



118 Lion Blvd PO Box 187 Springdale UT 84767 * 435-772-3434 fax 435-772-3952

**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2015
AT 5:00 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.
THE MEETING BEGAN AT 5:00 PM.**

Work Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joe Pitti, Commissioners Mike Marriott, Jack Archer, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor, Liz West, Kezia Nielson from ZNP

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Moumita Kundu and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording
2 citizens signed in; see attached list.

Chairman Pitti welcomed the Town's new Associate Planner Moumita Kundu to the community. They are looking forward to her support.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the agenda; seconded by Liz West.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

West: Aye

Archer: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Mr. Dansie said we are fortunate to have Moumita join our staff. She is highly qualified and Moumita was our first choice. Moumita has a Master's degree in City and Metropolitan Planning from the University of Utah. She has worked for the Department of Environmental Quality, Salt Lake City Sustainability Division, the City of Linden and the University of Utah doing greenhouse gas modeling. Ms. Kundu also has experience with city planning and sustainability issues. She holds Master's and Bachelor's degrees in Geography from the University of Calcutta in India.

Mr. Mike Marriott joined the meeting and took his place at the Commission table.

The University of Utah planning program students are coming to present their findings to the Town Council, Planning Commission and community at large. It will be Friday, February 13th at 6:00pm here at the Town Hall. It will not be a formal meeting, but a community meeting. Everyone is encouraged to attend. Good information will come from their presentation.

- Ms. West asked if the presentation will be recorded as she cannot attend. Ms. Carlson will not be in attendance but Mr. Dansie offered to help with the recording.

Mr. Dansie also announced the Town has a brand new state-of-the-art sound system installed in the Council meeting room.

Mr. Pitti announced another Z-Arts event with Julian G, world class pianist, performing this Friday at 6:00pm at the CCC.

Mr. Pitti suggested the Town have a booth at Earth Day in April as an opportunity for the community to weigh in on the General Plan. It would be a chance for us to go to them instead of them coming to us. Mr. Dansie said they had done this the last time the General Plan was updated and the Town was able to get some feedback from the community. He thought it was worth the effort.

Discussion/Information Items

Public comment period on General Plan Chapter 2 *Town Appearance*:

Mr. Pitti said tonight the Commission would be listening to public comment on chapter 2 of the General Plan *Town Appearance*. They had received emailed comments from Jack Burns on behalf of Zion National Park, Kavarra Karr and Morris Smith. Mr. Pitti announced to the attendees that there was an agenda and sign-up sheet by the door. He asked that people come to the microphone and give their thoughts. The chapter was projected onto a screen.

Mr. Dansie said the Commission had already reviewed several chapters of the General Plan. Tonight they would be specifically focused on chapter 2 *Town Appearance*. He provided an overview of the chapter and read the general goal, "To preserve Springdale's unique appearance: a small rural village surrounded by the natural beauty of Zion Canyon".

- There are four major areas of emphasis:
 - Village Atmosphere; a term that is used quite frequently. What are the characteristics that contribute to the village atmosphere and how best can they be promoted.
 - Visual Focus on Natural Features; recognize the surroundings of Zion Canyon are important. Don't want to detract from the views of Zion National Park; what goals and strategies promote this.
 - Building Design; buildings themselves have a contribution; need to have consistency and be appropriate to context of the area. Everything being built contributes to the appearance of the Town.
 - Clean and Well-Maintained Town; public areas are well maintained and clean.

There are strategies that support each of these four goals.

Mr. Pitti said that meetings go until 7:00pm on the first Tuesday meeting of each month. The first part of tonight's meeting would be dedicated to public input on the *Town Appearance* chapter. Then the full Commission will begin to review and discuss.

Bruce VanderWerff approached the podium. He asked the Commission what they had seen in this chapter that they wanted to change based on input they had received so far.

Mr. Pitti replied the intent of the meeting tonight was to first get feedback from the public on their feelings regarding the chapter content. The Commission planned to take out elements that had already been accomplished and bolster other parts based on community comments and survey results.

Mr. VanderWerff wanted to know, based on the public input so far, what direction the Commission would be going regarding this chapter and if there would be anything new. Mr. Pitti clarified that Commissioners wanted to listen to the public first and then hash out the chapter as a full Commission. They had not deliberated yet or made any specific changes or recommendations. Mr. VanderWerff said town appearance has been defined and he wanted to know what was new or changing. Mr. Pitti said he could not give a specific answer at this stage of what would change.

