

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING & LAND USE COMMISSION

Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2012

Time: 7:00 PM

Place: #2 CV Drive, Castle Valley Community Center

Present: Marie Hawkins, Mary Beth Fitzburgh, Tom Noce, Laura Cameron (arrived 7:08 P.M.)

Absent: None

Clerk/Recorder: Faylene Roth

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING & LAND USE COMMISSION

CALL TO ORDER: 7:06 P.M.

- 1 Open Public Comment.

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. Regular Meeting April 4, 2012.

Tom motioned to approve the April 4, 2012, Minutes as presented. Marie seconded the Motion. Marie, Mary Beth, and Tom approved the Motion. Laura was not present for the Vote. The Motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS

3. Town Council Meeting – Chair.

Mary Beth reported that the Town Council approved Option 1 (the higher of the two proposals) for the steeple replacement at the LDS Church. She said that Ron Drake had presented a petition to the Council with 41 signatures representing church members and neighbors. According to Mary Beth, the Town Council asked for assurance that there would be no need to change the steeple structure in the future. Roger Knell, Architect, and Jedd Morley, LDS Facilities Manager, said there would be no reason to change it.

4. Building Permit Agent.

None.

5. Procedural Matters-Open Public Meetings Act.

Mary Beth reviewed Utah state law on open meetings: an agenda must be posted 24 hours before a meeting; only items on the agenda can be discussed or acted upon during a meeting; three members of the commission gathered at any non-meeting event constitutes a quorum which means that no items under consideration by the commission can be discussed; any conversation

between an individual commission member and a citizen about issues and concerns for the commission should be shared with the commission at its next meeting.

Faylene related that she had attended a library conference as an employee of the Grand County Public Library. She participated in a workshop that provided instruction in how to use the U.S. Census Bureau website to gain information about local communities. Faylene will be available during Castle Valley Library hours to assist PLUC Members in utilizing this site.

Mary Beth and Faylene reviewed PLUC policy on maintaining documents in the PLUC binders. Faylene will remove agendas, minutes, and reports after three months. Other documents designated for removal will be inserted loosely in the back of the binders for each Member to determine whether to keep or to discard. Tab 12 contains permanent documents such as resolutions and ordinances pertaining to the PLUC.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

6. Discussion and possible action re: General Plan Review (table).

Marie motioned to untable Item 6 regarding the General Plan Review. Laura seconded the Motion. Laura, Marie, Mary Beth, and Tom approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

Mary Beth provided a working draft document of the General Plan Survey with changes made at the last meeting highlighted in gray.

Introduction - PLUC Members approved an introductory statement which provides a disclaimer that there is no guarantee that all concerns addressed in the Survey will be achievable by the Town in the next five years.

Statistics – Most of these questions were taken from the 2007 Survey. PLUC Members decided to delete identification of respondent as male or female and to delete the question asking for respondent's age. A request for the age of each individual in the household will follow the request for number of people in the household. Permanent resident was changed to Full-time Resident.

PLUC Members confirmed their decision to include renters in the Survey and to identify them as a category to determine if their points of view differ from full-time, part-time, and nonresident property owners. It was suggested that renters could be notified of the Survey through notices on the bulletin boards and in Castle Valley Comments. Renters can pick up the Survey at the Town Office.

The "Other" option in the last question will be deleted and a final question will be added to ask nonresident property owners if they currently rent their houses.

Section A – Water & Septic – A discussion revealed that the term “safe” used in Question 3 was ambiguous. PLUC Members decided to delete the question and to ask, instead, why property owners treat their water. Question 6, which asks why property owners chose not to drill a well, will have “Cost” added as one of the options.

PLUC Members approved the statement that identifies septic systems as “one of the biggest potential threats to our aquifer...” as well as the addition of “never” and “don’t know” as responses to some of the questions.

Discussion of the third question on septic systems focused on whether a reliable statement could be made by a property owner that their septic system was properly functioning. It was generally agreed that a professional, such as the septic tank pumping company, would need to determine proper functioning. Not everyone agreed that the pumping company could determine proper functioning or that they would want to accept the liability for doing so. Most members thought that it was important to determine what property owners and residents thought about this issue. It was suggested that local realtors be consulted about disclosure protocols on plumbing, wiring, etc., that are currently used when property sells.

