Planning Commission Meeting

Meeting Minutes

September 22, 2026, 5:30 PM

DRAFT

1. Call To Order Of Regular Meeting

Chair Correa called the Enoch City Planning Commission regular meeting to order on Tuesday, September 22, 2026, at 5:29 PM.

a. Pledge Of Allegiance

Commissioner Jones led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

b. Invocation (2 Min.)

Commissioner Poulson offered the invocation.

c. Inspirational Thought

Commissioner Hoopes shared the inspirational thought, noting that as someone relatively new to the position, he was always looking to learn and grow. He shared the following quote: *"If you are not willing to learn, no one can help you. If you are determined to learn, no one can stop you."* Commissioner Jones asked who authored the quote, and it was later identified by Commissioner Hoops at the close of the meeting as a quote attributed to Zig Ziglar.

d. Approval Of Agenda For September 22, 2026

Chair Correa asked if anyone had questions or comments before the agenda was approved. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

> Motion to approve the agenda for September 22, 2026, was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Finlay. The motion carried unanimously.

e. Approval Of Minutes For September 8, 2026

Chair Correa asked if anything stood out from the minutes of the September 8, 2026 meeting that needed to be addressed, changed, or corrected. No concerns were raised.

> Motion to approve the minutes from September 8, 2026, was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Jones. The motion carried unanimously.

f. Conflict Of Interest Declaration

Chair Correa and all members of the Commission declared no conflicts of interest regarding any item on the evening's agenda.

2. Public Comments

Chair Correa noted that no members of the public were present and that public comments would be bypassed.

3. Public Hearing To Amend Enoch City Code 14.100.113 Application For Water Connection, 12.2400.2413 Water Rights, To Allow The City To Allow Water Rights From Basin 71

Chair Correa called for a motion to close the regular planning commission meeting and open the public hearing.

> Motion to close the regular planning commission meeting and open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner

DRAFT

> Poulson. The motion carried unanimously.

The public hearing was opened. No members of the public were present to offer comment. Chair Correa noted no public interest.

> Motion to close the public hearing and return to the regular planning commission meeting was made by Commissioner Finlay and seconded by Commissioner Poulson. The motion carried unanimously.

---

4. Consider Amending Enoch City Code 14.100.113 Application For Water Connection, 12.2400.2413 Water Rights, To Allow The City To Allow Water Rights From Basin 71 And Send A Recommendation To The City Council

City Manager Robinson opened the discussion by providing an update since the Commission's last meeting on this topic. He reported that the proposed code amendment had also been taken before the city water board, describing it as approximately an hour and a half of robust discussion. He noted that the water board's recommendation to the city council had been included in the Commission's packet. While acknowledging that the water board is not a recommending body for code matters, he explained that their recommended language had been incorporated into the proposed code amendment.

City Manager Robinson noted that Cedar City had also purchased Basin 71 water rights a couple of years prior and had done so successfully, though no one had yet utilized them. He remarked that Basin 71 water is not necessarily cheaper than Basin 73 water, and acknowledged that as of the current time, he did not foresee Basin 71 water rights being used heavily unless a developer had them exclusively and was committed to a project. He suggested that future changes — particularly the completion of new wells —

DRAFT

could make the option more attractive, adding that the city wanted to get ahead of the curve on this issue.

Council Member Trower provided an update on the status of the new wells, reporting that the Iron Springs well closest to Wecco was very close to completion, and that the well at the corner of BZI was approximately 600 feet deep, with crews currently inserting the screen and still needing to complete the casing. She anticipated both wells would be done within about a month. City Manager Robinson added that even if the code amendment were adopted immediately, it would not go into effect in any practical sense until those wells were completed.

City Manager Robinson outlined the water board's key recommendations for the language of the amendment, including a provision to only accept senior water rights from Basin 71 — specifically, rights pre-dating 1944, as established by the Basin 71 groundwater management plan. He noted that Basin 71 has been under a groundwater management plan longer than Basin 73, and that securing water rights from Basin 71 could prove just as difficult as obtaining them in Basin 73. City Council Member Trower confirmed this assessment, noting that the groundwater management plan limits new water rights and that a basin-to-basin depletion haircut would also apply to any Basin 71 rights accepted. City Manager Robinson acknowledged that this technical nuance had been captured by the water board's recommended language to ensure that any water rights accepted from Basin 71 would be genuinely usable.

