

**Parowan City Planning and Zoning Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Agenda**  
**Parowan City Council Chambers – 35 East 100 North**  
**May 1, 2024 – 6:00 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Larry Zajac (Chair), Jamie Bonnett, Weston Reese, Troy Hoyt (Alternate), David Burton (Council Representative)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jerry Vesely, Heather Peet

**STAFF AND COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mollie Halterman (Mayor), Dan Jessen (City Manager), Keith Naylor (Assistant Zoning Administrator), Scott Burns (City Attorney), Judy Schiers (Secretary)

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Brody Swenson, Yvette Irons, Frank and Jeri Trautwein, Kristine Edwards, Eric Edwards, Linda Reese

**CALL TO ORDER:** Larry Zajac called the Public Hearing to order at 6:01 P.M.

**ZONE CHANGE REQUEST FOR A-0388-000-000 LOT 1, BLK 42, PLAT B, PAROWAN CITY SURVEY (181 E 500 N) AND PARCEL A-0388-0001-0000 LOT 4, BLK 42, PLAT B, PAROWAN CITY SURVEY FROM HIGHWAY**

**SERVICE TO R2:** Kristine Edwards said that her mom, Linda Reese, bought Lot 1 Blk 42 Plat B over forty-seven years ago and built a house. Twenty-five years later they bought the adjacent property (Lot 4) with the understanding that the property was zoned so that they could also, at some point, build a home there. They were not aware that the zoning had been changed until they came in to inquire about a building permit and were told that the property was zoned highway service and they could not build a home there. Kristine said her mom built her home in 1977 with the understanding it was in the commercial zone. She said since that time they understand that Highway 91 will be rerouted and they feel that changing this property to residential would be more family friendly in an area where there are already residential homes built.

Linda Reese said they built their shop on ¼ of the property and then built the home, understanding the zone was commercial. She said she didn't know the zone had changed.

Larry asked if they are requesting the two lots to be rezoned R2. Kristine said that was the original plan, and thought that zoning would be more flexible. Larry said that in a R2 Zone you could build a single-family home or you can build a duplex. He said with a conditional use permit in a R2 Zone, you could build a triplex or a fourplex. He thinks a R1 Zone may be more of what you want to do and give you more flexibility. Unless you want to build a duplex, he is not sure a R2 zone is what you may want. In a R1 Zone you can't build a duplex, but you can, as in any zone, subdivide the lot. You can build a house in one spot and then split the lot and put another single-family home. Weston said you have to look at if you want a duplex going in next door to you.

Larry said that with a conditional use permit, the developer would have to bring it to planning and zoning and then we make sure it fits in that neighborhood, but it is hard to deny a conditional use permit if they meet the requirements. He said if you can meet the street frontage, there could be a possibility of four lots here.

Dan said an R1 Zone would not prevent you from splitting the lot in the future. He said that these lots were never contiguous to the highway. Keith has been looking into when the zone changed and is unable to find anything. Dan said that UDOT's plan is to come down 700 North to have a true intersection which will make these lots farther away from the highway, which is one of the strongest arguments to consider the zone change.

Councilman Burton said that as far as having any real commercial value, it doesn't meet a highway service designation, because of the type of use it provides.

Kristine said if the property stays zoned Highway Services, it doesn't do her any good. Larry said that with the map provided it clearly shows there is residential across the street.

Kristine said that they would like to have R1 be considered for the zone change. She was told it would need to be re-noticed with the R1 designation.

There was a question on conflict of interest. Weston Reese is the son to the property owners. Larry said that Weston can declare a conflict of interest, but unless he receives monetary gain from this item, he can still vote. He said when in doubt, just declare a conflict of interest.

This item will be re-posted with a change from Highway Services to R1 and a public hearing set for May 15<sup>th</sup>. Larry said that someone would need to be to the next hearing, in case there were questions.

There were no other public comments.

Weston Reese made a motion to close the rezone public hearing. Jamie Bonnett seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of this motion.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW MANUFACTURED HOME SALES ON PARCEL A-2021-0001-0000 (APPROXIMATEY 350 SOUTH 2200 WEST PAROWAN, UTAH ADDRESS NOT YET ASSIGNED):** Dan wanted to clarify that this is to have a public hearing for a conditional use permit for a commercial business on this property. This is not a conditional use permit on a subdivision or PUD. That may happen, but that would come through as a different item. This is for a commercial piece of property and they are asking for a conditional use permit for a model home sales office.

