEWER SYSTEM.**

### COMMUNITY PAVED ROAD

- **45' ROW TYP.**
  - **15' RADIUS**
  - **DELTA 142.14**

### PROJECT:

- **REVISIONS - 4**
  - **DRAWN BY:**
  - **CHECKED BY:**

### DRAWING NO.:

- **104.07**

### SHEET NO:

- **4 - 29**

### SCALE:

- **1" = 20'**

### SHEET SIZE:

- **VICTORY MAP - NOT TO SCALE**

### FOR REVIEW

- **SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW V1.0**
MIDDLETON ZONE CHANGE
CEedar CIty, Utah

OWNER / DEVELOPER
THE PROPERTY IS OWNED BY LAUREL R. COSSLETT AND WILL BE DEVELOPED BY DALFENREID, LLC.

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

1. MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESCRIPTION

R-2-1 PARCEL:
CONTAINS 19.83 ACRES

BEGINNING AT A POINT

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

(LOW RES)

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LINE
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LINE

LEGEND

~ MIDDLETON GROUP LLC ~

MIDDLETON ZONE CHANGE
ZONE R-1 DESCRIPTION

R-1 PARCEL:
CONTAINS 26.03 ACRES
BEGINNING AT A POINT

(EXISTING)

PROPOSED ZONE LINE
EXISTING ZONE LINE
PROPOSED ZONING
EXISTING ZONING

R-1 (AT)

ZONE R-2 DESCRIPTION

R-2 PARCEL:
CONTAINS 19.83 ACRES
BEGINNING AT A POINT

(Existing)

PROPOSED ZONE LINE
EXISTING ZONE LINE
PROPOSED ZONING
EXISTING ZONING

R-2 (AT)

~ MIDDLETON ZONE CHANGE ~
CEDAR CITY, UTAH

~ S.I.T.L.A.~
(R-1)

~ S.I.T.L.A.~
(RA)

~ FRANCIS WAYNE/DIANA~
(AT)

~ MIDDLETON GROUP LLC~
(MPD)

~ EAGLE RIDGE AT-
SOUTH MOUNTAIN
(R-1)

LEGEND

PROPOSED ZONE LINE
EXISTING ZONE LINE
PROPOSED ZONING
EXISTING ZONING

~ MIDDLETON GROUP LLC~
(MPD)

~ S.I.T.L.A.~
(RA)

~ FRANCIS WAYNE/DIANA~
(AT)

~ MIDDLETON ZONE CHANGE ~
CEDAR CITY, UTAH

~ S.I.T.L.A.~
(R-1)

~ S.I.T.L.A.~
(RA)

~ FRANCIS WAYNE/DIANA~
(AT)

~ MIDDLETON GROUP LLC~
(MPD)

~ EAGLE RIDGE AT-
SOUTH MOUNTAIN
(R-1)
GENERAL NOTES

1. UTILITY LOCATIONS MUST BE VERIFIED IN THE FIELD BY THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR MUST CALL BLUE STAKES PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION.

2. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMOVAL OF ALL EXISTING MATERIALS AND FEATURES THAT RUN ALONG IT.

3. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAFETY ONSITE DURING ALL PHASES OF DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION.

4. CARE MUST BE TAKEN NOT TO UNREASONABLY DISTURB THE ADJACENT BUILDINGS DURING CONSTRUCTION.

5. THE PROPERTY LOCATED PER CEDAR CITY'S ZONING MAP.

6. THE PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED WITHIN ANY FLOOD ZONES PER CEDAR CITY'S FEMA AND LOMAR HYDROCOMPACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY MAP DATED JANUARY, 2011.

7. DIMENSIONS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALING, ANY DISCREPANCIES SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ENGINEER.

8. BUILDING FOUNDATION, EXCAVATION, FINAL GRADING, RETAINING WALLS, AND PAVEMENT SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTED PER THE SOIL REPORT.

8a: CUTS AND FILLS GREATER THAN 5 FEET NEED TO BE CONSTRUCTED PER THE SOIL REPORT.

9. ALL WATER LINES MUST BE BURIED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 36" TO TOP OF PIPE.

10. BASIS OF BEARINGS, COORDINATES, AND ELEVATIONS SHOWN ARE ON THE CEDAR CITY COORDINATE CONTROL NETWORK USING THE CEDAR CITY GPS BASE STATION AND CALIBRATION. ANY DISCREPANCIES SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ENGINEER.

11. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE ZONE.

12. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE AT (ANNEXED TRANSITION) PER CEDAR CITY'S ZONING MAP.

13. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE AT (ANNEXED TRANSITION) PER CEDAR CITY'S FEMA AND LOMAR HYDROCOMPACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY MAP DATED JANUARY, 2011.

14. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE AT (ANNEXED TRANSITION) PER CEDAR CITY'S FEMA AND LOMAR HYDROCOMPACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY MAP DATED JANUARY, 2011.

15. ALL DOUBLE FRONTED LOTS SHALL HAVE A SIGHT OBSCURING FENCE ALONG THE BACK LOT LINE.

16. THIS SUBDIVISION FALLS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE ZONE.