IVINS CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 18, 2023
435-628-0606

1) WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN AND COMMISSIONERS: The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. All present included Chairman Dave Robinson, Commissioner Pam Gardiol, Commissioner Perry Brown, Commissioner Doug Clifford, and Commissioner Derek Larsen.

Staff Attending: Dale Coulam-City Manager/Attorney, Mike Haycock-Building and Zoning Administrator, Chuck Gillette-City Engineer, Fred Castagne-Building Inspector and Sharon Allen-Deputy City Recorder.

Audience Attending: Bonnie Kline, Tiffany Ringwood, Sharon Gillespie, James Barden, Barbara Lewis, Chris Haddad, Rod and Carolyn Rasmussen, William Mayol, Linda Allred, Kim Menzel, Matt Marten, Lance Anderson, Michael Cook, Mikel Hugo, Sharon Barton, Connie Butterfield, Lisa Ganz, Jerry Miyahara, Terry Marten, as well as others who did not sign in.

A. Acknowledgement of Quorum

B. Flag Salute--Commissioner Pam Gardiol

C. Invocation--Commissioner Pam Gardiol

D. Disclosures--None.

2) REPORTS, PRESENTATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS-None

3) PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ITEMS-

A. Public Hearing Regarding a Zone Amendment from RA-5 (Residential Agriculture, minimum lot size 5 acres) to RE-37 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 37,000 sq ft), RE-20 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 20,000 sq ft) and RE-15 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 15,000 sq ft), with lot averaging overlay. Located at approximately Kayenta Parkway and Hwy 91. Kayenta Development, Inc-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant.

Mike Haycock stated that there are three parcels in this request. This had previously been brought forward as two parcels. City Council had denied those recommendations from the Planning Commission, and so the applicant is starting over. This is located at Hwy 91 and near the Kayenta entrance. City Council was concerned about the density in that area, and wanted a lower density, so the applicant has considered their request and brought forward their new map. The new section is just west of the proposed reservoir. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated was that the main issue with the City Council denying their application? **Mike Haycock** stated there were areas they were concerned about along three lots and having those lot sizes matching up without buffering. Lance Anderson stated that he is the petitioner. When they submitted their application previously, it went to City Council and Councilmember Jenny Johnson was adamant about the area on Kayenta Parkway and Hwy 91, so we took it to heart. We didn't go to RE-43. That is a mis-statement. He just looked that up. It is just under 34-36k per lot, so we chose RE-37. If we go along that corridor and all the properties in the future we zone RE-37 it will keep the rural look we are asking for. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated that includes lot averaging. Lance Anderson stated yes. He asks that if they stick with RE-37 that they do that all along the corridor to keep that openness. **Chairman Dave Robinson** opened the Public Hearing. Lisa