Brody Swenson said the manufacturing of the homes is in a factory in Boise. They ship the home in two to three halves and send them out on semi and then homes get placed with on a slab or permanent foundation. He said we want three model homes at this location.

There were no other public comments.

Jamie Bonnett made a motion to close the public hearing on this item and move into the regular Planning and Zoning meeting. Weston Reese seconded the motion and all members approved the motion.

**ANY CONFLICTS WITH ITEMS ON THE AGENDA** – Weston Reese declared a conflict with item number five, "Zone Change Request" and said he will not be voting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Larry said he was not at the April 3 meeting, so he doesn't have any input. He did not have a problem with the minutes from April 17, 2024. Troy Hoyt had some concerns on the way a motion was worded. He said that on page two, first paragraph, the motion is worded "not to be

effective and contingent on the two shipping containers being moved off the property.” He said he thinks that is not worded correctly and should be changed to read “to be effective on the two shipping containers being moved off the property.” He said otherwise it sounds as if it would never be effective. Because Heather made the motion and Jerry Vesely seconded the motion, and neither were present at this meeting, the commission decided not to approve the minutes.

Jamie Bonnett made a motion to approve the April 3, 2024 minutes and to table the minutes from April 17<sup>th</sup> until Jerry and Heather are present. Weston Reese seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of this motion.

**ZONE CHANGE REQUEST FOR A-0388-000-000 LOT 1, BLK 42, PLAT B, PAROWAN CITY SURVEY (181 E 500 N) AND PARCEL A-0388-0001-0000 LOT 4, BLK 42, PLAT B, PAROWAN CITY SURVEY FROM HIGHWAY SERVICE TO R2:** Jamie Bonnett made a motion to table item number five “Zone Change Request” until a public hearing can be held for a change from Highway Service to R1. Troy Hoyt seconded the motion. All members present vote in favor of this motion.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW MANUFACTURED HOME SALES ON PARCEL A-2021-0001-0000 (APPROXIMATEY 350 SOUTH 2200 WEST PAROWAN, UTAH ADDRESS NOT YET ASSIGNED):** Larry said what we are looking at now is the compatibility for this property to surrounding properties. Brody handed out a rough draft. He said after talking with Dan there are some changes because of storm drain issues. Dan said to clarify this property is in a flood zone and they will need an elevation certificate to allow building and to allow the storm drain conveyance along the back side of the freeway.

Larry and Dan agreed that at the time of building there will be a building permit application that will take care of setback issues, etc. Brody said that there will only be three model homes on the property, not the four that is on the handout. He said they want the homes horizontal to the freeway, to be seen by freeway traffic.

Larry said that the only condition that comes to mind would be the number of model homes allowed on this property. He asked the commission if they want to limit that number. He said that the conditional use permit goes with the property, and if somewhere down the line they want seven model homes, now it becomes a parking lot and not a show room. Dan said now it becomes a different use. Weston asked how many different models they have. Brody said 25 and understands what Larry is getting at. David asked if these models will be changed out. Brody said yes, but not consistently. Troy asked what is being done with the space where number four was, now that you are only requesting for number three. Brody said that it was drawn on there, but he never intended another trailer there.

Larry said that we cannot dictate the way to turn or place the model homes on the lot, but our main concern should be that further down the road, someone else buys the property and it becomes a storage lot for manufactured homes as opposed to a show room. Scott said that would then be a storage use and it would be in conflict with home sales. Dan said we need to be careful in setting parameters that are not addressing a negative impact. When it comes to conditional uses, there needs to be a negative impact that has been identified as being valid meaning is it noise, light, traffic, and what is the negative impact of three homes on the lot, rather than telling him how to run his business. We need to identify the negative impact first. Larry said he will restate the negative impact as housing density in any neighborhood against lot size. Scott said this isn’t comparing a neighborhood, this is a

commercial lot. David said that any decisions need to be objective and not subjective. We all have opinions but this needs to be based on regulations and ordinances.

Larry said his recommendation would be to consider limiting the number of models homes on display on this lot not to exceed the density of our residential zones. He said to think of this as a single-family residence and how many could be put on an acre. With a lot of 10,000 square feet, that would easily be four. He said he thinks we could reasonably increase that a little bit to maybe six, but need to consider our residential zone density. Weston said that it makes sense to follow the current density rules in the residential district. David said there is not going to be anybody living in these and it is for sales. Brody said this lot is .91 acres.

