

LA VERKIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, March 11, 2026, 6:00 pm.

City Council Chambers, 111 South Main Street

La Verkin, Utah 84745

Present: Chair Allen Bice; Commissioners: Kyson Spendlove, Sherman Howard Staff: Derek Imlay, Fay Reber, and Nancy Cline; Public: John Valenti, Brad Robbins, Patty Wise, Kevin Smedley.

A. Call to Order: Chair Allen Bice called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance were given by Kyson Spendlove.

B. Approval of Agenda:

The motion was made by Commissioner Sherman Howard to approve the agenda, second by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove. Sherman Howard-yes, Spendlove-yes, Bice-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Reports:

1. John Valenti reported on the city council meeting held on March 4, 2026.

2. Derek Imlay requested to cancel the March 25th meeting. They will have three new zones on the agenda in April. Irrigation will be back on Monday so they can fix the brakes and then it will be on for the city March 16, 2026.

D. Public Hearing

1. An ordinance amending title 10 Chapter 6B removing Two-Family Dwelling from the list of permitted uses in the R-1-10.

Public Hearing opened at 6:06

Commissioner Bice explained that the way that ordinance is currently written allows pieces of property with sixteen thousand square feet in an R one ten zone to put a duplex there. This would remove that that permission

Russel Smith commented they didn't know what the ordinance was for and was here to see what the outcome was of the discussion they had behind closed doors.

Commissioner Bice invited him to speak if he wanted.

Commissioner Spendlove said he would like to hear what Russel had to say because they haven't discussed this yet and wanted his opinion. He thought Patty Wise had something to say.

Patty Wise: I apologize if I missed this in previous planning commission meetings. I was a little surprised about the discussion on it. A sixteen thousand square foot property, allowing two units, makes the home more affordable, potentially more affordable. We just passed detached ADUs, which of course are smaller than the primary size. So, it doesn't seem like this is necessary. I think having a duplex, there are so many really nice ones out there. Kirk has some beautiful, just small individual properties that look great. So I see it as more an affordability thing, and it would still keep the spaciousness in the neighborhood. I don't think having two families on sixty thousand square feet would impact traffic, not any more than a detached ADU would. So I would be in favor of keeping it. And hopefully I read through the ordinance correctly.

Commissioner Sherman Howard commented he didn't remember discussing this in previous meetings. He asked what the reasoning was behind removing the duplexes.

Commissioner Bice said they would discuss it after the public hearing.

Lori Smith commented that she had the same question, kind of what brought this to the agenda? How did it come in? Or changed, what is it currently? What's in question really? Obviously, there's some kind of an issue. Or why would you want to change from what it currently is. Is that something that the public will hear, or we just get to kind of come and express our thoughts? So if we're just here to come and express our views on it, what is the ordinance currently and what are the proposed changes? Just removing these houses?

Public Hearing closed at 6:09

E. Business:

1. Discussion and possible action to recommend approval of an ordinance amending title 10 Chapter 6B removing Two-Family Dwelling from the list of permitted uses in the R-1-10.

Commissioner Bice commented that he would recommend that we request a continuation of that. Patty was right. This hasn't been discussed. It came to us at the request of city council, and we haven't had a chance to discuss it. It didn't come from the public, but it did come as a request from the city council. The options on item number one would be to, discuss and recommend, or the other option would be to move for continuance. To give us a chance to discuss before we recommend.

Commissioner Spendlove read through the ordinance and thought this fits a lot better in with our discussion for the downtown area. And what we're trying to do with the city itself. For like a long-term plan. He asked if they have to put an actual date on the continuation. Or can we table this discussion until we've had a work meeting with city council?

Fay recommended tabling it until the April 8, 2026, meeting. If they need a work meeting or any meetings with the city council, they can do that. Then on April eighth, they can come back to this body. They can have a more detailed discussion by that time. We'll have our other two members here. They can have that detailed discussion about why this may or may not be a good thing for the city or what options we have. Then at that point have a recommendation for the city council.

Derek agreed it would be a good idea to have a joint work meeting with city council.

Commissioner Bice suggested a quick half hour meeting before city council meeting.

Derek added that it would need to be longer than that. They need to discuss the mixed-use zone. How are we going to apply it? Where do we want to apply it? Would they like to go down the rest of State Street? This is vital to figure out and get an understanding of why the need to have a remove duplexes. He suggested not having a regular meeting, just a joint work meeting with Brad to take us through the process. He recommended having this discussion at the same time as that, because we really can't move forward with a lot of this until we understand what our vision is.

