

City of Elwood Town

Planning Commission

September 15, 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, September 15, 2026.

The following members were present constituting a quorum: Britton Hayden, Quinn Hamson, Erika Bywater, and Keenan Haramoto. Isaac Walker (absent and submitted written notes)

OTHERS PRESENT: Talsan Schulzke (Zoning Administrator) Jones & Associates, Brian Davis (Town Council Rep), Karolina Munns (Planning Commission Secretary), Zack Pali, Mary LaMont

Welcome/Prayer/Pledge

Commission Chair Britton Hayden called the meeting to order. Commission Chair Hayden offered the invocation. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Haramoto

Minutes

August 4, 2026 & August 18, 2026

Commission Chair Hayden identified several corrections to the August 4, 2026 minutes, including correction of objection numbers, and a vote count correction. A commission member also noted a spelling correction for a name.

A motion to approve the minutes for August 4, 2026 and August 18, 2026, as amended, was made by Commissioner Hamson and seconded by Commissioner Bywater. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Commission Chair Hayden opened the public comment period. No public comments were received. The public comment period was closed.

Commission Business

Action Item A: Review and discuss written and verbal objections to the proposed zoning map and ordinances

Preliminary Matter — Approved Subdivisions as Agreements with the Town

Commission Chair Hayden introduced a policy consideration: that a recorded, approved subdivision should be treated as an agreement with the town for purposes of the zoning consistency review. The commission was in unanimous agreement with this framework, finding it consistent with the leniency already extended to property owners who had submitted incomplete applications.

Review of Eight Approved-Subdivision Properties

The Zoning Administrator presented eight properties identified as part of recorded subdivisions that had been erroneously proposed for agricultural (AG) zoning. The commission reviewed each and determined corrected zoning designations as follows:

1. Keenan and Martin Nelson Subdivision — Three parcels (approximately 1 acre each) to be rezoned to R-1-40, consistent with their recorded residential subdivision status
2. Reed Subdivision — One parcel (house substantially complete) to be rezoned to R-1-20
3. Rupp Property — One commercial parcel, part of a recorded commercial subdivision adjacent to the Chevron station, to be designated C-1
4. Power Line Subdivision — Identified as a recorded commercial subdivision; to be designated C-2, with further discussion deferred to Objection 131
5. KJE Subdivision — Two parcels to be designated R-1-20.
6. WKD Subdivision — One parcel, treated as a residential lot, to be designated R-1-40
7. Morrison Estates — One parcel (near the railroad tracks) to be designated R-1-40
8. Fuki Subdivision — One parcel (house nearly complete) to be designated R-1-20

Review of Verbal Objections from Second Public Hearing (Nos. 227–233)

Objection 227 — Eric Stevenson (KJE Subdivision): Noted as tied to Written Objection 120; deferred to that item for final resolution.

Objection 228 — Joyce Cox: Ms. Cox, located within the 300-foot notification buffer but outside Elwood Town limits, sought clarification on how the rezone would affect her property. No action was taken; action assigned to follow up with Ms. Cox if adequate communication had not already occurred.

Objection 229 — Cody Viebell: Deferred to Written Objection 131 for final resolution.

Objection 230 — LeeAnn Lundgren (Nathan Lundgren, Written Objection 119): Ms. Lundgren expressed concern regarding C-2 and C-3 designations as they relate to her family's insulation business. The commission noted this had been substantively discussed with her after the public hearing and would be resolved under Written Objection 119, which addresses skilled trades uses.

Objection 231 — Lewis Cabinets / Truck/Body Shop (tied to Written Objection 125): The objector questioned why adjacent properties and his spec-build lots were not designated C-3. The commission found no new evidence to alter the prior recommendation and reaffirmed that the property should remain C-2, with any request for C-3 requiring a formal rezone application with a specific use plan.

Objection 232 — Jared Fronk: Noted as tied to Written Objection 114 & 130; deferred to those items. A late email received on Friday night was noted, in which Mr. Fronk formally requested C-3 designation for the front parcel.

Objection 233 — Ms. Lamont: Ms. Lamont requested consideration of reinstating the 2025 approach allowing individual property owners to opt out of the rezone. The commission determined this would not address the underlying compliance issue with the general plan and took no action on the request.

Review of Written Objections (100 Series)

Objection 102 & 109 (Cody Veibell) / Objection 131 (Jared Fronk — Power Line Subdivision): The commission considered the commercial parcel (ending in 0099) within a recorded commercial subdivision. The commission found that the approved subdivision and prior town approval of storage unit plans constituted a sufficient basis to designate the parcel C-2 for consistency. The residential parcel (ending in 0101), where a home is currently occupied, was confirmed to remain R-1-40. (Vote: 4-0 for C-2 on commercial parcel; 3-0 for R-1-40 on residential parcel.)

Objections 103 & 104 — Fred Titensor (Valley Implement / Tractor Dealership): Mr. Titensor had recently purchased an additional 0.5-acre lot (parcel ending in 0076) south of his existing dealership to allow for future expansion. The commission found the recent purchase and stated commercial intent sufficient to recommend C-2 for the newly acquired parcel. (Vote: 4-0.)