Mr. VanderWerff said the Park had made comments and he wanted to know what they were. Also, he inquired about the results of the survey.

- Mr. Dansie indicated the results of the Town-wide survey were open for interpretation but in general people liked the Town as it is. There were differences in opinion on how to maintain but no request for wholesale changes. The question remains, is the current regulatory scheme good as-is or are there things that will need to change in order to insure things remain as they are?

Mr. Marriott added the Commission was looking for something to digest.

Mr. Pitti said the Commission wanted to look at the General Plan from different angles and be sure public opinion had been vetted. There would be additional opportunities for the public to speak to express what they truly want.

Ms. Nielsen said if they hear from the community "we like it the way it is", then this too is useful information. In looking at the content of chapter 2, are there things that need to be tweaked or should it be left as-is?

Mr. VanderWerff asked if he could get a copy of the General Plan. Mr. Pitti indicated it was available online along with the Town survey.

Mr. VanderWerff wanted to know if issues relating to the night sky were in chapter 2. Mr. Dansie answered that it is mentioned in this chapter and also in other places within the General Plan.

Regarding the night sky, Mr. VanderWerff asked if there was information about lumens. Mr. Dansie said the majority of standards have to do with design of light fixtures and where they can be placed on the property. The Town does not regulate lumens except when the Town grants exceptions in the design standards. There is not an overall lumen cap. Lights need to be down directed and shielded, with no light trespass. If the lights have less than 1000 lumens of output there is some flexibility in design.

Mr. Dansie indicated language focuses on lights being designed appropriately and protective of the night sky. The ordinance is in place now and any issues would require a change to the ordinance. Mr. Pitti reminded that the Town needs to be in compliance with the night sky ordinance by 2016.

No other residents provided feedback.

Discussion/Non-Action Items

Review of Public Comment from January 20 regular meeting on chapters 6-12: Mr. Pitti stated the meeting on January 20th asked for public input on chapters 6 through 12 of the General Plan. Tonight the Commission would review and discuss the comments from the public.

- Mr. Pitti said Lisa Zumpft mentioned the Planning Commissioners didn't want the Historic Preservation Commissioners to specifically work on this section. He answered that nowhere in the minutes did it say that. The November 14, 2014 and January 6, 2015 minutes showed the Commissioners support and anticipated feedback from the Historic Preservation Commission. They welcome any feedback.
- The Planning Commission was instrumental in drafting and recommending the implementation of the ordinance to have a Historic Preservation Commission in the first place to preserve historic features in Town.

Mr. Taylor indicated there is an ordinance that established the Historic Preservation Commission but that is all we have done so far. A comprehensive ordinance will determine what to do with historic buildings. We decided this would be done later.

Mr. Pitti wanted to correct a false accusation that we did not want the Historic Preservation Commission input. He asked Mr. Dansie about Ms. Zumpft's comments regarding section 6.1.2.h and WPA projects. Mr. Dansie answered that section was removed because it has been combined with another strategy and this seemed to satisfy Ms. Zumpft. Her next question relates to why they were removing the strategy to adopt a Historic Preservation ordinance. Mr. Taylor indicated that we had already done that, but in future look to revise and make more robust.

Mr. Pitti said chapter 26 of the Town Code outlines their duties and is appropriate. We may add language that the Planning Commission work with the Historic Preservation Commission to develop new goals. If you read the code it specifically outlines what they would do to assist in the preservation and maintenance of Town historic sites. Again he reiterated that this is a General Plan and not a specific plan. He felt the Commission needed to do a better job of letting the community know it is plan of general ideas that guide. Specifics are worked out in ordinance form.

Mr. Taylor suggested they work with the Historic Preservation Commission and, if deemed appropriate in the future, they develop nuts and bolts ordinances for historic preservation. Mr. Pitti agreed and said in section 6.1.2.a it is important to state they will work with the Historic Preservation Commission to develop any new goals. Mr. Dansie said this would resolve Ms. Zumpft's concerns but keeps the General Plan general.

Mr. Taylor said in order for the Town to be eligible for Certified Local Government grants they need to have a Historic Preservation ordinance. Doesn't the ordinance we have allow us to get grants?