Councilman John Valenti commented that like everybody else here, he was surprised there was no discussion to his knowledge at the city council's level on how the city council recommended this. He was unaware of it just as everybody else was before this meeting.

Commissioner Bice suggested it wasn't the whole city council.

Patty Wise commented that this is something that I was very careful of when I was on the city council. And I think it speaks to transparency is that when recommendations are made to the planning commission to review something, to be told that the city council sent it forward. That John's correct. That's not accurate. The city council would have to discuss it in a meeting, make a public decision with a vote. The planning commission, if it's at the city council, if it's a couple of members of the city council who maybe speak with staff or speak with the mayor, or if it's just the mayor, I think that is transparency that should be told here in this meeting. Not only for the planning commission but for the public. To say the city council, that's six members with legislative, control over this. And it just doesn't matter what the issue is. I think that's something important. Just like John has started to do and I would try to do when the planning commission passed something or try to say what the vote was so that city council knows that it was a split vote or a full vote. I think going in both directions. So that's just a personal comment. Thank you.

Fay agreed it was a good idea for us to get together with the city council in a work meeting setting, go over the ordinance, discuss the reasons for it. At that point, a majority of the council may say, no, we don't want this and then we don't move forward with it. At least the planning commission would have some indication which way it would go. He thought it's important that they get together, have that larger discussion, get all those issues out on the table, and then we can decide which way to go from there.

Derek commented he would get some dates together to meet. But we want to have that meeting prior to any discussion continuing here. Even if we put that off for multiple meetings.

Commissioner Spendlove added that we could recommend it being pushed to the April eighth meeting, and then if we still haven't made a decision or had the correct discussion, we could recommend it for an extension.

The motion was made by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove to recommend tableting this discussion for April 8, 2026, meeting when more of the planning commission would be present, seconded by Commissioner Sherman Howard. Sherman Howard-yes, Kyson Spendlove-yes, Bice-yes. The motion carried unanimously

2. Discussion and possible action to set a public hearing for April 8, 2026, to establish a new MDR-8 zone.

Brad explained that this would be three new zones. The first one is the R-1-8. This will be a brand-new zone for the city. It's not going to go on any property in the city at this time. It's just a code that could be used by a developer at some point in the future. It would allow for detached single family residences, twin homes, triplexes and fourplex units, and clustered courtyard housing. Now with the new subdivision map ordinance that was passed by the legislature a couple years ago, there are some restrictions. For example, if it's a single-family home development or a two-family home development, they won't be able to get precise plan of architectural drawings, those types of things, unless there are other land use approvals proposed. The ordinance talks about setbacks for the front set to twenty-five feet, five for the sides, rear is ten, corner lot is fifteen. Then it gets into some development standards requiring common recreation area development agreement depending upon if it's triplex or fourplex fencing requirement, two car garage, and homeowners' association. Lot coverage requirement would be seventy five percent. Meaning they could not cover a lot more than seventy-five percent. And then an active open space requirement.

Commissioner Bice commented that it works out to 5,445 square feet per building for residents. Some of those will be duplexes and maybe two stories. But that's not dramatically smaller than the R-1-6 that we've talked about creating.

Brad commented they would discuss this more when they discussed the Top Side.

3. Discussion and possible action to set a public hearing for April 8, 2026, to establish a new HDR-14 zone.

Brad explained high density residential, which is HDR-14. That will allow for up to four stories in height and up to fourteen dwelling units per acre. Again, apartments, condos, anything but a town home you could go through the application departments that would allow you to do precise architectural drawings on this. Unless, of course, there is some other approval that's required. The height regulation couldn't exceed more than forty feet. Setbacks are essentially the same: front would be twenty-five, side would be twenty, rear twenty and corner lot twenty-five. He added that there'd be a graduated setback if it's adjacent to existing single family residential. That way they wouldn't have this high building coming up right next to the home. The actual height would be set back fifty feet. Meaning that the forty feet height would not be able to be achieved until fifty feet setback. There are also modifying regulations: a bike rack will be required, common bike area development group will be required, and lot coverage would not exceed seventy. Fencing requirements of block all around the property. Two car garages, the homeowner's association also in this. Also, a loading area, which he thought is important for apartment complexes. That would require one loading area per fifteen dwelling units for people that are moving in and out. And then open space requirement of two hundred square feet per dwelling unit, one hundred of that would have to be private open space. Storage areas are to be required. Again, parking. When we went through the little work with the balconies, he also added that back into this code. That requires the balconies to be closed with a solid block wall if they're facing exterior property lines. Then any type of outdoor storage would be permitted.