Dan said this is a commercial use in a commercial zone, but in the table of uses it is conditionally approved, not just permitted. Dan said in Utah State Code 10-9A-507, "A land use authority shall approve a conditional use if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards". Dan said if there are reasonable imminent detrimental effects that can be identified, we can impose some conditions to mitigate those. If we can, we have to approve it, if we can't then we have to deny it. We need to be careful to dictate something that isn't a reasonable detrimental effect.

Larry said that Dan and Keith will be the enforcement, so when there are too many houses on this property, where do we end up. Dan said then we will take care of that. He said we are not trying to mitigate a reasonable detrimental effect, but an aesthetic problem. Someone would have to provide evidence that it will affect property values, but need to have evidence to show how it would affect property values. If they said there will be too much traffic, noise, or dust, they have to have something that says how they will mitigate that.

Jamie Bonnett made a motion to allow a conditional use permit to allow Manufactured Homes Sales on Parcel A-2021-0001-0000. Weston Reese seconded the motion. Troy Hoyt voted in favor. Larry Zajac voted nay. The motion passed.

**ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNIT) PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AT 155 NORTH 500 WEST: FRANK TRAUTWEIN.** Frank Trautwein said that they want to put a duplex added to their existing house and feel they have met all the lot size regulations, it is just configuration that they are having a problem with. When they met with Planning and Zoning before, they talked about putting a duplex with a breezeway or small garage. He said at the last meeting, the City Attorney told him a duplex is two living units in one structure. Frank said that may apply to new construction but not necessarily to a remodel type of construction. He said he submitted some plans showing a single garage next to the double garage and then the other unit added on. Frank said that the site plan shows a single-family garage that doesn't go clear back to the proposed addition, only part way back, because he has a green-house he doesn't want to take down. He said he couldn't find a definition of a common wall anywhere except in an Oregon code, that said as long as you are connected 25%, it is okay.

Troy Hoyt asked if the existing house will have a connection to the proposed building. He said no, it is connected by garages.

Larry asked the dimension of the existing home. Frank is not sure. He thinks it is 36' deep (east to west). Jamie asked if he is wanting to do a single garage attached to the existing home. Frank said no, what he

would really like is to build is a detached building with a gravel drive in between, but he submitted these plans. He said there is not information anywhere in the state of Utah on configuration on how it can be built. He submitted an Oregon study which showed different configurations of duplexes, but no information in the state of Utah. Larry said that the document that was used for Oregon is applicable to cities in Oregon with populations of 25,000 or more, so would not be a comparison.

Larry said he is looking at the front elevation and seeing an existing garage on the primary residence and to the left of that what appears to be a single car garage door. He asked if between those two garages there is a wall. Frank said that the new garage and old garage have a common wall that extends part way back, attached floor to ceiling, and connected to the existing roof line. Larry said he would recognize that as a duplex.

Larry said there are other considerations regarding this application. There is not a formal application because fees have not been paid. Frank said he talked with the City Manager and the Zoning Administrator and they said to just submit the plans. Larry said that for you to have a complete application, the fees need to be paid and wants to make sure his expectations are realistic at this point. He said another consideration is that this home may be non-conforming. It appears that the set-backs where the pickup truck is does not meet the minimum set-backs and the homes would be sitting on top of utility easements. Larry said he can't determine that from the photos provided. If this is a nonconforming property, it needs to be modified and brought into compliance. Larry said he is not able to make an informed decision without those dimensions. Frank said there isn't a utility easement on his property. Larry said according to your deed there is. There is a 7 ½-foot to the north, 7 ½-foot to the west, 7 ½-foot to the south and going onto the next lot to the south, there is a 7 ½-foot easement so that makes a 15-foot easement there and then a 10-foot utility easement on the street. He said again there are not showing on any of your drawings, which makes it difficult for this commission to make a decision. The house itself is not dimensioned, which makes it difficult to figure things out. It would be good to know where the block wall is to the south. Frank said the block wall is 2 inches away from the property line, but the property line is no longer existing because we got rid of that property line. He said that the house he owns on the corner had a lot line adjustment and he made it a 10,000 square foot lot and put the rest of that property onto our primary property. Larry said that wasn't showing on the property plans at the County. Larry said you may need to get this straightened out with the County. Frank was frustrated that he wasn't given this information before appearing at the Planning Commission.