- Mr. Dansie said 'yes' that was a slight misunderstanding. We have an ordinance and a Commission which allows us to apply for CLG status.
- Mr. Pitti said that he, Mr. Marriott and Ms. Nielsen were the only three on the sub-committee in 2014. They took the initiative to create the historic ordinance so they could apply for these funds.

Mr. Taylor suggested if they add comments or strike a paragraph a note be added so people have an explanation as to why. This will help answer questions.

Mr. Pitti said point 6.1.2 is in the code already. Also 6.1.2.a is being replaced with verbiage about developing goals. For section 7.6.1 of chapter 7, Ms. Zumpft suggested the Town add verbiage about continued maintenance and follow up of the Russian Olive and Tamarisk removal project. Mr. Pitti indicated the Town Council and Planning Commission supported. Mr. Archer indicated that it is already in there, by stating "educate property owners about the negative impacts" and "encourage property owners to remove non-native vegetation along the Virgin River and its tributaries".

- Ms. West clarified and said Ms. Zumpft recommends they also state "continue to maintain".
- Mr. Pitti said it is already in there and encompasses more than just those two invasive species.
- Mr. Dansie suggested they not reference this specific project because it is a general plan. He recommended the word 'continually' remove be added. This supports Ms. West's point.

Mr. Pitti moved on to the comment made regarding 7.6.2.e and asked if the Town could regulate tubing.

- Mr. Dansie said not specifically. The Town had a good working relationship with the area tubing companies but once they were on the river they couldn't regulate use. It would be up to the Army Corp of Engineers, but we can regulate impacts on private property, trespass and littering.
- Mr. Archer asked if the tubing companies hand out brochures with the information about trespassing. Mr. Dansie said tubers are given a briefing with the rules, but once people leave they cannot be controlled. It is up to the property/homeowner and is an ongoing issue.
- Mr. Dansie suggested they can add verbiage about trespass issues and littering to the General Plan, but it was not designed to be overly specific. Mr. Taylor recommended this could be part of the chapter with police enforcement.
- Ms. West said she noticed people get off and rest and use properties on the way down the river. She suggested tubing companies encourage it is a nonstop route.
- Mr. Dansie reiterated that these suggestions were all something we could pursue, but for the General Plan state that trespass and litter are issues we want to resolve.

Mr. Pitti addressed Ms. Farnsworth's comments made on chapter 8. She recommended they add the word 'native'

- Mr. Taylor mentioned the Parks chapter had similar language. He suggested 'native drought tolerant' was more appropriate terminology rather than just 'drought tolerant' or 'native'.
- Ms. West said turf grass needs to be included. Mr. Dansie said he wants to support the goals but commented that *native* low water plants are much more difficult to come by commercially than just low water plants. They need to understand the implication for homeowners if native plants are required instead of standard low water use plants.
- Mr. Taylor asked if these were requirements or strategies to be promoted. Mr. Dansie answered that the General Plan has no affect. It is designed to guide the Town's ordinances. The impact is at the ordinance level.
- Ms. Nielsen said she didn't think it needs to be native. They are hard to find. She said 'native or drought tolerant' would work.
- Mr. Pitti mentioned he had tried a variety of seeds from sources and the native plants are actually hard to grow. He understood Ms. Farnsworth passion and suggested the Commission develop language that continues to educate. Ms. West agreed and thought they can add information about participation to the education section.

Mr. Pitti continued with the comments provided from section 8.2.2.c and being sure runoff from new development doesn't affect old development.

- Mr. Taylor asked if this was in the building code already to which Mr. Dansie answered 'yes' this was already established case law and was in the construction standards of the Town. The Commission can add a clause in the General Plan to support but it was already in place. Town engineers review the storm water plans for new developments.

Mr. Pitti moved on to 8.4.4.b where Ms. Zumpft had questioned why this had been deleted. He said Commissioner Taylor had answered this question and it is due to state regulations. Mr. Taylor reiterated that if people are passionate they can compost on their own but it couldn't be done on a larger scale. People can take material to the county dump or do something on their own property if they were that passionate about it.

- Mr. Pitti also added that using the Town chipper was problematic and opened a host of problems with liability. Mr. Dansie concurred and said the Town staff does not have the ability to support.

Chairman Pitti asked the Commission if they wanted to discuss burning. He said burning was counter intuitive to clean air and green standards. Mr. Dansie asked if the Commissioners wanted to look at burning from an air quality or safety standpoint. They answered, 'both'.