Commissioner Bice commented this requires one hundred square feet shall be a private patio. Will that be the case if they're on the fourth floor of a four story, and how? What would that look like? Like a tennis court area that belongs to them.

Brad explained that it would be a patio that's a ten-by-ten area where they can sit. And then another hundred feet would be in a congregated area.

Commissioner Bice clarified that they would be attached to their fourth floor balcony.

Brad replied yes it would be their private patio.

4. Discussion and possible action to set a public hearing for April 8, 2026, to establish a new R-1-6 zone.

Brad explained that the R-1-6 allows one family homes on six thousand square foot lots. They could not have a building any higher than thirty-five feet, and accessory building could not be more than twenty feet in height. Front, side, and back would be twenty-five, the side would be eight feet, the rear would be ten. Of course, a two-car garage would be required. The lot coverage should not exceed 70%. A developer that does these needs to actually install the front yard prior to certificate of occupancy, which he thought was good for family homes.

Derek added that there is another option to consider for the setbacks. Making the garage still maintain the twenty-five foot setback but letting the porch maybe move to a twenty. Minimizing the front yard, enlarging the backyard, and making the side setbacks five, rear ten, on the other one five, because then they are hitting fire code at the five-foot setback, just because the lot sizes are small.

Commissioner Bice asked with their permission they would consider items 2,3, and 4 together when setting a public hearing.

The motion was made by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove to recommend set a public hearing for April 8, 2026, for the MDR-8 zone, the HDR-14 and the R-1-6 zone, seconded by Commissioner Sherman Howard. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussion regarding preliminary concept design.

Derek explained that Casey Stratton came before them a few weeks ago. Derek talked to the landowners around the property, and they were not opposed to the plan. This is what the corridor study that we participated in with UDOT actually talked about having the commercial, the higher density, and then opening up to larger lots as you move out. Whereas the high density would basically pay for the roadway infrastructure and everything. His request is for an R-3-6. The layout doesn't work for the R-3-6. They could take it into consideration and discuss it more later because we want to make sure, we get this right. And this may be part of the discussion for the work meeting that we have. Then we can get a better understanding from both planning commission and city council, if this would be something they would want to entertain doing. The city paid a lot of money with the state to provide that corridor study. This is what they recommended. The study proves that if we want to get that walkable downtown this is how we need to start doing it, and whether it's applicable in that area or somewhere else in town. The city needs to try and find ways of getting other multifamily dwellings, so that there can be at least some chance of affordability or attainability

6. Discussion and presentation regarding the Top Side property.

Brad explained this is a heads up as to what's going to be coming their way from our creative industry. These two developments that they are going to talk about are probably the two largest single developments in the history of the market, and so they're going to be very important, and very impactful. He thought they needed to stay in touch with and get their hands on as soon as possible. He would talk about zoning a little bit: the SITLA property, the other property called the Bank property. What the development process is going to look like, what studies are probably going to be necessary, what a potential financial strategy. The SITLA property is 330 acres and has a buyer as you may be aware. The bank-owned property is approximately 566 acres for a total of 900 acres. It's a big development. It's a big development California standard, any state you go to, this is going to be a large, big development. It's going to really impact the town in what could be a positive way. There was an existing development on here before; it was called Mosaic. That was in 2005, but it's essentially dumped at this point. And that just consisted of the bank owned property, 566 acres. The zoning out there right now is PCD (planned community development) that allows for mixed-use, large-scale development, and it fits well for this piece of property. He didn't think this type of zoning had ever been used in the city before. This will be something new to be looked at. The SITLA property is a negotiation with developers at this present time. It's my understanding this is a big-name developer. In his experience, you're better off having a developer that's got a few dollars that can actually do some stuff as opposed to one struggling to get by. When this happens, the development will be entered into with a development agreement with the city, and the property will be developed in a PCD zone. The bank property that's approximately 566 acres. There was a development agreement already approved between the bank and the city. The new name of this property is going to be La Verkin Mesa. The chosen developer will be entitled to 1600 dwelling units, which are equivalent dwelling units, and that's going to consist of residential, commercial, short-term rental units, parks, open spaces, probably a school site. There'll probably be some governmental facilities up there, such as police, fire, church sites, trails and then infrastructure facilities. The commercial is going to consist of a minimum of fifteen percent of the total project acreage that will eliminate some of the residential units. That'll be figured out as time goes on how much actual commercial is going to be. It could at least be a minimum of fifty percent. Developments can be phased, and these planning areas can be sold off to other developers. This is normal in this type of process. Developers do not do all development of the acreage. Developers, which just may be in this case, sell off to commercial developers that actually develop the property. These transfers will be allowed between different planning areas. There is nothing abnormal about that that's part of the normal planning process. The developer will be required to design, install, and construct all project improvements. That is absolutely normal; cities don't do that type of stuff anymore. They have no ability to do that after all this. The developer will have had a vested

