

City of Elwood Town

Planning Commission

August 18, 2026 meeting minutes

The Board of the Planning Commission of Elwood Town met at the Elwood Town Hall, 5235 West 8800 North, Elwood, Utah, at 7:00 PM on Tuesday, August 18, 2026.

The following members were present constituting a quorum: Britton Hayden, Erika Bywater, Isaac Walker and Keenan Haramoto

OTHERS PRESENT: Talsan Schulske(Zoning Administrator) Jones & Associates, Phil Shimek(Town Council Rep), Karolina Munns(Planning Commission Secretary), Brenda Jacques, Ron Jacques, Mary LaMont, Marc Allred, Jeff John

Welcome/Prayer/Pledge

Commission Chair Hayden called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. The invocation was offered by Commissioner Bywater. The Pledge of Allegiance followed by Commissioner Haramoto.

Public Comment

Commission Chair Hayden opened the public comment period. No public comment was offered. The public comment period was closed.

Commission Business

Work Meeting

Discussion Item A: Planning Commission Training Session led by Chair

Commission Chair Hayden led the Commission through a reading and discussion of Chapter 30 of the Elwood Town Code, which governs the establishment, membership, procedures, and authority of the Planning Commission. Commissioners reviewed the chapter in full, with members reading sections aloud in turn.

Discussion Item B: Briefly address schedule plan for Rezone Objection Discussions being moved to 1 Sept

Commission Chair Hayden confirmed that all discussion of specific rezone parcel objections is postponed to the September 1, 2026 meeting. The postponement was attributed to Commissioner Hamson's absence and his inability to provide written comments in advance, as well as other scheduling demands on the Chair during the preceding week. Zoning Administrator Schulske was asked to finalize written recommendations for the parcels

addressed prior to the postponement point (approximately 121 of 128) so that the public could review them in advance. The Administrator indicated these were nearly complete.

Discussion Item C: Discuss new public hearing plan and quick review of the 27 properties involved

Commission Chair Hayden outlined the plan for the September 1, 2026 meeting. The meeting will open with a public hearing on 27 properties that are part of a follow-up rezone action. Following that public hearing, the Commission will not discuss those 27 properties immediately, as a 10-day written objection period must be observed. The Commission will then proceed to deliberate on the properties from the July 21 public hearing.

Discussion Item D: Discuss Proposed Code Changes: Proposal to remove requirement to post notices to newspaper [31.01(E)(2-all), 32.05(C), 155.038(B)(1), 155.039(B)(3), 155.042(C)]

Commission Chair Hayden presented a proposal to remove the existing code requirement to post public notices in a newspaper, noting that this is no longer a state requirement and that the task creates an administrative burden with limited public benefit given declining newspaper readership. The Chair identified all code sections containing the word "newspaper" as the scope of the proposed change.

Zoning Administrator Schulske was assigned to research current Utah State Code to confirm whether newspaper publication is still required for any of the above notice types before any formal amendment is drafted.

Discussion Item E: Discuss Proposed Code Changes: Cleanup additional RD-1 & RD-2 references over to RAD-20 and RAD-40 [155.127(B)(1)], 155 Chapter Table of Contents references 175 and 176]

Commission Chair Hayden identified two remaining cleanup items from a prior code revision. First, §155.127(B)(1), within the additional scheduled uses section, still references the former zone designations "RD-1" and "RD-2" rather than the current designations "RAD-20" and "RAD-40." This appeared to be either a scanning or typographical error from the prior revision. No Commissioner expressed any concern with correcting this. Second, the Chapter 155 table of contents still lists the old zone titles under sections 175 and 176. Zoning Administrator Schulske indicated he believed the numbering may auto-update, but agreed to verify with staff and confirm whether a formal ordinance amendment to the table of contents is required.

Discussion Item F: Discuss Proposed Code Changes: Proposal to add a new Use for Professional Trades within Schedule of Uses for C-2 and possibly a definition; consider whether to split this into with/without material retail sales [155.023, 155.126]

Commission Chair Hayden introduced the proposal to add a formal "professional trades" or "skilled trades" use category to the Schedule of Uses at the C-2 designation, noting that the current code lacks an explicit listing for

licensed trade contractors such as electricians, plumbers, HVAC technicians, and similar businesses. This gap was identified as potentially discriminatory toward blue-collar and trade-based businesses compared to professional office uses such as medical or legal practices.

Discussion among Commission members and members of the public present yielded the following key points:

The terminology "skilled trades" was suggested by Zoning Administrator Schulske as preferable to "professional trades," to better differentiate the new category from the existing "professional offices" definition and to reflect the nature of the work. Several members and public attendees supported this framing. One attendee suggested "skilled and professional trades" as a broader, more encompassing term.