- Ms. West said when she met with Joe Barker he indicated burning doesn't affect air quality but it was a nuisance. He said air quality is ok.
- Mr. Pitti said burning was more a nuisance when the smoke from burning clouded the vistas. Ms. West suggested the safety issues of burning be addressed in the education section including what not to burn.

The chapter 9 public input was addressed next. Ms. Zumpft suggested another photo be used to represent curb and gutter. The Commission agreed.

- Mr. Archer suggested a picture from Desert Pearl or in front of the Worthington Gallery be used to illustrate.

Section 9.1.3.b was deleted because all sidewalks had been completed except for area next to the Desert Pearl vacant lot. Mr. Taylor asked if sidewalk could be put there. Mr. Dansie answered 'yes' it just hasn't been on the Town's improvement list. Normally a developer will do or the Town will do. He said we can leave mention of curb and gutter in the General Plan since it is not completely done, although the Town anticipates it will be done soon.

- Mr. Pitti asked if the vacant lot was used as overflow parking for the Desert Pearl. Mr. Dansie answered that people just use it for parking. Mr. Dansie suggested that when the property owners come back with a plan for connection of the bridge to the highway then they can discuss this idea further. For now, they can leave this section in the General Plan.
- Mr. Taylor asked if parking for the restaurant would be in that lot. Mr. Dansie said the parking calculations had been revised and it was unclear if additional parking was needed. The ordinance amendment reduced the number of parking stalls required for restaurants especially those in conjunction with transient lodging facilities. Desert Pearl has more parking than they need but he needs to verify. With the opening of the restaurant that section of the sidewalk should be completed soon.

Mr. Pitti continued with chapter 10 section 10.3 and the comment regarding developing a strategy that the Town work with the OC Tanner Amphitheater to increase performances and improve parking. Mr. Pitti said they are their own separate business entity and he was not sure it was the Town's place to specify this in the General Plan. Mr. Dansie agreed and said the General Plan doesn't need to get specific but they can say to cooperate with Dixie State University on use of amphitheater because we do share a close relationship. No harm to add a strategy that encourages cooperation.

- Mr. Taylor suggested other strategies mention the Canyon Community Center and Library so he felt it ok to mention the OC Tanner too.

For chapter 11 Commissioner Archer felt it was ok to change EMT to EMS.

For section 11.1.4.d, the term 'code enforcement' was highlighted, but Mr. Dansie said it was just a note from a previous work meeting.

Under section 11.2 Mr. Archer offered to follow up on the residential usage percentage.

Mr. Pitti said section 11.1.2.a had been addressed. Mr. Archer said bicycle patrols cannot be done with a four man team. They had been tried before and didn't work.

Chapter 12 received public input as well. Regarding 12.1.3.d, Ms. Farnsworth had asked why gray water was removed. Mr. Taylor had addressed the question about gray water in the previous Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Pitti mentioned that Ms. Zumpft made comment that she didn't want the Planning Commission to rush the process. Mr. Pitti said they plan to take a first look at every section and make suggestions. It is the first step, not the only step.

- He reiterated that having the General Plan done by the June Town Council budget meeting is a goal not a deadline. The last General Plan update took a year and a half because there was not an end date in sight. This time around the Commission is taking about eight months to get feedback. They will take all the time that is needed. Again there is no deadline.

Continuation of General Plan Update Process; Review of chapter 2 Town Appearance: Mr. Pitti expressed his surprise that more people were not here tonight to discuss the chapter. He said perhaps people feel the General Plan is ok in the town appearance category and therefore did not feel the need to provide input or feedback. He said the Commission could start at the top of the chapter and review what Mr. Dansie had previously highlighted.

Commissioner Marriott began by asking the Commission if they should more fully define statements such as the first general goal "to preserve Springdale's unique appearance". He was curious what the definition of 'unique appearance' truly is. He posed the question if they should look specifically at things we like and highlight those, or is it ok that this term is vague. What is it that we think is unique?

- Mr. Pitti said he saw it as more an opening statement which is explored throughout the chapter.
- Ms. Nielsen said the General Plan identifies Springdale as a unique rural village. The four aspects identified are the human history, the pioneer heritage, the setting within Zion Canyon and the positioning as the gateway to Zion National Park. We are committed to preserving that distinction that makes us different from other places in Utah, the southwest and the world.