Commissioner Finlay raised a broader concern regarding growth and water supply. She noted that the Basin 71 groundwater management plan allows for 21,000 acre-feet per year of use, while current usage stands at approximately 28,000 acre-feet per year — a deficit of 7,000 acre-feet. She asked pointedly, "Why are we still growing?" City Council Member Trower responded that because no new water rights were being issued, the controlling mechanism was the availability of senior water rights on the market. She explained that farmers selling those senior water rights — those predating 1944 — keep that water in service, and that the state would not curtail senior rights. Any junior rights, she explained, would be subject to curtailment whereby the state could say the rights exist on paper but the water cannot be used until the aquifer recovers.

DRAFT

Commissioner Finlay pressed further, expressing concern that the state itself was still encouraging more people and more businesses to come to the region even in the face of declining water availability. City Manager Robinson agreed it was "the million dollar question," and explained that from the city's regulatory standpoint, if a developer submits the required water rights and meets all applicable requirements, the city is legally obligated to approve the development. "There's nothing that we can do," he said. "We can't say we don't think there's enough water out there." He framed it as an age-old question the region has grappled with since its earliest settlement.

City Council Member Trower added important context, pointing out that unlike Washington County — where the Washington County Water Conservancy District already owns most of the water and developers pay an impact fee of approximately $17,000 — Iron County requires developers to bring their own water rights. She argued this requirement functions as a meaningful check on growth because it makes water the single most expensive component of any development. "The water rights curtails the building," she said, "because you can't build if you don't have water." She noted that requiring water rights had caused their price to rise dramatically for senior rights, effectively curtailing some building through market pressure.

A member of the Commission, Kyle Jones — identified from context as a developer familiar with construction costs — strongly affirmed this point, stating that water is "probably the single most expensive item in building a residential style home," and that it often exceeds the combined cost of fuel, heavy equipment, and land acquisition over the life of a project. He noted that in cities where developers cannot bring their own water and must pay an impact fee instead, that fee can be more than double the cost of purchasing water rights on the open market. He cited Cedar City's fee structure as an example, estimating it at roughly $30,000. He also acknowledged the social dimension of the question, observing that communities need to be able to grow to allow families and neighbors to afford to live near one another across all stages of life.

City Council Member Trower noted that the requirement to bring water rights — while contributing to affordability challenges — was specifically designed by cities and counties to curtail unchecked development and ensure accountability. She acknowledged, however, that those with money to build generally have the means to

DRAFT

acquire water as well, which circles back to broader concerns about affordable housing that the Commission agreed were beyond the scope of the evening's discussion.

The Commission reached consensus that the proposed amendment, incorporating the water board's recommended language regarding senior water rights and the basin-to-basin depletion haircut, was appropriate and should move forward.

> Motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the amendment to Enoch City Code 14.100.113 and 12.2400.2413 to allow water rights from Basin 71 was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Finlay. The motion carried unanimously.

---

5. Public Hearing For September 22nd, 2026, To Amend Enoch City Code 12.1700.1702 Permitted Uses

Chair Leonard called for a motion to close the regular planning commission meeting and open the public hearing.

> Motion to close the regular planning commission meeting and open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Jones and seconded by Commissioner Hoopes. The motion carried unanimously.

The public hearing was opened. No members of the public were present to offer comment.

> Motion to close the public hearing and return to the regular planning commission meeting was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Chair Correa. The motion carried unanimously.

DRAFT

6. Consider Amending Enoch City Code 12.1700.1702 And Send A Recommendation To The City Council

City Manager Robinson explained the background of this proposed amendment, noting that it originated from an issue identified by the city's building official. The zone in question — identified as the MXR-18 zone — currently permits single-family mobile homes on individual lots. However, a separate section of city code requires that the primary dwelling on any lot be at least 20 feet wide at the narrowest point of its first story. The problem, City Manager Robinson explained, is that standard single-width mobile homes do not meet that width requirement — only a double-wide configuration placed side by side would satisfy it. He noted that the city had not yet run into any enforcement issues on this particular street, as it is the only one zoned in this manner, but stated that the city did not want to find itself in a position where a developer presented a mobile home and the city could not lawfully deny it, only to discover later that the unit did not meet the code standard already on the books.