Larry said the agreement with the city staff was, you are not paying a fee because they had answers for your questions, but there was some kind of stand-off at some point. Frank left the meeting. Dan said when there is something that is in a gray area and not easy to figure out, we will bring it here to get an interpretation. He asked what the best way to go about this is, that is best for the Planning Commission and the property owner. If the issue is vague and the code is not clear, we feel we need to bring it to the commission and have a discussion. Larry said you have the administrative leeway to make decisions and follow the code, but where the code is vague, he is fine for it to come here. Weston said property owners should know there are utility easements on their property. Larry said we need a complete application because he feels the applicant wants the Planning and Zoning to make decisions.

Dan said what he is hearing is good and actionable. We need a complete application with dimensions. He said the problem with this item was we needed to determine what a duplex is. Larry said in preparing for this discussion he looked up Utah Code 38-11-102 which says a duplex is a single unit with

two separate living units and a twin home share a common wall with both living units having a common wall running along the lot line. Scott was concerned that this issue was still being discussed and wanted to make sure that a motion was not made, since the applicant left. Larry said it was just a discussion.

Jamie said she understands where Mr. Trautwein is coming from in not spending \$6,000.00 to have plans drawn up if we deny the application. Weston said he thinks we would accept hand drawn plans as long as all dimensions and information is on the plans. Larry said he needs to figure out the PUEs and the lot line issue, as the county records do not reflect that quick claim deed. If the lot is non-conforming, we need to vote no with recommendation to the applicant to go to the board of adjustment.

Dan said if Frank comes in the office, he will need to present a complete application, pay a fee, and we need to figure out if this is non-conforming. Frank did present something that looks like a duplex, but we need a flood plain permit, and if non-conforming we would deny it and it would need to go to board of adjustments.

**MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN:** Larry said that there was an open house last night for the Master Transportation Plan with a nice introduction to some of the features. He said he would encourage the Planning and Zoning Commission members to get the information and look at it. Dan said he would have Callie put it on the City website and have Judy forward the information to the Commission members. Larry said one of the items of interest is the long-range plan, greater than 10-year for implementation and the short-range plan, with a 10-year horizon. He said one point of interest is conceptually, Holyoak Lane, east of the Maverik is going to be pushed fully and Center Street will not be the Brian Head road any longer. The proposed road is an 88-foot road which leaves one foot on each side of the easement. This would be quite a change. This item is set for a public hearing on May 15<sup>th</sup>. There was a discussion regarding trade-off between tourism and the traffic through residential areas.

Larry said there are ways to give public comments, on-line and a comment form in the city office. He said that the future land use map will need to be updated. Dan asked if the future land use map shows future roads. Larry said yes. He said that we need to look at this plan and make a recommendation to adopt and make it a part of the general plan. It starts with the Planning Commission. He said, we will need to do some homework on this to make the best recommendations. Larry said that the roads need to be on it so that we can make the best-informed decisions and there are no conflicts between the Future Land Use Map and the Master Transportation Plan.

Weston said that the future land use map is a recommendation not a mandate. Larry said, as is the general plan. Larry asked about an overlay on the future land use map. Dan will ask about an overlay. Dan asked Larry to get with him so he understands what he is wanting to see done.

**DISCUSSION ON ADDITION TO LAND USE CODE – STRUCTURES AND USES PROHIBITED IN ZONES UNLESS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED:** Dan said that this topic has come up a few times and this is not an action item. Dan questioned in the table of uses in residential areas, if something is not expressly permitted, is it prohibited. He said for example, if you wanted to open a marijuana dispensary, and our table of uses doesn't say anything about it, is it permitted, a conditional use or prohibited. Our code is silent.

Dan said several cities have code in their land use chapter by the table of uses, that says if it isn't permitted it is prohibited. He said he couldn't find anything in state law. Someone wanted to put a windmill in their back yard, it was not over 35 feet, it was 28 feet tall. If it is over 35 feet, you have to get

airport clearance. In looking at this, if they want to get a building permit and meet setbacks, I said they could do that. Larry said if it isn't a use in that code, it is prohibited. Dan said he felt we needed to have a discussion about this.