Ganz stated she lives at Bickmore Circle and that there is a discrepancy she noticed on the map from what is on the application to the staff report. On Parcel 5 it shows RE-15 but the narrative does not show RE-15. It is not a complete application when the map doesn't show accurate information. She would also like to address the discussion that is coming up later, which is implementation of the General Plan. She thinks it is important at every meeting to vote with implementation of the General Plan in mind. To refresh what the survey showed, the residents wanted to keep open spaces and trails. 80% of the public said that was Number One. That is significant. When asked what they want from City Council in terms of development, 70% of the public overwhelmingly said they want to keep it agricultural. She hopes the Planning Commission will consider the City survey when addressing some of these upzones. These parcels represent 55 acres of land currently zoned RA-5. The applicant states he is matching what is already out there, but there is a lot of green showing out there. RA-5 is a legitimate zone so if that rationale is to match what you already have out there, then RA-5 makes sense. The City has nine Low-Density Residential districts. Consider the lesser zones directly under RA-5 as an option because little by little, every upzone whittles away at what the community wants. It worries her that one by one each zone request takes away from our open spaces and agriculture. The applicant has a right to request it, but the Planning Commission and the City Council are not obligated to approve it. 55 acres is a lot of land, keep it RA-5 and keep our open spaces and agriculture. Sharon Gillespie stated she lives on East Ridgecrest Circle. Parcel 5 on the map says RE-15 but on the lower right it says RE-20. That needs to be clarified. What is the value of an averaging overlay and why? We keep reading about the cost of land in Ivins and our inability to have attainable housing and according to the Gardner Institute, every time we upzone it increases the value of that land. That makes attainable and affordable housing even more challenging. She would like to ask this applicant if there is any small carve-out to be held back for a group of small homes, to help Ivins City meet their affordable housing requirements? **Fred Castagne** stated there were no comments on Zoom. Terry Marten stated he is trying to follow guidelines we have established in the west Ivins area. It is a tough thing to do because in his view, the Planning Commission and City Council have thrown that under the bus. We have never created anything in Kayenta that would be considered a disappointment. To think at this point in time, we would start to take advantage of zoning, and not do the best project we possibly can for the area makes no sense. The area he established as a 37,000 sq ft is his attempt to preserve the character of Hwy 91, something that we have failed to do so far. Kayenta supported and proposed the Hwy 91 corridor that was created 12-15 years ago, and gave 30 ft of their property to be made available for trails and landscape. We were on board with the things people were asking for fifteen years ago. It is a good mile and a half of walkway that was given to the City with one string attached, for a water line to replant trees. Don't just expect Kayenta to create the low-density for Ivins. If you ask me to do that, ask other adjacent landowners to do the same. Everything in our plan has changed by the Planning Commission and City Council in the last five years willy-nilly, without much public discourse. If he is doing something out of character, let him know and he will change it. Whatever he agrees to, hold others to the same standard. That is all he is asking. Lance Anderson stated we discussed changing the note on the zone map on RA-5 to explain what that was awhile back. In 2007 or 2008 RA-5 was put in our map as a holding pattern. That is why the whole City showed green, to protect the mountainside. We aren't protecting agriculture, it is open space. **Mike Haycock** stated we haven't passed that note yet. We did the General Plan instead. That note depends on the City Council as recommended by Planning Commission. Lance Anderson stated we have to think about what RA-5 meant to the

DRAFT

City when we painted that all green. It wasn't for agricultural purposes. We got turned down at RE-15 so we have requested RE-37. Carol Cox stated she lives on Willow Springs Way, which backs up to Parcel 1. This is a better plan with larger lots on the outside of the property. Where will the roads go and how will they access them? She is concerned about the pine trees on Kayenta Parkway. This is a much better plan and she is happy that they made the changes that they did. Lance Anderson stated Parcel 5 is RE-15 and the description is wrong. The map is correct. Terry Marten stated he has been working on this property for 45 years. Regarding access we have a plan showing on the transportation master plan that has been established for fifteen years, which is the maroon dotted line that starts at our property and comes up through the drywash area and brings access to all the properties off Hwy 91. That is being challenged by the Washington County Water Conservancy District and the City at this time. We haven't come up with another solution at this time. Hearing no further comments **Chairman Dave Robinson** closed the Public Hearing.

B. Discuss and consider recommendation of a Zone Amendment from RA-5 (Residential Agriculture, minimum lot size 5 acres) to RE-37 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 37,000 sq ft), RE-20 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 20,000 sq ft) and RE-15 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 15,000 sq ft), with lot averaging overlay. Located at approximately Kayenta Parkway and Hwy 91. Kayenta Development, Inc-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant.