right in order to develop the property as per the approved plan. Again, that's normal in a development phase as we talked about. Because there is some development restrictions placed as a result of this development agreement, the planning commission will not have total discretion as to how this thing is going to develop. However, they do have the ability to influence how it's going to develop and what's going to go on and how it's going to look. The development process will follow requirements dictated in the PCD zone, and it will also follow general plan goals and objectives. There is going to be a document that is developed through this that outlines zoning, development requirements, development standards, circulation, major design concepts, municipal services, phasing administration, grading, defining hillside, and open space, which will be quite a bit of that up there. In essence, they're going to have a specific plan and development for both of these properties. They'll probably be two separate ones, but having said that, these have to be integrated together. They don't want two different developments that don't talk to each other or don't integrate with each other. He thought the developers would also want to do a master conveyance map. That is, essentially, that each planned area as defined will be its own separate lot. There'll be infrastructure; it'll be shown on your master plan infrastructure. It consists of arterial roads, collector streets, and those types of things. When that map records those streets, and that infrastructure will be dedicated to the city at that time. It will allow the developer to then take these other lots and spin them off to other developers. They can improve the project as it continues on. He also thought there's also going to be a follow-up development agreement necessary. As far as studies and plans are concerned there is definitely going to be a traffic study, analyzing traffic impacts, signalization, those type of things. UDOT's going to have their say into what goes on out there. There'll be a biological assessment, an archaeological assessment, a slope analysis, drainage study, and geotechnical geological study. Then there is going to be a master infrastructure plan that kind of spells out how much it's going to cost and what infrastructure is going to be required in order to serve this entire development. Those are called community facilities plans. Also, a public facility plans to plan the schools, fire stations, parks, and those types of things. How is all this stuff getting paid for? The city has adopted ordinance to allow for a PID or a public infrastructure district. In essence, it's an assessment district. Most states like California that's the only way major development gets paid for. Funding is through the assessment district. The way these essentially work is that the developer will come in and figure out exactly how much the infrastructure is going to cost in order to develop this, and that would include water, sewer, all your street improvements, whatever it takes in order to build this development. That number is then figured out in what a bond would be for that amount, and then that bond is then attached to the subject property. When the commercial comes in and the single-family homes come in, that assessment is then divided amongst all those different players that are out there. So, if you buy a house out in a place like this, that has a PID, you may end up having to pay as part of your bond payment. And that can be anywhere from a fifteen-year bond to thirty-year bond. Depending after thirty years, that bond gets extinguished. But what that does is allow the developer to go in and build out all the master plan improvements immediately, instead of having a phased development. Most developers like this road because it makes more sense for them. In a lot of ways, it makes more sense for the city too, because you get all your improvements right up front. Now, there is probably some risk to that if there is some failure, but like in California, this is done every day. It's not clear at this time, whether any of these developers want to do this PID process. The only other option is for a developer to pay for those improvements themselves, probably through some type of phase program.

Commissioner Bice asked if that will be in place so if they choose to do the PID they can.

Brad explained that the city has adopted the ordinance, so they're allowed to go down that process now. They will have an assessment engineer to figure out what it's going to cost. Get involved in bonds and those sides of things, and there's going to be someone on the staff that's going to have to follow this whole thing financially. But all that can come later on. This is kind of the way major development is done anymore.

Commissioner Spendlove commented there is a PID's in hurricane towards Sand Hollow Road using that same approach.