Troy said we would want to get a better understanding of the code and if they were written in a way to suggest we put language that Dan is proposing, or the opposite and which would make the most sense. Larry said that it seems in terms of applicability, we would be talking primarily land use code, Title 14, and Title 15. Dan was suggesting that they be put somewhere by the table of permitted uses. That would fall in Title 15. He agrees we need to look closer to decide where we need to put it. Larry asked Troy what he meant by the opposite. Troy said when the code was written, it told you the things that were permitted. But, to accomplish what we want the code to do, it doesn't necessarily mean there was any thought given in the drafting of the code and all the possibility of things we should permit and why stop it at only things that were considered were in the code. Larry said in the windmill example, if there is no code and a 65-foot windmill is being proposed, if you look at those that do have code, there are things that such as lot setbacks, or if the windmill is 65 feet tall it needs to be 65 feet from the fence so it doesn't fall and ruin the fence. He said in my opinion when something has been approved, some thought has been given to it and guardrails and boundaries for a conditional use. He said you don't just approve it because you don't talk about it. He said another extreme example, if someone wanted a mini nuclear power plant in their backyard that ties into the grid, it doesn't say we can't but there may be some code that doesn't permit it. He said we do consider things and when we find something that is not allowed, we look at it and try to find somewhere to add it to the code.

Dan gave examples from two different sources.

Utah county code titled Structures and Uses Prohibited in Zones Unless Expressly Permitted - "Structures and uses of land which are not expressly permitted within a zone are hereby declared to be expressly prohibited therein. Any use not expressly permitted can only become permitted by amendment to this land use ordinance."

Salt Lake City Code titled Uses not Permitted - "Any use not specifically permitted or conditionally permitted in this table of permitted and conditional uses for the specific zoning district is prohibited. Only uses listed as a "P" or a "C" in the table of permitted and conditional uses for a district shall be allowed where designated."

Larry said from his perspective he likes this and wants to figure out where it would fit in the code. Mayor Halterman likes the idea of adding to our code if it is not in the list as being permitted, it is prohibited.

Dan said if there is a statement in our code, that it is not permitted, someone could petition to change the code to have it permitted.

Scott said defensibly the statement "Structures and Uses are Prohibited in Zones Unless Expressly permitted" would work. Then the applicant can petition the planning commission if they want something not permitted.

Dan will draft language and look at the code to determine where in the code it should be inserted. Judy will advertise for a public hearing for May 15, 2024.

**LAND USE CODE DEFINITIONS:** Larry handed out a draft definition for Land Use Code. Jamie asked about “Hotel or Motel, Residential” – It says kitchenettes or kitchen facilities. She said she has stayed in hotels without those facilities and wanted to understand this. Larry said that this would mean occupancy of longer periods.

Dan had a question regarding the add on habitable structure “which does not include recreational vehicles,” he is unclear on this. Larry said that means that a habitable structure includes items listed, but that a recreational vehicle is not a habitable structure as an ADU. Weston said we could also say “excludes recreational vehicles.”

Larry will add the word means behind the title “Complete Application.”

Scott said Utah code has a definition of habitable structure. It says “Habitable structure means a structure that has the apparent purpose of or is used for lodging or assembling person or conduction business whether a person is actually present or not.” (Utah Code 76-6-101)

Larry said that he likes the definition he found and as long as it is not sideways of state definition, he feels good about leaving it. Troy asked if we wanted to make an addition from the state code that says it is not only for overnight stay but you can conduct business.

Larry read the changes “Habitable Structures means a structure that has facilities to accommodate people for an overnight stay, or to conduct business, including, but not limited to, residential homes, apartments, condominiums, hotels, motels, and manufactured homes; and excludes recreational vehicles.”

Troy Hoyt made a motion that we adopt the Land Use Code Definitions with the changes to Complete Application, Habitable Structures, and Hotel, Motel, Residential as discussed. Jamie Bonnett seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of this motion and it passed.

**IADU AND EXTERNAL ADU PROPOSED CODE:** Larry said this has been talked about before and we had options to consider and made some decisions to leave some out. He incorporated those changes and now has what he would consider is the final draft, pending comments from the commission.

Troy said in respect to the definition to primary dwelling it says “means a single-family dwelling that is detached and is occupied as the primary residence of the owner of record.” Did we mean to say that no property owner can rent both his home and an Airbnb attached to his structure. Larry said this had nothing to do with rentals at the moment. This has to do with internal accessory dwelling unit. This definition is the Utah State definition, copied word for word. Whether they can rent or not rent will be applied in the short-term rental definition.