- Mr. Marriott asked about human history and what does that mean and how does it translate specifically into what this Town looks like? What is the driver behind this point that ties back into town appearance?
- Ms. Nielsen said that human history could be deleted. The Canyon has been occupied for thousands of years and taking into consideration those that were here before Europeans occupied the Town. There are not obvious things in Town that show this. The Park has artifacts.
- Mr. Pitti suggested they focus on overarching elements and strategies then go back to the minutia. However, Mr. Marriott said that is essentially what he is getting at. They need to define what 'unique village' means.
 - Mr. Pitti asked what it meant to Mr. Marriott. Mr. Marriott replied that what it means to me may be very different than what it means to someone else. He would have to think about that. It is more than just a simple sentence.

Mr. Dansie said Mr. Marriott's observation was good because it is the crux of the matter. It was a good exercise to understand what it means and how it was previously defined. As Ms. Nielsen points out, a previous Council and Commission has already gone through that exercise of defining what they think the unique character and village appearance is. Sub-points A-H elaborates on this idea. He admitted the initial clause is vague and why there is so much detail to back-up. Discussion should focus on these sub-points to determine if they unique to Springdale. If so these should be preserved. If not, they should focus on others. Decide what makes up Springdale's character and focus strategies on those.

Mr. Taylor asked are we really a small rural village with hotels and restaurants and three million people going through. Mr. Dansie replied it was all in your frame of reference.

Ms. Nielsen said 'yes', we are not a city, we are a town. We are not an urban area, we are a rural area. We asked in the survey what people thought these terms meant. There was a lot of input and we need to look at what the community said. How did people define this space they are living in.

- Mr. Marriott said he recommended the Commissioners take time to think this through and review again before giving feedback.
- Mr. Archer agreed. Surveys say what people who live here think about the Town. It may not be reality but come up with new ideas and a way to express it.

Mr. Staker said he loved the thought of pioneer history, but was hard pressed to find anything historical and back to pioneer days. He sees commercial entities. We need to recognize what we are and not what we want to be. We are the gateway community to a major national park and we are here to provide services to the people who come here. No one makes a living with farming anymore. The rural thing is a stretch. We need to recognize this.

- Mr. Archer agreed and felt the Historic Preservation Commission was important and they can help bring out the historic elements. Mr. Staker felt it should be saved but was such a small faction. Some areas in Utah have historical districts and houses. What we have in Town is practically falling down.
- Ms. Nielsen expressed that farming is our heritage and part of the people that live here. Those that come to Town don't know they are hobby farmers. Look at Kanab; it is all about the old west and heritage. This is what people who live in this Town want to highlight. It belongs to the people who live here. Visitors come and go away. For those that still live here this effort matters for them. We need to remember this process is for the residents of Springdale.
- Mr. Pitti wholeheartedly agreed. Even to visitors that pass through our community, they see it as a rural town. There's no way they see it as a bustling commercial entity. They see hotels and restaurants but overall it is a small rural town. The local arts council receives funding based on this fact. We have only 28 students in the elementary school. We are only three miles long. If you revisit the survey, the community repeats language relating to small and rural over and over again so it must be protected. We must strike a balance. We get a lot of income from visitors and commercial entities but underneath it all is a community that lives here and we must be cognoscente of that.
- Mr. Staker said he agrees with the comments of Ms. Nielsen and Mr. Pitti but they need to realize what it is that drives the community. He would like to see cows and pigs and fields and pastures too but that is not the driving force.
- Mr. Pitti said we can strike a balance of both and help ensure the small scale through ordinances. The appearance of scale gives it the small town feel.

Mr. Taylor said the strategies we adopt should guide low impact and small scale because there will be more growth. Strategy should be to keep at more human scale. People are not making money off of cows, most are very urban people. Ordinances dictate heights and square footage and this helps guide development.

Ms. West said certain words stuck out to her from the surveys – small, independent businesses, open space, walkable, friendly, quaint, and safe.

Mr. Pitti asked if there were suggestions on how to move forward to hone in on a definition of what town appearance is.

Mr. Marriott suggested we all look at the first four pages.