A licensed trade contractor present in the audience described the operational reality of trade businesses, noting that they commonly store inventory, have service vehicles coming and going, and may store materials on site, which could cause such operations to superficially resemble warehouses or distribution centers. The Commission discussed the line between incidental material storage as part of a trade operation versus primary warehousing or supplying to other contractors. The consensus was that the primary use of a property should determine its classification, and that trade businesses with incidental material storage should generally remain a C-2 use.

The Commission considered whether to split the proposed category into uses with and without retail sales. After discussion, Commission Chair Hayden expressed a preference for a single, unified definition covering skilled trades regardless of incidental retail activity, noting that if an operation's primary use shifted to retail supply, it would then need to be reclassified accordingly. Zoning Administrator Schulske voiced that keeping the definition somewhat broad would allow the Commission to interpret edge cases on their merits rather than being constrained by overly specific language.

Multiple public attendees affirmed the importance of a clear, welcoming pathway for skilled trade businesses to establish operations in Elwood, noting that past ambiguity had caused prospective businesses to look elsewhere. The Commission was encouraged to look to DOPL (Utah Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing) contractor licensing classifications as a possible framework for defining the scope of qualifying uses under this new category.

Zoning Administrator Schulske received an assignment to draft proposed language for a new "skilled trades" or "skilled and professional trades" use category and definition for §155.023 and §155.126, to be reviewed by the Commission at a future meeting. Draft should reference DOPL licensing classifications as a framework and should not bifurcate the category based on the presence or absence of incidental retail sales.

Discussion Item G: Discuss Proposed Code Changes: Discuss whether to make modifications to add C-1 and/or C-2 to Printing in Schedule of

Uses and possibly adjust definition; compare to Lithography, Monument Work, etc. for consistency [155.023, 155.126]

Commission Chair Hayden raised the issue of inconsistency between related use categories in the current Schedule of Uses. The three uses examined were Lithography (including photo engraving), Printing (including engraving, blueprinting, and duplicating), and Monument Work.

The Commission further observed that the existing definitions do not account for modern forms of printing and engraving, including laser engraving, laser etching, and three-dimensional printing, all of which represent common contemporary trade uses. The language, last significantly updated during a prior code revision, was considered outdated. Members noted that the term "printing" today connotes a very wide range of activities—from a neighborhood copy and sign shop, to large-format industrial publishing operations, to residential-scale 3D printing—and that the current code does not meaningfully distinguish among these.

The Commission agreed that Zoning Administrator Schulske should research how comparable municipalities classify these uses and return with a proposal that may consolidate or reorganize the three existing categories, add a modern equivalent capturing laser engraving and 3D printing, and assign appropriate commercial zone designations based on the actual intensity of the use. Commission Chair Hayden noted this is not an urgent item relative to the rezone work, and that it should be addressed when capacity allows.

Discussion Item H: Discuss Proposed Code Changes: Discuss potential additions to code to add specific conditions related to Conditional Uses — e.g. noise, smell, sound, light, other nuisances [Code Sections TBD]

Commission Chair Hayden opened a discussion on whether the town's existing code provides adequate enumerated conditions that the Commission can impose on conditional use permits, noting that conditions must already exist in code in order to be applied to a specific permit. Without explicit code provisions for nuisance-type conditions such as noise, odor, or light, the Commission's ability to impose such conditions on a conditional use applicant is limited.

Commission members and public attendees discussed several specific nuisance concerns, including nighttime decorative lighting (such as programmable LED facade lighting) and its potential impact on neighboring residences and the nearby migratory bird habitat area. One attendee noted the apparent tension between existing commercial lighting requirements—which specify minimum illumination levels for safety—and concerns about light pollution. Commission Chair Hayden confirmed that the town does have a commercial lighting section addressing downward-directed lighting and parking lot illumination standards, but acknowledged that residential lighting is not currently regulated in the same manner.

Regarding noise, the Commission noted the existence of a nuisance ordinance under Title 9, which addresses specific enumerated nuisances including barking dogs, but does not include a general decibel-based noise standard. It was observed that a measurable noise threshold would be straightforward to establish but that calibrating the right standard for a rural agricultural community—where farm operations at unusual hours are a normal and protected activity—requires careful consideration. Agricultural uses were recognized as generally protected from nuisance claims under state right-to-farm principles.

The Commission acknowledged that the current conditional use framework functions as a "yes, with conditions" mechanism rather than a discretionary approval or denial tool, and that having clearly enumerated nuisance conditions in the code strengthens the Commission's ability to protect neighbors without blocking legitimate uses. No specific code additions were finalized at this meeting, but the discussion identified noise (decibel standard), odor, and lighting as areas warranting further research in neighboring rural municipalities.

Work Meeting

There being no further business, Commission Chair Hayden adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm. The next regular meeting of the Elwood Town Planning Commission is scheduled for September 1, 2026.