Brad explained that that's probably what you're going to be looking at now regarding a timeline with this. Other than approval for the DA for the La Verkin Mesa project, nothing has been done at this time. It could take a minimum of twelve months to three years to get fully invested. That would include the financing package and everything that you need in order to get development moving. The planning department or the planning commission will be part of this process. When they figure out who the developers are, we'll come back and give you better timelines for how these things are all going to work out. We just need to work aggressively when that time comes and get this thing where it's going to be. This is a big deal for the city. Unfortunately, some of the pristine land is going to probably go away. It's an exciting time for the city, and this will be a great project for the city.

7. Discussion regarding the General Plan.

Kevin Smedley handed out a map and explained he thought it would be helpful with the discussion about annexation. There is not very much land left to annex. South of the gorge, that's a big obstruction to get up through and there's mostly public land, and a little bit of private land there. Water conservancy lands right on the edge, and then a little bit of private land that is kind of within the peninsula. We had that discussion to come back and discuss annexation. There's an aerial showing ownership with acres on each parcel. So, those are the three pieces of information. They will be talking on a very high level about the top site as part of general plan. The very first thing is there's a little graphic at the top of that page showing basically a quasi - 3D map of where the top site is. Is that a helpful thing to have in?

Commissioner Bice replied he thought it was helpful and should be included.

Kevin explained that he made the changes they suggested at the last meeting. They didn't have any more suggestions, they moved on to page 10, but they had no changes. On page 11 added in the densities on the two residential categories.

Commissioner Bice commented that under anticipated changes at the bottom, the last sentence says, "to maintain the rural character of La Verkin", he really like that. But he wasn't sure it was going to work for them. He wasn't sure they should have it in our general plan. It's going to continue to become less rural.

Kevin replied some parts of town could remain rural.

Commissioner Bice agreed. He lives on eight acres, and he would like those big pieces of land to remain as long as possible. However, when this was written in the general plan, they were very rural. He wasn't sure it should stay in the plan.

Commissioner Spendlove recommended they modify it to say, "some rural character".

Commissioner Bice read on page 12 that residential development can occur either as an infill or new subdivisions because of the desire to maintain existing large lots.

Derek commented years ago we had really small lots. He thought some of them were R-1-10. And somewhere in the middle of that, we jumped up to R-1-14 because that was the big push. We had bigger lots so we could get a better product and cleaner yards. Large lots now, aren't sustainable. Developers aren't going to develop anything because they don't pencil them out. He thought the generation now really wanted the R-1-6 to R-3-6 areas with minimal lot size to maintain. He didn't feel like the large blocks were sustainable anymore.

Commissioner Bice suggested the wording "economically feasible". We should have as many as we can economically support, but he felt those days are gone.

Kevin asked if it needed to be even included? The market drives the size of lots.

Commissioner Bice didn't think the general plan should push them toward larger lots.

Commissioner Spendlove suggested taking the sentence out. Or change it to say on the Top Side.

Kevin commented on page twelve he dropped the work acquiring land. Unless the city plans to purchase land for recreational facilities.

Derek commented he didn't think the city would be buying any. That the recreational land they would acquire on the Top Side.

Commissioner Bice asked Patty about the developer donating or us purchasing right along that edge of Topside and connecting the trails?

Patty Wise replied it is on the master trails plan, so it has to be considered. I'm not sure if we have that in the development agreement. The goal would be that all development topside and down here, that anything of consequence in size would include trails, not just open space but trails.

Derek added we need to protect that.

Kevin commented that it wouldn't be a plan by the city but a development agreement. Do you want to mention that local commercial services will increase as more people live in the general area?

Commissioner Bice thought that was self-evident.

Kevin asked about the suggestion at the bottom of that paragraph. "To accommodate the preservation of the viewsheds, development will not be allowed in sensitive or hazardous areas. Viewshed will be preserved."

Commissioner Spendlove liked that wording a lot more. It was clear what the city was asking for.

Commissioner Bice asked about the paragraph that says development should not occur north of Highway Nine. The city limits actually go north of any of the houses in Toquerville, but it's up that really rugged canyon. He was not sure that'll ever be developable, but when this Topside happens, maybe it might. That's BLM land.

Derek commented it would be hard for the city to get BLM land.

Commissioner Spendlove thought there was a small portion of land by that that was SITLA property.

Kevin replied there is a small piece on the east side of highway nine its 39 acres.

