

City of Elwood Town

Planning Commission

February 17, 2026 Work 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 P.M. on Tuesday, February 17, 2026.

The following members were present constituting a quorum: Britton Hayden, Quinn Hamson, Curtis Crouch, and Isaac Walker (newly appointed)

OTHERS PRESENT: Mayor Scott Goodliffe, Phil Shimek (Town Council Rep), Karolina Munns (Planning Commission Secretary), Talsan Schulzke (Zoning Administrator) Jones & Associates, Zack Pali, Rue Rasmussen.

Welcome

Chair Hayden welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mayor Goodliffe introduced Isaac Walker, who had graciously accepted the opportunity to serve on the Planning Commission. He noted that Erika Bywater had a conflict and would attend the next meeting. The Commission welcomed the new member.

Public Comment

No public comments were offered.

Commission Business

The Commission noted that meeting minutes from February 3rd were provided for review but would not be voted on during this work meeting. Approval was scheduled for the March 3rd meeting.

Work Meeting

Discussion Item A: Discussion of uses of personal devices for planning commission related business

The Commission discussed potential risks associated with using personal electronic devices for town business. The Commission discussed several considerations: the legal distinction between cloud-based communications (Gmail, Google Chat) versus text messages stored locally on devices. The group developed questions to submit to the town attorney regarding legal requirements, including whether providing access to cloud-based accounts (Gmail) would satisfy discovery requests without surrendering physical devices, and how different communication methods (email, chat, text) are treated legally.

Action Item: The Chair will contact commission members individually about device preferences and may proceed with purchasing tablets for those interested.

Discussion Item E: Discussion of section 150 ordinances stating timely completion of developments

The Commission reordered the agenda to discuss this item earlier.

The Commission reviewed draft ordinance language designed to prevent developers from "cherry-picking" easy-to-develop lots while abandoning more challenging portions of subdivisions. The proposed amendments address phasing requirements, timeline enforcement, and priority development lots.

Key provisions discussed included requiring phasing for subdivisions over 15 lots, mandating that developers demonstrate substantial completion (75% of lots) of one phase before commencing the next, and ensuring priority development lots (non-road frontage, difficult drainage, higher development costs) are distributed across phases rather than deferred to final phases.

The Commission debated whether "substantial completion" should be measured by building permits issued or certificates of occupancy. Members leaned toward building permits as the metric, reasoning that requiring 75% of homes to be fully completed and occupied before starting the next phase would be overly onerous on developers. Building permits would indicate active construction and lot sales while still preventing abandonment.

Timeline provisions proposed include base timeframes for completion (such as seven years for subdivisions of 50+ lots) with possible two-year extensions upon demonstration of good faith efforts. The Commission discussed whether timeframes should begin at final plat approval or approval for construction, concluding that approval for construction was more appropriate since plat recording can be significantly delayed.

The group acknowledged the challenge of preventing developers from starting multiple subdivisions simultaneously and cherry-picking across properties. While the proposed language includes consequences for non-compliance (such as prohibiting new subdivision applications if a developer is not meeting timelines), members recognized this would not prevent initial cherry-picking across multiple projects if developers remained current on stated timelines.

Action Item: Talsan will research standards used by surrounding communities regarding lot thresholds, timeframes, and whether different requirements apply based on lot sizes (larger than half-acre versus smaller). The Commission will continue refining the draft ordinance language at the next meeting, beginning at Amendment Three, Priority Development Lot Requirements.

The Commission agreed the draft represents substantial progress and will move toward attorney review once remaining sections are finalized, with the understanding that ordinances can be amended if issues or loopholes are discovered after implementation.

Discussion Item B: Discussion and review of draft of citywide rezone

The Commission provided background for the new member on the citywide rezone effort. The entire town is currently zoned as "R" (residential) or "C" (commercial),

which are not official zones in the town's ordinance. Official zones include R-1-40 (one-acre lots), R-1-20 (half-acre lots), RD-1 (average of one unit per acre), RD-2 (average of two units per acre), and various commercial and industrial designations.

The town attorney has advised that the town can unilaterally rezone all properties through a single public process, sending hearing notices to all property owners. Jones and Associates prepared a draft rezone map based on current land use, proposing to zone properties according to their existing use (agricultural land as AG, residential homes as residential, operating businesses as commercial).

The Commission discussed whether to adopt RD-1 and RD-2 as standard zoning designations or implement them as overlay zones. Talsan explained that if RD-1 and RD-2 were overlay zones, the base zoning would be R-1-40 or R-1-20, with the overlay providing developers the option (but not requirement) to pursue flexible lot sizing with overall density averages. If adopted as standard zones, the Commission would have more control over where and how flexible development occurs, as developers would need to request specific zoning designations.

The Commission will continue this discussion at upcoming meetings.

Discussion Item C: Discussion and review of Elwood Town Ordinance Title III Administration, Chapter 30 Organizations, Planning Commission 30.05(B)

A public hearing on the amended ordinance is scheduled for March 3rd, with proper posting requirements.

Discussion Item D: Discussion of RD-2 & RD-1 zone ordinance and lot size calculation

This item was noted as tied to Discussion Item B and was not separately discussed.

Discussion Item F: Discuss attendance plans for next 2 meetings

The Commission confirmed attendance plans for upcoming meetings on March 3rd and March 17th.

The Commission reviewed meeting preparation timelines, confirming that agendas will be finalized by Wednesday the week before meetings, allowing the planning commission secretary to post materials by Friday at noon (for commissioners) and Monday (for public posting). This provides commissioners with Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday to review materials before Tuesday evening meetings.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned following completion of the agenda items at 8:30pm.