- Mr. Pitti said there is a lot to this section that has worked for our community. If it were objectionable, he would have expected a lot more people be here tonight providing feedback. They should use this silent voice as one of acceptance.
- Ms. Nielsen agreed and said especially given some of the survey answers.
- Mr. Pitti added the feedback from the University of Utah students might provide something that resonates with us. Their questioning to visitors and residents alike had a lot to do with town appearance.

Mr. Marriott asked about the purpose of the highlighted sections of the chapter. Mr. Dansie said upon his initial review he wanted to point out areas the Commission may want to pay attention to. It is by no means an end-all list.

Commenting on Mr. Pitti's statement about the University of Utah students, Mr. Dansie recommended people read the Listentospringdale.com website survey responses as they are very insightful.

Mr. Pitti suggested they start with the highlighted sections. They can update the number of residents in the community from the 2010 census to 527 people. On page 3, Mr. Dansie said the rural heritage workshop was done in 2001 so the information could be replaced with the updated survey information.

Mr. Pitti agreed with Mr. Taylor's earlier comments about providing explanation next to the highlight so people understand the intent.

Continuing to work through the chapter and the associated yellow highlights, Mr. Marriot questioned the grid and asked if there was updated information for the same categories so a comparison can be made.

- Mr. Dansie said they didn't ask the same questions that led to the grid, but there were similar themes of answers that can be input.

Continuing on page 4, under numbers 1, 2, 3, paragraph B, Mr. Dansie said current public input can be updated in these sections.

Mr. Taylor commented that the Zion Park Scenic Byway should be updated to the current progress of ZC3.

Mr. Pitti referenced 2.1.1.b. Mr. Dansie said it had been accomplished.

Mr. Archer asked the last time the Town looked into purchasing property to facilitate parking. Mr. Dansie answered the Town has never looked at purchasing any specific property for parking. They have talked about it in a broad sense.

- Mr. Pitti asked if property at the beginning of Town had been looked at. Mr. Dansie said they looked conceptually at a number of places and proposed a plan whereby a developer could pay an in lieu fee in exchange for the total number of parking stalls they would need and then the Town would use this money to acquire parking area. The Town Council didn't like this idea. The Town does not have a revenue source to purchase property.

On page 2.8, section 2.1.3 addresses the adverse effects of gated streets and communities. An ordinance prohibits gates in subdivisions. The Commission can decide to take out or keep in to bolster the message.

- Mr. Taylor asked if anyone had applied to get a gated community. Mr. Dansie said the ordinance prohibits gates unless for health and safety reasons. No one has applied.
- Mr. Taylor referenced Watchman subdivision. Mr. Dansie said this was developed before the ordinance went into place. If development had gates before the ordinance went into place then it could remain. Gates across driveways are not addressed in the ordinance.
- Ms. Nielsen suggested it be left so there is a way for people to come to the Town and petition.

On page 2.1.4, which addresses preserving open space, Mr. Dansie suggested they add recommendations from Sumner Swarner's study to this section.

Under 2.1.4.b the Park suggested verbiage that would encourage trailheads to Zion National Park.

- Ms. Nielsen said it would be good to have a legal mechanism to cross private property for trail access.
- Mr. Pitti wanted to encourage the words 'hiking areas' instead of 'trailheads'.

- Mr. Dansie said we don't want to require anyone to give access but encourage so hiking opportunities are open and accessible to the public. He added the Town provides incentive to developers who provide access to open space and the Park.

Next highlighted section 2.1.4.e, addressed established zone specific setbacks, but Mr. Dansie thought this didn't make much sense. There are already zone specific setbacks and so he wasn't sure what this was getting at.

On page 2.12 there is a picture of the Town Hall that is outdated. Mr. Dansie thought this should be replaced with an image of a better example. Mr. Taylor recommended a picture of the Community Center.

Mr. Pitti wanted to go back to 2.1.5 and 2.1.5.b addressing 'cut rock'. The Park suggested they use 'hand-tooled' and shaped instead. Mr. Dansie said he thought this was just semantics. The Commissioners discussed the use of the word 'native' and how practical it was. Mr. Marriott thought it would be good to promote and encourage, but not require. Mr. Staker agreed and thought the native stone was the feature they should emphasize. They decided to use the word 'encouraging' instead of 'requiring'.

Continuing to review the comments provided by the Park, on page 2.1.4, 2.2.2.b, discussing the creation of a river use plan to protect the river from the impacts of recreational uses such as tubers and kayakers; this was done but no formal plan has been developed. It can be left in and made more specific.