Objection 108 — Carl Petersen: The parcel, which has been commercially zoned for an extended period and was previously listed for sale as commercial property, was recommended to remain C-2. (Vote: 4-0.)

Objection 110 — Marc Allred (Lewis Cabinets): The commission noted the objection aligned with the commission's own prior determination. Because Lewis Cabinets was already operating under a use that pre-dated the C-3 designation, the commission reaffirmed the property should be designated C-3 to reflect the original intent of the C-3 zone classification. (Vote: 4-0.)

Objections 114 & 130 / Verbal 214 & 222 — Jared Fronk (Polaris Property): The commission debated whether the vacant commercial parcel, which Mr. Fronk uses as collateral for operating loans for his Utah and Idaho businesses, should remain commercial or be changed to Ag. Mr. Fronk submitted documentation demonstrating the commercial value of the property to his ongoing business operations — the only objector to provide such financial evidence. The commission agreed this constituted a legitimate commercial land use and that the parcel should remain commercial. Regarding C-2 versus C-3, the commission declined to upzone to C-3 without a formal application and specific use plan, consistent with its treatment of similar requests. The property was recommended for C-2. (Vote: 3-0 on C-2; Isaac Walker's note excluded from C-2/C-3 sub-question as he lacked the benefit of full discussion.)

Objection 120 / Verbal 227 — Eric Stevenson (KJE Subdivision): Mr. Stevenson demonstrated substantial progress on the subdivision, including transfer of water rights and installation of a fire hydrant as required, and completed construction on one of three lots. The commission found the evidence of

investment and compliance with subdivision requirements compelling, and recommended the parcels be designated R-1-20. (Vote: 4-0.)

Objection 124 — Garth Day (Rupp Property/Commercial Subdivision Parcel): The parcel, which has been commercially zoned for at least ten years and was actively marketed as commercial property, was recommended for C-1 consistent with the recorded commercial subdivision finding. (Vote: 3-0; Commissioner Haramoto recused.)

Objections 121 & 129 — Garth Day and Micah Capener (Five Parcels Between Chevron and Church): This discussion addressed five parcels, four of which were presented by Mr. Capener (including a small sliver parcel) and one larger parcel by Mr. Day. The commission agreed to treat all five properties consistently given their shared history under the town's Master Planned Community (MPC) process, which spanned approximately five years. While neither objector established formal vested rights, the commission found the long-term good-faith planning effort constituted a meaningful basis for favorable consideration, comparable to the standard applied to other objectors who submitted incomplete but substantive applications. The commission declined to grant commercial zoning, citing the impracticality of split-zoning the combined Day parcel and the fact that the general plan projected the area as predominantly residential. All five parcels were recommended for R-1-20. (Vote: 3-0; Commissioner Haramoto recused)

Objection 106 — Randy Moulding (Consistency Correction): Commission Chair Hayden identified an inconsistency: one of Mr. Moulding's parcels located within the town-initiated annexation zone had been recommended for Ag, while comparable parcels in the same annexation area (Day properties) were being recommended for R-1-20. To ensure consistency, the commission updated its recommendation for the parcel inside the annexation zone to R-1-40, consistent with the lower-density designation applied to similar parcels farther from State Route 13.

Verbal Objection 211 / Written Objection 115 — Rasmussen Property (Consistency Correction): The Zoning Administrator's note on Verbal 211 was identified as inconsistent with the planning commission's prior decision on Written Objection 115. The Zoning Administrator was directed to update the record to reflect the commission's recommendation of R-1-20 for that property.

Objection 132 — Shawn Croney (Backyard Lots): The objector referenced two residential parcels that were currently zoned residential and erroneously described as commercial in the objection. The commission noted the objector had not yet acquired one of the referenced parcels and therefore lacked standing to speak to that parcel's zoning as a move to C-2 would be considered an upzone and needs to be requested by owner separate from citywide rezone. The commission recommended the parcel owned by the objector remain R-1-20 consistent with their current residential designation. (Vote: 4-0.)

Action Item B: Recommend to Town Council — Amendment to the Elwood Town Zoning Map & Ordinance 155.126, 155.140-143, 155.155-158, 155.170-174, 155.185-192, 155.205-210, 155.225-235

The commission discussed the process for forwarding its recommendations to the Town Council. Commission Chair Hayden confirmed with town legal counsel that the Town Council does not need to conduct an additional public hearing and may act upon the planning commission's recommendation directly, including reaching out individually to affected property owners where warranted. The commission agreed to submit a complete, amended zoning map alongside the supporting Google Sheets documentation to provide the Town Council with a clear reference record.

A motion to recommend to the Town Council the amendment to the Elwood Town Zoning Map and Ordinances as stated, with the Google Sheets and updated zoning map provided as backup references, was made by Commissioner Hamson and seconded by Commissioner Haramoto. The motion passed unanimously.

Work Meeting

No work meeting items were addressed.

Adjourn Meeting

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Haramoto and seconded by Commissioner Hamson. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:20pm.