The staff recommendation was to remove single-family mobile homes as a permitted use in the MXR-18 zone, thereby eliminating the internal inconsistency in the code and avoiding future confusion. Commissioner Finlay commented that this seemed sensible, and there was no further discussion among the Commissioners.

> Motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the amendment to Enoch City Code 12.1700.1702 was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Poulson. The motion carried unanimously.

DRAFT

7. Set A Public Hearing For October 13th To Amend Enoch City Code 12.2500.2502, Section 12.2400.2407(B)(7), Sections 12.1200.1204(H) & (I)(III)] And Section 12.1200.1205(H) To Require A Traffic Study Done For Any Development That Accesses SR-130

City Manager Robinson introduced this item, explaining that the request came from UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation). UDOT had asked the city to codify a requirement that any subdivision or development tying in to SR-130 (Minersville Highway) must first complete a traf fic impact study. City Manager Robinson noted that SR-130 is state-owned and subject to stricter access control standards than city-owned roads, and that the corridor between the roundabout going south is prime commercial property in his view.

Commissioner Jones asked how much a traffic impact study typically costs. City Manager Robinson replied that it depends on the engineering firm, but that he had spoken with an engineer who indicated their studies run up to approximately $7,000 on the high end, though they often cost less than that. City Council Member Trower clarified that UDOT was requiring the studies so that the department would have the data needed to plan appropriately before granting new access points onto the highway. City Manager Robinson agreed, noting that UDOT already has strict standards regarding the spacing of intersections and that the traffic study would give them more information to inform those decisions.

Commissioner Poulson expressed concern that adding another required study could deter smaller, independent developers — "mom and pops" — by adding yet another expense to an already costly process. City Manager Robinson acknowledged that this was a possibility, saying, "That's just one more cost they have to figure out." However, Commissioner Hoopes offered a counterpoint, explaining that the traffic study could actually save developers significant money. He noted that the study would determine the minimum improvements required — whether that was a full intersection, a

DRAFT

deceleration lane, an acceleration lane, or simply an acceleration lane alone — rather than having UDOT mandate the full suite of improvements without data to support a lesser alternative. "It could save millions of dollars," he said. City Manager Robinson illustrated this point by referencing a recent project near 5600 South where a right-turn-only lane onto a city-owned road had come in at well over $1,000,000 just for asphalt and paint, for what was essentially a single turning lane.

Commissioner Jones raised an additional practical concern, asking whether the city could place a time restriction on how long the engineering firm conducting the traffic study could take to complete its work, noting that delay could be just as burdensome to developers as the cost itself. City Manager Robinson replied that this was a good idea and said staff would run it by UDOT representative Matt Rhodes before the October 13th meeting to see if such a provision could be included. Commissioner Jones elaborated that he was thinking specifically about a maximum amount of time stipulated within the agreement between the contractor and the engineering firm, and suggested it would be beneficial to have some kind of cap ensuring the study was completed within a defined window. City Manager Robinson agreed and said staff would look into adding that language, though he noted it might prove redundant given that the state already imposes a one-year window from the point of approval for a developer to act before having to restart the process.

Commissioner Finlay asked for clarification, noting that while it seemed obvious, she wanted to confirm for the record that a property owner cannot simply place a driveway directly onto Minersville Highway — even though city development exists on both sides of the road. City Manager Robinson confirmed this, explaining that it is precisely because SR-130 is a state-owned highway that it is subject to limited-access standards. City Council Member Trower noted that this type of situation — a state road running through or alongside a municipality — is common throughout Utah, and that the limited access standards exist to prevent the kinds of long-term traffic and safety problems that have plagued other cities where development was allowed to encroach directly onto major routes. "It's for thinking for the far future," she said, "but we appreciate it."