Commissioner Pam Gardiol stated that Diane Bracey and Jeff DeVore wrote their concerns that based on previous zoning board meetings, there doesn't seem to be a specific plan. They have heard comments like don't worry, the land will be developed consistent with Terry Marten's overall plan for Kayenta. That's great. Then let's see the plan. Put it in writing. **Dale Coulam** stated the statute doesn't require a plan at this stage. This is a density issue regarding zoning. Statute outlines the order and that is to change the land use if needed, the zone if needed, and then the preliminary plan. The order will stay the same but the process will change significantly at the first of the year, because the Statute has changed. There will no longer be a concept plan which was just a report. It was eliminated as a requirement. No plan will be presented to the City until Preliminary Plan. We follow what the State legislature gives us. That is the process. Some applicants voluntarily show a proposed plan to show what they are thinking at the time. That is not an approved plan. What they show is not binding because no plan is required at zoning. We cannot do conditional zoning based off a plan you are shown. Zoning is a density issue so you think about what is your vision for this area. This is the most discretionary part of the land use and zoning process. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated that when the Planning Commission recommended to City Council, we said RE-15 with no overlay. He wonders if Parcel 5 really needs the overlay? He recommends that we take that off of the RE-15. **Commissioner Derek Larsen** inquired if it is a complete application? **Dale Coulam** stated the application was clear. The map is clear. The agenda item is clear. As part of your recommendation, before City Council the applicant needs to correct that map's narrative. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that because no plan is required we don't know how it would be accessed. It does not appear in our land use maps that there are any restrictions, like a gully or a wash. **Dale Coulam** stated when they submit their Preliminary Plan they would identify what areas may contain sensitive lands and meet with the Sensitive Lands Committee to discuss how those areas are affected and developed or not developed. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated the magenta road that Terry Marten mentioned is currently under objection because it is in the middle of the reservoir they want to build. **Chuck Gillette** stated the blue line

DRAFT

is an unnamed major collector road and there are issues with that road because it ignores the topography and would be nearly impossible the way it is aligned now, but we have never come to a conclusion as to where to put it. There will be an access developed off Hwy 91 into that area. Our road master plan says that dotted lines don't necessarily have to be built in the locations shown. It is just to show what sort of connectivity is expected in that area. Roll Call Unanimous.

MOTION: Commissioner Derek Larsen moved to approve recommendation of a Zone Amendment from RA-5 (Residential Agriculture, minimum lot size 5 acres) to RE-37 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 37,000 sq ft), RE-20 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 20,000 sq ft) and RE-15 (Residential Estates, minimum lot size 15,000 sq ft), without lot averaging overlay on the RE-15 parcel. Located at approximately Kayenta Parkway and Hwy 91. Kayenta Development, Inc-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant. Amend the map definition on Parcel 5 before presenting to City Council.

SECOND: Commissioner Pam Gardiol

VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Dave Robinson	AYE
Commissioner Pam Gardiol	AYE
Commissioner Perry Brown	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Derek Larsen	AYE

C. Public Hearing Regarding a Zone Text and Ridgeline Map amendment to provide protection for rock outcroppings that may not meet the definition of a ridgeline, but are still worthy of preservation and protection.

Chuck Gillette stated that he is representing the Sensitive Lands Committee who received an application on the 120 acres for Retreat at Snow Canyon. We required them to submit an application and identify any sensitive lands. There were concerns on whether or not there were some slopes. Nothing they identified on the property as defined in our ordinance was a slope but there were some lava fields to be protected. The ridgeline identified on our sensitive lands map as the red line, which is our original map, there was a dispute over. Our ordinance identifies interior bluff ridgelines. We did a site visit and there was a dispute over whether it is properly defined as an interior bluff ridgeline. There is a question if the ordinance is ambiguous. If it is ambiguous it is possible the ombudsman would rule against the City in terms of being able to enforce it. There were concerns on both sides on whether we wanted a legal battle over this ridgeline. There was a request for the applicant to submit an alternative plan more in harmony with protecting the rock outcroppings and interesting features worthy of preserving. They submitted several alternative plans but the one we settled on shows two major rock outcroppings on the ridgeline and they are proposing to preserve those. We couldn't really approve this plan if the City takes the stance that the ridgeline is an accurate representation of something we are trying to preserve according to the current ordinance. We did a text amendment and a map amendment to the ordinance to be in harmony with this alternative plan and make it possible to approve this plan. The ridgeline protection was kind of embedded in the low-density residential slope protection part of the ordinance so we pulled it out of there and gave it its own section. Class A is the land hill ridgeline which says that no structures can be built within 100 ft vertically of that ridgeline. Class B was the ridgeline where we originally had this ridgeline definition. There were some pretty onerous setback requirements and provides visual protection for those ridgelines. The third, Class C ridgeline is a slightly different color, and says as identified on the sensitive lands map, no development shall disturb the interior City bluff