Larry asked about address designations for Internal Adus. Judy said that we use a primary address then separate with the addition of unit A and unit B.

Larry said he wanted to point out that in this code that was decided in an earlier meeting, under requirements “separate utility connections and separate utility meters are prohibited.” Larry said that separate addresses with the addition of unit A and unit B for emergency services would be a valid addressing concern, but whether we wanted to have separate utility connections and meters is another



issue. Dan said we could leave it open in land use code and define in our water and electric code. We don't have to define it here. Dan would suggest we get strike that sentence.

Jamie said it says required parking shall be paved with a hard surface. She said that we changed our hard surface definitions to say asphalt and thinks gravel would be sufficient. Larry changed it to required parking shall be gravel or paved with a hard surface.

Jamie made a motion to accept and approve the IADU definitions as discussed with the changes made and send to public hearing on May 15<sup>th</sup>. Troy Hoyt seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor and the motion passed.

Larry handed out both the external Adu and short-term rental draft code and would like comments. He would like the commission to take both of these handouts home and would like comments. He said these are not outlined properly, but considered a working copy. He said he will be adding more to the documents, but wants the commission to have ideas and comments for the next meeting. The definitions that we just approved are listed in these documents as well, so you can skip over those, because we have already reconciled these.

Weston had a question about a barndominium square feet. Larry said that is something that we could look at, and make notes to bring back for the next meeting.

**WATER CONSERVATION LAND USE CODE:** Larry said there are two things to consider on this code:

- 1- recommendation on where to place in the code and;
- 2- the recommended statement.

Larry said that in Parowan Code 14 we have 14.14.050 "Water Supply". We could make a new code 14.14.055 immediately following that to put the statement. Dan said his thought is it would be in the water conservation code and putting a statement in the subdivision development code that redirects to the water code. Larry said that is what is in the recommended statement.

Larry asked about it being available for the public hearing. Dan said he can have it ready for the public hearing on May 15<sup>th</sup>.

David asked about the state requirements. Dan said that those don't need to go to the Planning Commission, they will be added into the water conservation plan.

After a discussion it was determined that it would be most appropriate to put it under 14.14.105 "Water Conservation Requirements" and then point it back to our water conservation code.

Jame said this says essentially we are requiring any new subdivisions to use our landscaping code. Dan said we are mandating some things, but not super restrictive at this point.

Larry said that is what is in the recommended statement "Water conservation measures shall be implemented in subdivisions developed after the (date of this code). At a minimum water conservation measures will meet the applicable requirements of Titel 7 of PMC and specifically the requirements in 7.xx.xxx. Subdivisions containing three (3) lots or less are exempt from this statement."

Larry said that we will need to know where in the water code this will go.

Troy Hoyt made a motion that a section entitled “Water Conservation Requirements” shall be added to Parowan Municipal Code at 14.14.105 and the recommended statement as provided will be submitted for community review via a public hearing. Jamie Bonnett seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor and the motion passed.

**BUILDING PERMIT UPDATE – KEITH NAYLOR:** Keith provided an update on building permits. He said in April four permits were issued. One new residential, one demolition of a home and new residential, one addition with garage and bonus room and administrative approval of the windmill we talked about.

Jamie asked about the demolition of the house on 200 South. Keith said that was started in March. Larry said building permits are good for a year and some sit on it for a while. Keith said that the home needed to be torn down because a tree damaged the home, but he hasn’t seen any new applications at this address.

Larry said in visiting with Keith, he indicated that he was finding numerous contradictions to our code and will be bringing these to the commission.

**MEMBER REPORTS:** David Burton said just to reiterate there will be five public hearings on May 15, 2024. Dan said there is a training open from Five County and Utah League of Cities and Towns . He will forward the information to Judy and she will send it out. He said you have to register by May 15, 2024 and it is free.

Larry said he had a discussion with Mike Hansen with Hansen and Associates, who are rewriting our subdivision code. The funding for that expires at the end of the calendar year. If Hansen and Associates are not finished by that time, the funding is. Mike Hansen agreed to have their initial report for the first Planning meeting in June. This will be on the June 5<sup>th</sup> agenda. He said he is hoping to get the document early and hoping they can tell us where the state code and the city code conflicts and is contradictory. He also talked about the training on May 8, 9, 10<sup>th</sup> and doesn’t start until noon on the eighth.

**ADJOURN:** Weston Reese made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:26 P.M. Troy Hoyt seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.