

MINUTES
CASTLE VALLEY TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING & LAND USE COMMISSION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 2006
AT THE COMMUNITY BUILDING, #2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE, CASTLE VALLEY, UT.

Joint Workshop on the General Plan

Council Members Present: Damian Bollermann, Valli Smouse, Ranna Bieschke, Jim Lindheim, Alice Drogin.

Commissioners Present: Michael Peck, Marie Hawkins.

Absent: Vicky Kress, Gil Gonzales.

Others Present: None.

Town Clerk: Rebecca Martin

Call to Order: Meeting called to order by Damian Bollermann at 6:37 PM

Re: Opening Statement/Mission Statement

Discussion centered on expressing a general “vision of cooperation” and whether or not a “warm and fuzzy” feeling/general mood is important in the mission statement.

The degree to which a General Plan directs the Town Council and activities in the Town was discussed. Wording discussed ranged from the general, e.g., “X, Y, Z ideals would be facilitated by the Town” to the specific, e.g., “the Town will enforce compliance with X, Y, Z ordinances”. Eventually, it was agreed that the General Plan serves as a basis upon which ordinances would be based, and ordinances are what citizens would have to comply with.

People discussed the degree to which specific examples should be used, such as carpooling or cooperative gardening, vs. general concepts.

The definition of commercial was discussed at length, as well as the history of problematic conditional use permits (CUPs) which have “morphed” into larger/different things; the winery was used as an example. The appropriateness of farm stands was discussed. Wording people liked included “There will be no commercial zoning” or “no commercial zoning permitted”, and “low-impact home-based businesses.” Limiting the number of commercial visits/traffic per day was said to be a CUP goal.

Changing demographics were discussed including the Castle Valley traditions of eclectic demographics, strategies about property values, originality and preservation of the rural lifestyle.

Ranna suggested that the 5 acre minimum lot size should be moved into the preamble because it is one of the prime values.

People spoke in favor of keeping Page 2, Paragraph 3 of the current General Plan as is.

Re: How the revision process will go:

Each person will be responsible for incorporating the changes in their own draft. The pieces will all be put together again at the next (General Plan) meeting, and then a draft will be brought to the public for their input. The Council did not think that a tracked change document would be needed to bring the General Plan work before the public.

Re: General Plan Description and Plan Implementation (page 3 of current General Plan):

There was consensus to keep these two sections as is without changes.

Re: Land Use (changes discussed based on existing General Plan and on drafted suggestions for changes from Michel and Jim – both documents included):

Jim suggested removing the word “agricultural” from the land use goal statement, added in the phrase “desert residential”, and referred to water quality and impact on the fragility of the desert environment. Discussion ensued about the definition of the word “rural” and about agricultural values. Alice suggested including discouragement of herbicide use.

Most of this section was re-written.

The 5 acre minimum density clause will remain.

Michael suggested including an encouragement for new building projects to incorporate conservation and alternative energy aspects. Discussion ensued about writing this into ordinances for enforcement. (see also #6 of the new draft) Paragraph 2 of the new draft will be moved to the housing section.

(#4 & #5, new draft): Lengthy discussion ensued about wording on home-based businesses, including CV examples of difficult businesses (CUPs), and distinctions and/or restrictions about “retail”, “commercial” and “industrial” uses. Jim suggested that “no retail” and “no commercial” are inaccurate. Suggested wording to use included “only home-based businesses are allowed”, and then “only if they have a low impact on neighboring property and the community”.

(#7 & 8 of the new draft, and #8, 10 & 11 of the current plan) An intent to influence compatible land use and water quality and quantity conservation purposes was added. Annexation issues were discussed. The need to come up with a plan to prevent problems with the takings issue was discussed. An addition about encouraging the land trade was discussed; suggested wording included “such as conservation easements, public lands trades to keep the wildlife corridor viable, etc.”

It was decided to keep #9 (of the existing plan) as is and or to combine it with #10 & 11.

Re: Housing:

Discussion ensued about whether wind power is allowed or not, including historic and current CV examples.

Using the word “encourage” was generally agreed to be good wording for a general plan with “enforce” an ordinance concept. Setting up in resource area in the library and other educational efforts were discussed as forms of encouragement.

Red Tagging places for demolition was discussed, with a CV example given. Valli noted that something should be in the plan if the Town intends to do it, but that the Town does not have to do everything in the plan.

People discussed holding Clean-Up Day twice per year and the possibility of funding the second one through taxes.

In the housing goal, adding the phrase “to preserve the unique diverse character of housing in the Town” was suggested.

Re: Roads:

Discussion ensued about the level of quality desired in maintaining the roads, with differences in opinion. Adding the phrase “low impact” to the goal was suggested. Words used ranged from “passable” to “safe”, to “efficient”, to “high quality”.

The concept of roads serving as fire breaks was discussed, including easement and weed factors. Something about fire prevention will be added.

Mowing weeds on the side roads was discussed.

There was discussion on dust suppression.

Removing the references to “trails” was suggested, including item 6.

There was discussion on speed bumps and the possibility of adding speeding on the side roads to the nuisance ordinance draft.

Alice suggested listing permaculture as a method to ameliorate damage that flood waters cause. Discussion ensued about how CV road issues stump engineers.

Re: Environmental Concerns:

Note: Valli provided one draft of the environmental concerns section and Jim provided another. (Discussion touched on both drafts and the existing General Plan – all copies included)

The goal statement was changed to include global issues.

Most of this section was re-written.

Discussion ensued about restrictions being needed only when people do not respect their neighbors and how realistic a safeguard this may/may not be.

Encouraging the utility companies to explore alternative power sources for Castle Valley was discussed, such as installing a field of thermal-solar dish concentrators in the Cisco desert.

A section on national/global issues was suggested.

Re: Economic Basis: No one worked on this section.

Re: Water:

There was discussion on whether the Town could try to partner on in-stream holdings.

Discussion ensued on requiring any planned development to prove water availability of sufficient groundwater resources to support development.

Concern was expressed that when people buy lots with no water, they will come to the Town for water. Discussion ensued about whether a water system could be put in or not with our low density and geologic issues. Adding a clause that the Town will not guarantee the availability of water/water rights to owners was discussed.

The next General Plan Special Meeting was planned for Thursday, August 31st, at 6:00 PM, at the Community Building.

Ranna moved to adjourn the meeting. Valli seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

ATTEST:

Rebecca Martin, Town Clerk