DRAFT

ridgeline and any accompanying rock outcroppings within 20 feet of either side of the defined ridgeline or outcroppings. Those are the changes being proposed to the Sensitive Lands Ordinance. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated is some of this land actually City-owned land? **Chuck Gillette** stated no, the City owns a small piece of land that backs these house properties but that is colored red to say that it is staying the same protection as the original ordinance. Those changes don't relate to that bluff at Cordero Drive. They have the same ridgeline protection that they had before. There is a gap at the major wash. **Chuck Gillette** stated yes, we pulled it out because the alternative plan doesn't protect anything there. We knew we would be cutting through the ridgeline there. We have a proposed Master Plan road with 400 South that was cutting through the ridgeline there. Also looking at the slope map, there is less of a ridgeline there than in other parts of that area. **Chairman Dave Robinson** opened the Public Hearing. Michael Cook stated he lives on Padre Canyon, and this protects significantly less of the ridge by comparing the maps. The area they are leaving in red belongs to Blue Moon Holdings. The area to the north of 400 South which is part of EWD's plan is being treated differently. It is being pulled out for this specific project. It is not appropriate to pick and choose on how to administer your sensitive lands ordinances based on who is applying. Why are we the applicant? **Dale Coulam** stated this is the determination by the Sensitive Lands Committee and they asked Staff to make an amendment to the text and to the map because of the risk that it may not meet the ridgeline definition in the ordinance currently. They wanted some protection for this ridgeline. The applicant is entitled to have this decided with the ordinance in place at the time of the application. In order to do what is being proposed they would have to waive the ordinance that was in place at the time that they filed and agree to protect these portions of rock outcroppings that are significant and worthy of protection but may not meet the current text defining ridgelines in the current ordinance. Mike Cook stated that Mike Haycock mentioned during the sensitive lands process that the applicant was aware of the map and the ordinance at the time of the application and in order to amend they would have to pull the application and reapply. That makes sense. We are amending an ordinance and a map and reduce the original preservation of that ridge without following that process. You are accommodating the developer and making changes to the sensitive land ordinance and map to make it easier for them to bulldoze sections. Then you are not applying it to another owner just south of this only because they are not intending to develop right now. It is very confusing and needs clarification. We are whittling down the soul of the City by taking out natural topographical features that makes this City the beautiful place that it is. Think long and hard and be specific and unambiguous about this. Jerry Miyahara stated he is representing EWD and SITLA. The original red line that ran through the property and the dark brown line that represents steep slope conditions had specific criteria in the ordinance. We understand that is the map to which we made application. The ordinance is very clear on the procedures to handle sensitive lands and if anything is identified on the map, then it is studied by a civil engineer and those studies determined there were no steep or very steep slopes conditions in this area. We don't have any problem that it was on the map but it takes an inventory on what conditions exist. We feel strongly that it does not meet the definition of an interior bluff ridgeline. The other property that lies northeast to the ridgeline is a strip that the City owns. The total amount of the red line identified on the existing sensitive lands map, this preservation plan would not disturb approximately 81% of that line. The Master Transportation Plan will require about a 5% disturbance to create that crossing at 400 South. We do not want to enter into a legal argument even though we feel we have a strong position and if there is any ambiguity in the code, the State Ombudsman in other cases has clearly given the