Commissioner Bice added that maybe that's fine for now, but BLM doesn't like to be next to density. They're prone to try to unload that. And that piece of La Verkin is as big as the rest of La Verkin. It's just very rugged and may never be amenable to development, but it is a whole bunch of property.

Kevin commented that as you go forward if BLM was looking to dispose of land in that area, then that's something that could be added to the general plan too. Because it's not just a static document. He thought they could eliminate the annexation part.

Derek commented the only one would be the fight over Pah Tempe with Hurricane city. Every time we've tried to bring it in, they fought us. Every time they've tried to bring it in, we fought them. So, it stayed in the county.

Kevin commented they can leave this discussion in there. He would look at it again based on that. He put that together today to see if there's anything more that could be carved out or clarified.

Derek suggested wording it as potential annexation.

Kevin continued to the goals and policies on page are fourteen. There're just a few things that he was recommending. On page Fifteen, the one thing that he did have as a suggestion, was something they need to do under goal four, preserve natural assets. Integrating possible city facilities such as trailheads adjacent to those lands.

Commissioner Spendlove commented that that's something we've been doing over the past few years. He thought it's something they need to keep in our goals moving forward.

Kevin asked about under the "potential action steps", under number two, create a more streamlined zoning ordinance map that is customized to the working of La Verkin. Is this something that needs to be kept in there?

Derek replied that as far as our zoning map is concerned, there is a new one on our website. It shows the zoning. They can click on a property, and it'll take you right to the code.

Kevin asked if the zoning ordinances are up to where they want them to be? As far as streamlining changes. Do you want to leave goal or action set number two in there?

Derek responded that it should be continued, it needs to improve and progress.

Kevin commented on number four rather than just specifying two programs, there's others. He made a broader statement. Page sixteen: community development gets into design and beautification and that sort of thing. This, you can see under the first paragraph, there's just some clarifications in there. Any things you'd rather do under community survey or beautification? We did not do that as part of our initial effort with the January update. He recommended that it be taken out because it's old information, however, if they felt like they needed to keep it they could.

Commissioner Bice agreed to take it out.

Kevin asked for any changes to pages 16-18. There were none. Page nineteen. Potential action steps. There's a number of these that I'm just asking if these are still needed to be there. Develop design guidelines for the main transportation corridor. You had the study done recently.; is that still needed to be left in there? Is that still being worked on?

Derek replied they had two studies done. The corridor study with UDOT, and then there was another one he didn't know what the update was.

Patty Wise commented that The Zion National Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan went through the state legislature. It was approved to go to the governor to be signed. It's something that as a city we get and want to be aware of. Its guiding principles are what it is. It's not mandates or anything, but guiding principles. So that could have a very positive impact on how the lower income portion of the corridor looks.

Kevin continued under number two, there is a goal to define the view shed for protection. Is that something that. That seems like a pretty specific goal for a broad landscape.

Commissioner Bice thought the zones did that.

Commissioner Spendlove added that and we've started to define them even more heavily now to help the viewshed.

Kevin replied that and this is saying, define what you think is viewshed.

Commissioners Spendlove and Derek didn't think they could define it.

Kevin continued to number three. Consider infill development tools that make properties easy and affordable to develop by reducing reductions in requirements like parking setbacks. So, this I know you've been modifying your zone ordinance. Is this something that's still even as a possible action? Or is this something you've just been working on and you're continuing to work on?

Derek agreed to leave it in because our ordinances are old and deficient.

Kevin continued to number four about updating and enforcing the nuisance ordinance.

Derek suggested that needs to be constant. It's only been done a few times since he has worked in the city. Things change and dynamics. Sometimes it's the property and/or the house.

Kevin continued to number five. City council could identify historic areas and buildings. The city does have the historic preservation council. Something, the city council would like to have a recommendation from them to act on, rather than city council just identify.

Commissioner Bice agreed it should be kept in the plan.

Commissioner Spendlove added that it should be the preservation committee.

Kevin continued to strengthen the sense of place through public art, gateway development, wayfinding, and through investments and through state investments. The first that came up in any of the discussions was the sense of place and public art. Do we need some discussion previously in the chapter?

Commissioner Bice replied that at the intersection of SR9 and 500, they had a grant some years ago and put a little monument there. This maybe serves that. He didn't feel it needed one more place.

Commissioner Spendlove added there's benefit in having the different opportunities for art and streetscape. He thought they needed to have something in there that would help them with the landscape, the streetscapes and art.