- Mr. Pitti suggested instead of creating a river use plan, they should state 'encourages the protection of the river', so it is not as specific.

For section 2.2.2.c, the Park suggested the inclusion of language to remove non-native species. Mr. Pitti said we are looking to protect the river corridor without getting too specific.

- Mr. Dansie thought it was two different ideas – 2.2.2c requires more of a buffer from the river and the Park is suggesting non-native trees be removed from these areas. This is ok to include but it should be in a different strategy than this one.

Ms. West grammatically corrected the last sentence on page 2.15

Mr. Dansie suggested the color of historical structures be mentioned in the *Historic Preservation* chapter rather than *Town Appearance*.

Mr. Taylor noted an inconsistency in 2.3.1 that relates to building height limits. It should be corrected to 20' to 28'. Ms. West noted that 2.2.3c and 2.1.5c has the exact same verbiage.

Section 2.2.4c addresses light spillage. Mr. Dansie said the lighting ordinance defines and requires this, but it could be mentioned again in the General Plan. The Commissioners agreed that it should be included.

Under 2.2.5b Ms. West made the suggestion to change verbiage to 'low water use' turf grass. Mr. Dansie said the plant list included grasses. The Park appears to be referring to grasses that are even lower water consumers than fescue or rye. Mr. Dansie suggested alternative language be 'where appropriate, investigate low water use turf grass'.

Comments on sections 2.1.3c and 2.1.3d 2.3.1e regarding native stone should be changed to be consistent with earlier sections.

Mr. Dansie highlighted 2.3.1e because it doesn't really say anything and should be deleted.

Ms. West wanted to publically thank the Park for taking the time to read, think through and respond. Their input is helpful.

Mr. Pitti said going through the highlighted areas was the tip of the iceberg. For their next meeting they will continue with the *Town Appearance* chapter. The next informational item will be from the February 13th presentation of the Stephen Goldsmith students.

Mr. Dansie mentioned he did not anticipate any DDRs for the February regular meeting. Therefore they could continue to review this chapter during that time.

Ms. Carlson said the Town had received comments about the time of the meetings. Perhaps the Commission wanted to adjust to allow for those who would prefer a slightly later time.

- Mr. Pitti said they had discussed this before. He thought there was a misconception that we work for the Town. We are all volunteers who are dedicated and take time to do this. If the time is bumped up we may get more people, but people can also join at another time. He does appreciate the consideration.
- Ms. Carlson noted changing the time also affects staff and the hours they work during meeting days.
- Mr. Pitti said the Commission will provide other opportunities for public comment including an Earth Day booth.
- Ms. Carlson mentioned that she can highlight the email and address where people can send their written comments.
- Mr. Pitti said the written comments are all part of the record. Ms. Carlson indicated all comments are forwarded to the Mayor, Town Council and Planning Commission as applicable.
- Mr. Staker said it seems like a written record carries more weight than someone standing at the podium.

Mr. Marriott asked if it would make sense to break up the review of the General Plan into sections and review over time instead of tackling all at once. Mr. Dansie indicated most municipalities do the entire plan at once. The General Plan is a vision for the community. Doing it piecemeal may lose the ability to create a comprehensive vision. For an established plan where no major changes are anticipated, maybe it can be done bit by bit.

Mr. Pitti asked if it had to be reviewed every five years. Mr. Dansie said our own language in the General Plan dictates a review every five years. Ms. Nielsen thought it was state mandated, but it is actually a self-imposed timeline.

Mr. Dansie said the General Plan is a good asset for the Town and should be referred to often. It is also a really good defense for the Town in the case of lawsuits. It is a document that shows why we did what we did. If the plan is old it makes arguments tough.

Mr. Pitti commented that if we find the General Plan is working then we have the option to approve with minor changes.

- Ms. Nielsen said portions of it continue to work. She recalled Mr. Dansie stating that we should be looking at what needs to be changed and not as an entire re-do. Consider the parts that are no longer pertinent or those that have been accomplished.

Mr. Pitti said we don't want to get caught in semantics. They need to look at the underlying elements and messaging. The General Plan is a tool to help guide ordinances.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn made by Jack Archer at 7:12 PM; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Taylor: Aye

Pitti: Aye

West: Aye

Archer: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.


 Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  _____

