List of City Code Items to Review, Add, Change

Updated October 9, 2025:

This is a work in progress. Although numbered, these numbers do not reflect prioritization. Next steps:

- Add any other issues we should address
- Prioritize the list and set a time limit for completion of all items
- Work on one item at a time and provide the Planning Commission with City Council direction, an expected completion time, and supporting material to help them make recommendations.

1. **Affordable Housing Overlay Zone.** Consider creating an Affordable Housing Overlay Zone for Ivins, modeled in part on Springdale's Chapter 6A and chapter 13, article D, "Moderate Income Housing Development Overlay (MIHD) but tailored to our community's needs. Springdale's code provides a good framework for integrating affordable units into new developments — with clear site and design standards, long-term affordability requirements, documentation and covenants, phased build-out rules, and enforcement provisions. Using this as a starting point, we should also research what other Utah cities have done to promote workforce and moderate-income housing, so we can design an overlay that balances housing attainability with Ivins' character and growth goals.

2. **High Density Residential (HDR) Land Use.** This use allows R-1-5, R-2-6, R-2-10, R-M, R-M-TH. At least move R-1-5 into a new use category and consider if other categories should be created.

3. **Planned Development Overlay District (PD).** Review this overlay to determine why it isn't working for developers (not being used) and if it should be revised or eliminated. Starting at Section 16.07.401, the PD lets a developer propose a subdivision with more flexible lot sizes and layouts than the base zone allows, in exchange for a better overall neighborhood design. The PD overlay does not increase the number of units or uses beyond what the underlying zoning already permits; it just lets the developer rearrange that same density more creatively.

4. **Lot Size Averaging.** Another option to the PD overlay above, is simply to allow lot size averaging in certain zones. I prefer the PD overaly, but both should be considered. Instead of every lot being forced to meet the same minimum (e.g. 10,000 sq ft), allow a subdivision to have an average lot size with some lots smaller (or larger) as long as the total density is not exceeded. This may not apply in all zones. For example, St. George's code (10-7A-3) allows lot size averaging in RE-20 and RE-37.5 zones, however no lot size shall be reduced to less than sixty-five percent (65%) of the required lot size for the applicable zoning district.

5. **Multifamily.** Review all multifamily zones (R-2-6 through R-TH and R-M) to determine whether their current standards are still appropriate. Revise townhome and multifamily construction

requirements to ensure new projects are not boxy or out of character with the community. Consider adding "Mansion-Style Multifamily" design standards and possibly new zones or an overlay to encourage multi-unit buildings that maintain a single-family appearance and scale. Mansion-style refers to a residential structure containing up to six (6) units, designed to appear as a single large house when viewed from the street.

6. **Resort Mixed Use (RMU).** Section 16.17.101 lists requirements for RMU. A couple of years ago I pointed out conflicting requirements that made an application unworkable. Review this section because it is an opportunity to combine housing with commercial and I recommend changing the name to simply Mixed Use. Review all other references to RMU in the code to ensure compatibility. Also review the Mixed Use Development Overlay District starting in 16.08.101.

7. **Resort Commercial (RC).** Unlike RMU or RV Resort uses, there is no similar section in city code listing RC requirements. Review all other references to RMU in the code to ensure compatibility.

8. **Comm Nehd Land Use & CN Zone.** Eliminate on maps and in code

9. **Add Buffer Requirements to City Code.** When a new project includes smaller lot sizes than the adjoining neighborhood, we require a "buffer" of lots that are similar in size to the existing homes, though they may be somewhat smaller. We should consider whether the code should specify a minimum percentage (for example, requiring the buffer lots to be at least 75% of the size of the adjoining lots). We might also want to address buffering across the street, to ensure a smoother visual and scale transition where higher-density development faces existing single-family homes. Although this practice is already being applied, it is not currently defined in city code, which creates uncertainty and inconsistency. The task is to formally add buffer requirements to the code so that expectations are clear and consistently enforced.

10. **Perimeter Walls.** For new development along local (residential) and minor collector streets, should the code prohibit continuous perimeter walls and instead require that homes front or side onto the street and that driveway access be provided from the street or rear alleys? Alternatively, should this be an encouraged guideline rather than a requirement? Evaluate whether anything in current code inadvertently discourages street-facing orientation.

11. **Revisit Home Occupation Standards**. Reestablish home occupation business requirements. Our Table of Uses lists home businesses as allowed but references standards in Title 5, Chapter 3, which was repealed in 2017 and never replaced. Without clear current standards, staff and residents lack guidance on what qualifies as an acceptable home-based business, how impacts

should be managed. Clear standards also help determine when fire or safety inspections should apply.

12. **Review and Clarify Enforcement of Real Estate Sign Code.** Review Ivins City Code §16.21.118 (Real Estate Signs) to ensure our policies and practices are clear and consistently applied (size limits, temporary permits, nightly removal, and the two-sign maximum). I'm not sure the standards are being applied consistently (i.e. Sentierre signs have not usually followed the removal requirements or sign maximum). We should review the code to confirm that the current conditions are what we want to enforce or, if they no longer make sense for Ivins, update them so they can be applied clearly and fairly going forward.

13. **Short-Term Rental (STR) Code Gaps.** We allow short-term rentals (STRs) in overlay areas and in the RC and RMU but our detailed standards in Section 16.07 apply only to the STR overlay. This leaves STRs in RC and RMU without any operating requirements. In addition, there have been STRs in neighborhoods where they are not allowed. There are at least five steps we can take under HB256 in those situations. Washington City has adopted clear STR standards and reported at ULCT last week that they are successfully enforcing them.

14. **Civil Penalties for Violating City Code.** I recommend that the City review and update its civil penalty provisions to remove confusion between Ivins City Code §4.03.201 and the Consolidated Fee Schedule (Ordinance 2024-12). The Code states that each day a violation exists is a separate offense subject to penalties, while the Fee Schedule sets fixed fines of $250 for a first offense, $500 for a second offense within twelve months, and $1,000 for subsequent offenses — which appears inconsistent and unclear for both staff and residents. In addition, the City should consider establishing different penalty levels for homeowners versus commercial entities, since the current amounts may be unnecessarily steep for individual residents while potentially too low to deter commercial violations.