> Motion to set a public hearing for October 13th to amend Enoch City Code 12.2500.2502, Section 12.2400.2407(B)(7), Sections 12.1200.1204(H) & (I)(III),

DRAFT

> and Section 12.1200.1205(H) to require a traffic study for any development accessing SR-130 was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Jones. The motion carried unanimously.

---

8. Commission/Staff Reports

Public Works Director — Hayden White

- Crews had begun work on Mid Valley Road at old Highway 91 and were waiting for blue stake clearances due to a high-pressure gas line in the area. Once cleared, grubbing and subgrade work would begin. When complete, Midvalley Road will have a true 90-degree intersection onto old Highway 91.
- Staff continued working through meter error notifications flagged by the city's water tower monitoring system, identifying and notifying residents of leaks and unusually high nightly water usage.
- The city's irrigation line was scheduled to be shut off November 1st. Fall fertilizer applications were underway to ensure the product gets watered in before winter.
- Phase 3 of Valley Gate subdivision had its asphalt completed during the week of the meeting. Home construction on that phase was expected to begin within approximately two weeks.
- Phase 3 of Pine View subdivision, located across the street from Boebert Park, had all underground infrastructure installed and was preparing for asphalt.

Highway 91 Project Update

Commissioner Finlay asked about the apparent status of the Highway 91 improvement project, noting that sections looked complete but that there appeared to be freshly graded or scratched squares in the pavement, and that construction signage was still posted. Public Works Director White explained that the contractor was in the process of performing a smoothness test required by UDOT as a condition of final payment. A specialized truck equipped with sensors is driven over the roadway to identify areas

DRAFT

where old patches meet new, or where the surface does not meet the smoothness standard, and those areas must be ground down before the test is passed and payment is released. He added that the contractor also still needed to replace all roadway signs within the project limits with UDOT-standard signs and complete one final round of striping. He anticipated that the project would be substantially complete by approximately October 7th. He confirmed that even though work on the shoulder was minimal, UDOT's contract requires full traffic control measures to remain in place throughout.

Asphalt Drop on Minersville Highway

Chair Correa reported that he had called in a large drop of asphalt that had fallen from a contractor's truck onto Minersville Highway. He described vehicles swerving around it. He noted additional smaller drops trailing down the road, consistent with material sticking to truck tires as they drove through an existing asphalt pile. Public Works Director White also noted that he had struck a piece in the roundabout, describing the sensation as disorienting while turning. Chair Correa asked whether the contractor could be asked to clean up the remaining drops. Public Works Director White said he would raise the issue with UDOT, noting that since it was primarily their project, UDOT was the appropriate point of contact.

Horseshoe Well Update

Commissioner Finlay asked about the status of flushing the Horseshoe Well. Public Works Director White confirmed that the ordinance to allow a 24-hour flush had been passed, and that the contractor had indicated they would be on-site the previous Monday to begin setup. He had not yet had a chance to confirm whether the contractor had started. He explained that the contractor would first conduct several hours of test pumping to determine the well's yield before committing to the full flush procedure, and that once the decision to proceed was made, the city would notify neighboring residents in advance. Commissioner Finlay noted that he is frequently asked about the well by residents in the area and was glad to have an update to share.

DRAFT

Garden Park Flagpole — Blue Sky Drive

Chair Correa raised a concern about the flagpole at Garden Park on Blue Sky Drive. He noted that at some point there had been a plan to share the use of a lift with Cedar City to replace the rope on the flagpole, but he was uncertain whether that work had been completed. Public Works Director White acknowledged that the cemetery flagpole had been addressed but that Garden Park had apparently been missed. He confirmed the rope at Garden Park was in poor condition and noted that the flag itself — which he and his nephew had recently put up — had been damaged by wind and had been tied together at a break point. He said he would have someone address it the following day.