DRAFT

landowners the benefit of that. The Sensitive Lands Committee proposed we come up with a revised plan as a compromise. SITLA has significant economic interest in this project and the lot loss is coming in at 19. These are 10k or 7,500 sq ft lots. That's a 25-30 million dollar loss for this project. This is a significant preservation plan. We support there are valuable features out there and beautiful rock outcroppings. We provided 3D modeling along 400 South and Puerto Drive to show that even if we preserved it completely those homes can't see it with development in front of it. We believe there are beautiful rock outcroppings in that area and this is the plan that we came up with to present to the Sensitive Lands Committee that they unanimously approved. Sharon Barton stated she lives on Mesa Vista Drive and the original sensitive lands map has been the map we have all lived by since 2014 and has been considered an accurate and fair map for almost ten years. It has been involved in other developments before this developer came forward. In reviewing the Sensitive Lands Overlay District section we are considering changing, in 16.08.201 the second purpose is to protect the health, safety and welfare of all residents and minimize any risk to life and property. The fifth purpose is to guide and require responsible land use and development due to environmental sensitivities. For them to try to reclassify a ridgeline seems reckless and insensitive development of that land. It is a great detriment to the residents of Ivins. The agenda says it is an amendment to provide protections that may not meet the definition. But, they may. So let's stand on the ridgeline and ask the City what is best for that land and the residents. She thinks overall that the developer would want to be a good neighbor instead of a threatening neighbor. **Fred Castagne** stated there were no comments on Zoom. Hearing no further comments, **Chairman Dave Robinson** closed the Public Hearing.

D. Discuss and consider recommendation of a Zone Text and Ridgeline Map amendment to provide protection for rock outcroppings that may not meet the definition of a ridgeline, but are still worthy of preservation and protection.

Dale Coulam stated that the applicant is entitled to have this ridgeline issue decided under ordinances that were in place on the date when filed, at the time of application. It says the ridgeline of an interior bluff is identified as the point where the slope becomes steeper than 18% and coincides with a very steep slope boundary of the area defined in the City's ridgeline map. The process under the sensitive lands ordinance is to identify potential sensitive lands on their application. It then goes to the Sensitive Lands Committee (SLC) and the applicant provides a detailed study to see if this is a protected ridgeline under the ordinance or not. Since the SLC determined this may not legally meet the definition of a ridgeline, it requested the text and map clearly show some protection to the rock outcroppings. The applicant would have to waive the right to have their application decided under the original ordinance when they filed. The current ordinance also stated that for purposes of identifying a ridgeline in the City's ridgeline map, the following viewpoints “have been used,” which are all out west by Kayenta which doesn't see this interior bluff. It has been argued that language doesn't apply, or at a minimum is ambiguous. There is some legal risk whether it has protection. The Sensitive Lands Committee was attempting to try and define this so some protection could be applied to the rock outcroppings. Technically even if this is amended it doesn't apply to their application. They would have to waive their rights under that application. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired what would we be passing here? **Dale Coulam** stated you'd be passing a basis that shows this text and map as a compromise, giving the rock outcroppings some protection that are at risk of having no protection. We can proceed with the application as it is in the current ordinance and then those legal issues would being raised. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired if this is more or less