PLUC Members decided to delete the question regarding monitoring holes at the end of septic drain fields after hearing the results of Laura's communication with David Snyder, Septic Inspector for Utah Division of Environmental Quality. Snyder responded that drain field inspections were not necessary in small residential gravity-fed septic systems. He said there was a danger that monitoring holes could allow seepage upwards through the drain field. The best advice, according to Snyder, for maintaining small gravity-fed septic systems is to use no additives, minimize solids, inspect every three years, and pump only when necessary. Laura will forward a copy of his response to PLUC Members and to Mayor Erley.

The last question regarding support for a municipal well will be revised, to include a phrase indicating that it be for all residents not just those without potable water.

Section B – Roads & Drainage – Primary discussion focused on asking about a willingness to spend more Town money on the dust concern question. However, it was decided to leave this section as is.

Section C – Agriculture & Livestock – No additional changes were made.

Section D – Other Health and Safety – PLUC Members felt that it was important to leave the question, “Do you favor the Town continuing to spend money and sponsoring events on invasive noxious weed education and removal?”, here where they might receive more attention, rather than move it to “Let Your Voice Be Heard,” because of the health concerns involved.

Section E – Quality of Life – No additional changes were made.

Section F – Economy – the words “to live” were deleted in the last question.

Section G – Ordinance & Enforcement – PLUC Members approved the inclusion of a description of the enforcement policy in this section.

Section H – Community Life – Discussion focused on what options were available to Towns that wanted to opt out of the use of SmartMeters. It was decided to survey the community to determine if there was concern about this issue before researching options available.

Section J – Housing and Zoning – PLUC Members discussed the lack of commitment from the hospital, at this point, to consider a part-time health clinic in Castle Valley, as well as whether senior housing was a realistic concept for Castle Valley. However, no additional changes were made to the questions in this section.

Section K – Government – After discussion, it was decided to delete the question asking for suggestions to improve the Town's Enforcement policy. No other changes, other than rephrasing for consistency, were made.

Section L – Let Your Voice Be Heard – PLUC Members decided to include “noxious weed removal” from the list and to change “dust control on roads” to “dust control,” which would include the problem of dust on lots.

It was also agreed to delete the Column 5 option—to have the Town spend less money on an issue. It was noted that respondents can answer 'No' in column 4 to express this opinion. Members felt that the Town was already fiscally responsible with its small budget, and did not feel it was necessary to emphasize a negative response. The table will also be revised to indicate where the “Not Applicable” responses apply.

The last two questions will be reworded to make them more specific.

Mary Beth reviewed the Capital Improvement Projects list and suggested that the phrase “a small amount of” should be deleted in the instruction line. PLUC Members agreed to add dust control to the list of potential projects and a municipal well and pump on Council Member Hill's recommendation, to indicate that it would cost the Town money to do this.

The final five questions were used in the 2007 Survey and will be retained in this Survey.

Mary Beth will present a Final Draft of the General Plan Survey for the next PLUC Meeting. She asked for input regarding additional changes before the next Meeting.

Mary Beth reported that she had talked with Christy Williams who offered to lead a focus group in a meditation-visioning process. The purpose of this meeting will be to produce a set of broad and long range goals that embody our communities most fundamental and cherished values. These goals will then be presented to the PLUC for consideration as part of the General Plan review process. It is intended to foster participation from the wider community in a way that is visionary, creative, and “right brained”. It was agreed to schedule this at a separate time from the PLUC Meeting in June and it will be open to the public.

Mary Beth proposed reviewing the final draft of the General Plan Survey at the June PLUC Meeting and then sending it to a consultant for review. It is hoped that the Survey will be ready to send to property owners and residents in July or August.

Laura motioned to retable Item 6. Tom seconded the Motion. Laura, Marie, Mary Beth, and Tom approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

7. Discussion and possible action re: regulations for solar panels, windmills, and other alternative energy structures (tabled).

Left tabled.

8. Discussion and possible action re: reviewing and amending Ordinance 96-1: Watershed Protection Ordinance (tabled).

Left tabled.

9. Closed Meeting (if needed).

None.

Marie motioned to adjourn the Meeting. Tom seconded the Motion. Laura, Marie, Mary Beth, and Tom approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:53 P.M.

APPROVED:

ATTESTED:

Mary Beth Fitzburgh, Chairperson Date

Alison Fuller, Town Clerk Date