City Manager Robinson

City Manager Robinson offered several updates and informational items:

- **Meeting Schedule Reminder:** He reminded the Commission that there would be five Tuesdays in September, meaning the next regular planning commission meeting would not be held until October 13th — three weeks away — rather than the typical two-week interval. He asked members not to arrive a week early for the meeting.
- **October 13th Training:** He reminded the Commission that at the October 13th meeting, Rob Terry — the state planning training coordinator for the Property Rights Ombudsman's office — would be presenting training on annexations. The city council had also been invited. City Manager Robinson noted that he had attended Mr. Terry's annexation trainings previously and described them as high quality. He encouraged all commissioners to attend, as the training would count toward their minimum required annual training hours.
- **State ADU Legislation Update:** City Manager Robinson reported that during the last state legislative session, the legislature updated its standards regarding accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He explained that while cities had previously been required to allow internal ADUs on most lots, the new requirement now extends to external (detached) ADUs on lots exceeding 11,000 square feet. He noted that Enoch City's smallest single-family residential zone — the R-1-11 zone — has a minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet. He and Building Official Lynn had discussed two approaches: (1) simply adding external ADUs as a permitted use in

DRAFT

the R-1-11 zone, which would practically extend the requirement to all lots of that size or larger, including those that meet the minimum exactly; or (2) creating a new code section specifying that lots over 11,000 square feet may have an external ADU subject to existing ADU standards. He indicated staff was leaning toward the first approach — adding it as a permitted use in R-1-11 — and asked for Commission feedback. The Commission indicated general agreement, and City Manager Robinson said staff would bring it back as a formal code amendment.

- **Utility Bill Fee Schedule Change:** City Manager Robinson noted that the city council had approved a change to the fee schedule at their last meeting, adding a $1.00 per month fee for residents who wish to continue receiving hard-copy paper utility bills. He explained that the fee is intended to recover the approximate cost of postage, noting that a stamp costs roughly $0.78. The new fee would go into effect December 1st. He added that a hardship waiver process was still being developed for residents who cannot afford the $12 annual fee.
- **Public Comments on Agenda:** City Manager Robinson reported that he, the city attorney, and the mayor had recently discussed whether to remove the public comment item from the planning commission agenda. He noted that public attendance at planning commission meetings is relatively low and that comments received rarely pertain directly to planning commission business — more often they relate to city council matters or staff issues. The consensus from the city attorney meeting was to leave public comments on the agenda for now, as it was not creating a problem, but to revisit the question if circumstances changed. Commissioner Finlay noted that the planning commission meeting may actually be less intimidating to some members of the public than the city council meeting, which was offered as one reason to retain public comments. The Commission agreed to leave the item in place.
- **Impact Fee Summary:** City Manager Robinson reported that following the previous meeting's discussion of impact fees, he had researched the matter further using the city's AI-assisted code review tool. He reported that Enoch City's average all-in impact fees for a typical residential home range between approximately $15,000 and $17,000 depending on the zone, and noted that this figure is slightly below the national average. He indicated that staff would continue to monitor those figures to ensure the city was neither over- nor undercharging.

DRAFT

Council Member Trower

Council Member Trower indicated that most items had been covered by staff. Chair Correa asked whether she was still interested in pursuing code work related to large commercial vehicles parking in residential areas. Council Member Trower confirmed the interest. City Manager Robinson noted that the city currently has language in the code that generally prohibits such parking, and that the primary issue is enforcement rather than the absence of applicable regulations. He reported that several complaints had been received from neighbors unable to get through or out of their streets due to large vehicles, and that staff had already spoken with the police department about monitoring the situation. He offered to forward the relevant code language to Council Member Trower for her review and said staff would look into whether any additional changes were warranted.

Chair Correa offered a brief observation to close the staff reports, sharing that he had visited the city's new Lin's business that day for coffee and witnessed a young woman being interviewed for a job. He remarked that this was exactly the kind of economic activity the city needed, calling it "really good to see."

---

9. Adjourn

Commissioner Hoopes noted for the record that the inspirational thought shared earlier in the meeting was attributed to Zig Ziglar. He also suggested that the chair assign someone to prepare the inspirational thought for the next meeting in advance. Commissioner Jones mentioned that he had compiled a printed list of inspirational thoughts kept in his binder for future use.

> Motion to adjourn the September 22, 2026, Planning Commission meeting was made by Commissioner Hoopes and seconded by Commissioner Jones. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.

Created with ClerkMinutes

DRAFT