DRAFT

protection? **Dale Coulam** stated it would depend on how a court rules. We could let it go through the litigation process. **Chuck Gillette** stated we met on 400 South and there is a mound and you can see the two major rock outcroppings. With the alternative plan there would be a cluster of homes at the base of the slope, then the rock outcroppings and on top a setback per the ordinance of 20 ft and more cluster of homes and it would create this open space and create a level of homes below and above and protect those rock outcroppings. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that would cause them to lose 19 homes. That seems like more protection. **Chuck Gillette** stated it is definitely less density. It says the ridgelines that coincide very steep slopes. There are polygons on the map that identify very steep slopes. There is an argument whether it should coincide with the polygons or coincide with the sensitive lands very steep slopes section. The applicant is saying that it needs to coincide with an identified sensitive lands steep slope. There is also the perspective that it just needs to coincide with the polygons very steep slopes. There are gaps on the map so you could argue that it doesn't coincide. It is not a solid line. The City couldn't take that position. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired why is the connection behind those three lots not being made as a Parkway? **Chuck Gillette** stated we own just to the slope. Once you get to the top of the slope, the City doesn't own it anymore. The developer of those homes owned it originally and they didn't know what to do with it so they gave it to the City. We are never going to do anything with it. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated it is a pretty big area. This may be an improvement, but the problem is it is not legally binding to this developer. **Dale Coulam** stated it may or may not be an improvement. It is a legal question in dispute, subject to litigation. The Sensitive Lands Committee is hoping to settle the legal dispute and offer some protection to the rock outcroppings that may not meet the definition of ridgeline under our text. **Mike Haycock** stated that on the old ordinance and where it stands on a ridgeline they protect it by moving houses back 150 ft. The modeling the applicant did shows you can't see the ridgeline from anywhere outside the subdivision if they build houses that are two-story. By preserving this and putting road access in, they are no longer hidden in someone's backyard. The alternative plan opens it up so that there may be some access if they go by the plan they've provided. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated that adding this third category is applicable throughout the City. If this type of situation arose another time that the rock outcroppings didn't meet the old definition of a ridgeline, we would impose this if applicable. **Dale Coulam** stated that is correct. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated that she will save her comment for after the vote, but she believes something more needs to happen to this ordinance. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated under the current ordinance, SITLA could still go forward. **Chairman Dave Robinson** SITLA could go forward whether we like it or not. We are trying to work with them. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated yes but in their desire to be friendly to their community, they are suggesting this. They have said if the City will do a new ordinance that refines the definition, so that the rock outcroppings could be defined under this ordinance, they will accept that. We still have the ability to do our road as we have planned, and they will lose some lots, but they get to move ahead and avoid litigation and court. He doesn't think our current ordinance and restrictions would hold up. They are saying they will accept this new ordinance if we move it forward. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated that as she read through the entire document there are some places that need attention. This document needs to come back to us to get updated in alignment with the General Plan. Roll Call Unanimous.

MOTION: Commissioner Doug Clifford moved to approve recommendation of a Zone Text and Ridgeline Map amendment to provide protection for rock outcroppings that may not meet the definition of a ridgeline, but are still worthy of preservation and protection.

DRAFT

SECOND: Commissioner Perry Brown

VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Dave Robinson	AYE
Commissioner Pam Gardiol	AYE
Commissioner Perry Brown	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Derek Larsen	AYE

4) DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. Discuss and review the General Plan.

Chuck Gillette stated he made some changes and history to stormwater, hillside and geological policies and drywashes. His changes are the red underlined portions. He added a statement about groundwater because he has had areas that need to be mitigated and then those mitigations were not enough so he needs to go a little overboard. Stormwater courses he added a statement about the requirement of adequate detention basins to minimize the rate of flow. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired if we can dual purpose those basins for soccer fields? **Chuck Gillette** stated they can but there are limitations. If is just for their subdivision it is still too small for a pickleball court. Regional ones we can. We did that on 400 South and that has worked out really well. There is a chance one day that soccer field will go under water and he hopes there is not six inches of mud when it does. He added a statement regarding arterial streets, drywashes and channel armoring. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated remove "every" on that one awkward sentence and then it sounds good. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that General Plan is an umbrella over everything else the City does but it doesn't need to be thick, just a thin cover for protection. If the General Plan is 80 pages it will defeat the purpose that it really has. Tactical planning doesn't need to be in there because we already have the ordinances and laws that regulate that. Some things are best left in the detailed plans that fall under the General Plan. It is not an enforceable document. We are not writing code. It is just the umbrella of what we are responsible for. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated she concurs and that's why we cross-reference. Then the measurables. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated measurables feels to him like we are trying to put code in. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated as she reviews the plan that refers to various other communities that have created them, she saw a composite and then the implementation where those measurables come in. We need to show we are making progress that aligns our action with the General Plan. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired what does the State's position for measurables? **Mike Haycock** stated the Moderate Income Housing Plan has measurables in there. There is not a format. There are certain requirements and elements that need to be completed but it doesn't have a format. He doesn't know how you measure how you want the City to look. We will need to go through our ordinances and base them off what we do in the General Plan. That is a task that needs to happen. Whatever format we end up with let's go through the process to see how it is going to work. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated that she took 10.9a.403 and the General Plan Prep document and synthesized that with this document. We can use this as a reference document to see if there is anything we have forgotten. Maybe measurables will be at the next level in the implementation plan. This is part of the evolution of this document. We organize it the way we want and streamline it. We've made significant progress. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that if we lump everything into a section called land use and services as another section, and what the City thinks we need in those particular areas. **Chairman Dave Robinson** inquired what about roundabouts? **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated put it in land use. But put it in one or the other. **Commissioner Perry**