Kevin suggested they tie that in because they have design guidelines that they're working on. Maybe tie that into discussion with that.

Derek asked what the definition of streetscape is.

Kevin replied that the streetscape includes the buildings adjacent and includes the street itself.

Commissioner Spendlove added it was the information in the corridor study with parking and streets.

Derek asked if they could talk about that when we're doing our parking ordinance. Plus, all of their landscaping should be tied back into the ordinance that they approved through the conservancy district. As far as trees, number of trees, types of bushes to be compliant with vegetation are included. It could tie back into that,

Kevin commented he would take a stab at deciding, though with the discussion paragraphs since this is something that you want reports within the body of that chapter and sounds like some of them might go better with transportation. Page twenty, this is actually what helps drive things in every community. There was a correction in that first two introductory paragraphs setting the height in there. Under the current conditions, it refers to a study done in 2012, listing 365 companies within La Verkin. He did a web search and came up with 108 companies. It kind of is very specific about the three industries that are the most established, or is it better to have discussion about just the idea?

Commissioner Spendlove thought it should not be so specific, or it would have to be updated every year the number of current businesses.

Kevin commented on the community survey that was done in 2018. Is that information helpful to you?

Commissioner Bice didn't think it was any longer relevant.

Kevin commented that just changed the wording for areas of potential like included in the 2018 general and just talked about State Street and Fifth North as primary for economic development. With some of the suggestions that were given, grocery stores, restaurants, regional farmers market are these the kinds of things the city is still trying to attract? Do you want to be more general.

Commissioner Bice thought it should be more general.

Kevin admitted it was confusing to him, but he didn't know if it was helpful to them or not. These opportunities can increase and support the tax. Industries that currently have a large impact could be a focus in our cities because of regional economic forces. Is that helpful

Commissioner Spendlove replied it's not.

Kevin turned to page twenty-two There is a top paragraph that has a discussion about short term. He thought that that's discussed elsewhere in the plan. It definitely does bring people to the community. Do we want any discussion there specifically about short-term rentals under economics?

Commissioner Bice replied it has become a sensitive subject in La Verkin.

Kevin referenced a survey, already in the plan, that was eight years old.

Commissioner Bice recommended taking it out.

Kevin replied under Goals and policies. Recognize that the economic opportunity areas identified by the community, which are those three areas above, the list above. If we don't really need those, did they want to spell out priority areas other than along State Street and Fifth? That's your focus, right? Or commercial when that comes.

Commissioner Bice agreed and added the Top Side potentially also.

Kevin asked Derek if the city provides incentives for businesses.

Derek replied that the city does not.

Kevin recommended they take out that sentence. Under potential action steps. They want to provide input designated council member who's responsible for business recruitment. Relationship regulation affects the local economy. He asked if the city council had someone that just spearheads that?

Derek replied that Kyle Gubler and possibly Councilman Prince. He suggested the change could be city administrator and/or city council member.

Kevin continued on to number two. This is zone intersection for commercial development. Do you proactively do that anymore? Does the city do zone changes or wait for request to change.

Derek replied that not that we change it, but they amend to add other allowances within the existing zones. RV resorts that are now are not allowed these days. We amended it, went through a process. As far as changing a whole to a whole different zone, these have pretty much been in place for quite a long time, but we do amend them. And that's going to be part of our big discussion topic.

Commissioner Bice added they have talked about amending it to mixed-use.

Kevin moved on to receiving governor's award as being a business friendly community. Is that something that is still working towards or would like to leave them there? That's spearheaded statewide by Salt Lake Chamber. The business license development process is getting rid of inefficiencies. Is that something that has been done already? You feel like it needs to be done.

Derek responded that the only thing we've done for business license, it kind of gets bogged down because of the fire department. Their input and lack of ability to go out and inspect in a timely manner. Fees are always a thing, charging enough or too much. He thought through our process the only one that really gets involved with people is if there's something that needs to be done is the police.

Kevin finished with the section: identifying inventory and assembling underutilized parcels for redevelopment. You have a redevelopment agency, if that's something that the city has an appetite for.


Derek suggested taking it out.

Kevin said he would clean it up and make the changes they suggested. They have a few more sections to do but it's coming to an end.

H. Adjourn:

Commissioner Allen Bice adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

04/08/2026
Date Approved


Planning Commission Chair