DRAFT

Brown stated he responded to that email and he is right on target. What do we do with the vision so he suggests making it a new Chapter 4 and Chapter Six becomes services. Vision is the overall umbrella that guides this document. He agrees with Commissioner Doug Clifford on this and how to move this forward. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated so reorganize it? **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated the vision is its own chapter and take out the policies. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated so the vision goes at the start. Everything else supports it. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated rearranging isn't necessary. Vision is first and then the next two are land use and service topics. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated the vision is the umbrella and those elements go under it. She went through the entire document and made changes on duplication and sentences that were cumbersome. Chuck Gillette's changes she has not reviewed. We are just deciding where the pieces go now. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated we may need some transition paragraphs. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated on August 8th where do we start? **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated first review the Plan as it exists. Review Commissioner Doug Clifford's draft changes of what he sees that would look like to see what order it goes in, and then see if it flows or if there are other elements we want to include. There may be something we want to include like technology changes, like Chat GPT and AI. **Commissioner Perry Brown** stated he will work on the vision element chapter with intro and closing sentence and give suggestions where policies might go. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated she asked that they all read through her edits. She had suggested another sentence about dark sky and wildlife habitat. It is not included in the edits. But she still advocates for it. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated we need to consolidate it into a cliffnotes version, so citizens will read it. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated streamline it. **Mike Haycock** stated he added the Moderate Income Housing section as approved by City Council. That needs to fit in and not be changed. He attached the ordinance because it is the law of the land and it needs to be included and formatted that way. **Commissioner Pam Gardiol** stated she made grammar and punctuation corrections to Ordinance 2023-01. **Dale Coulam** stated the Moderate Income Housing Plan is a required element of the General Plan. It can be an attachment and that is how it has existed so far.

B. Discuss and consider approval of the Ivins City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for June 27, 2023.

MOTION: Commissioner Pam Gardiol moved to approve the Ivins City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for June 27, 2023.
SECOND: Commissioner Perry Brown
VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Dave Robinson	AYE
Commissioner Pam Gardiol	AYE
Commissioner Perry Brown	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Derek Larsen	AYE

5) REPORTS
A. Planning Commission
B. Chairman

Chairman Dave Robinson stated he withdrew from the Council race due to time constraints so don't vote for him. **Dale Coulam** stated they were able to remove his name from the ballot.

C. Building and Zoning Administrator, Mike Haycock

DRAFT

Mike Haycock stated that the Planning Commission meeting dates they have in front of them is accurate except for the meeting we just added for August 8th. **Chairman Dave Robinson** stated that September 5th was removed due to the Primary Election.

D. City Manager/Attorney Dale Coulam

E. Items to be placed on future agendas.

Mike Haycock stated there is a Conditional Use Permit for Pacificorp/Rocky Mountain Power for the expanding the substation and maybe a couple subdivisions that are still going through TRC. August 8th will be a work meeting for the General Plan at 4 pm.

6) ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Derek Larsen moved to approve ADJOURNMENT

SECOND: Commissioner Doug Clifford

VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Dave Robinson	AYE
Commissioner Pam Gardiol	AYE
Commissioner Perry Brown	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Derek Larsen	AYE

DRAFT