

1 MINUTES
2 KAMAS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
3 TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2020

4 7:00 p.m.

5 THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD AS AN ELECTRONIC MEETING WITHOUT ALLOWING THE PUBLIC TO
6 COME TO CITY OFFICES OR ANOTHER ANCHOR LOCATION TO PARTICIPATE, PURSUANT TO
7 GOVERNOR HERBERT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER 2020-5.

8 **Public may participate electronically through Zoom or comments may also be**
9 **made by email prior to the meeting at kamascityutah@gmail.com**

10 Join Zoom Meeting

11 <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85073149807?pwd=dG9lYXplaXkvZU9OdmZmMnFCZU5QZz09>
12

13 Meeting ID: 850 7314 9807

14 Password: 916988

15
16 Mayor McCormick opened the meeting welcoming those in attendance electronically:
17 **COUNCIL MEMBERS:** Councilors Garry Walker, Kevan Todd, John Blazzard, Allen
18 McNeil, and Monica Blazzard.

19 **STAFF:** Recorder, Kim Peacock; City Planner, Natalie Souza; Public Works Director,
20 Matt Crittenden; Engineer, Scott Kettle.

21 **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Amy Yost, Tina Early, Bonnie Torres, Jason Gyllenskog,
22 David Darcey, Scott Simpson, Nathan Miles.

23
24
25 **OPENING INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE**

26
27 Invocation by Councilor Allen McNeil

28 Mayor McCormick led the public in the Pledge of Allegiance
29

30
31 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

32
33 Bonnie Torres asked if she could talk about the rezone now. Mayor McCormick told her
34 he would give time for comments during the discussion of the rezone. Torres stated she
35 would wait to give comments.
36

37 Amy Yost asked why the public comments were before other items on the agenda and
38 things are discussed. Sometimes things are brought up and that's when the public would
39 have comments. Is there a way to have it later in the agenda?

40 Mayor McCormick explained we talked about this when we decided to have this as an
41 agenda item, the consensus was it would be better to have it at the beginning and

1 depending on the topic we could take comments for the individual topics at the time it
2 was being discussed. We would have the overall general comments first.
3 Councilor McNeil explained one of the reasons we decided to have it at the front is some
4 people don't want to sit through a lot of agenda items. They may just want to make a
5 public comment to city administration. They just want to be able to come, make a
6 comment, and not have to sit through all the other agenda items that they might not
7 necessarily be interested in. Councilor McNeil stated Amy Yost presented the other side
8 of the argument that people may be coming for an agenda item that's being discussed and
9 want to be able to have their input. Although, on an item that might come up an action
10 may be taken before public comments are able to be made. This is why we've left it at the
11 front. Yost stated that makes sense.

12
13
14 **REZONE REQUEST BY TORRES/GYLLESKOG TO REZONE PROPERTY AT**
15 **APPROXIMATELY 705 WEST 200 SOUTH FROM A-5 AGRICULTURE TO R-A**
16 **RESIDENTIAL**

17
18 Natalie Souza read the following staff report.

19 This item on the agenda has been advertised as a public hearing. A notice of this hearing was
20 published in the Summit County News. It has also been posted on the State and City websites.
21 Letters were mailed to all landowners within 1,000 feet of this location.

22 The applicant, with a signed affidavit from the owner, has initiated a rezone for this parcel, in
23 accordance with Section 15.03.010 of the Kamas Municipal Code.

24 **Kamas City General Plan and Future Land Use Map**

25 Kamas City General Plan and Future Land Use Map show this parcel as dually zoned. The first six
26 hundred feet from Highway 248 is zoned Entry Corridor Commercial (ECC). The remaining part
27 of the parcel is zoned Agricultural Five Acre (A-5).

28 **Discussion of Proposed Rezone and Compatibility with the Kamas City General Plan, Focusing**
29 **on Approval Criteria from KMC 15.03.010(5)**

30 In accordance with Section 15.03.010 of the Kamas Municipal Code, *the Planning Commission*
31 *may recommend, and the City Council may grant a rezoning application only if it determines that*
32 *the rezoning is consistent with the policies and goals of the Kamas City General Plan and that the*
33 *applicant has demonstrated that:*

- 34 *a) The proposed rezoning is necessary either to comply with the Kamas City General Plan,*
35 *proposed Land Use Map, or to provide land for a community need that was not anticipated at*
36 *the time of adoption of the Kamas City General Plan.*
37 *b) The existing zoning was either the result of a clerical error or a mistake of fact, or that it failed*
38 *to take into account the constraints on development created by the natural characteristics of the*
39 *land, including but not limited to steep slopes, floodplain, unstable soils, and inadequate*
40 *drainage, or*
41 *c) the land or its surrounding environs has changed or is changing to such a degree that it is in*
42 *the public interest to encourage redevelopment of the area or to recognize the changed*
43 *character of the area.*

44 The remaining part of this parcel that is currently zoned A-5 is about 3.16 acres. After City
45 approved roads are taken out of the acreage, there are about 2.5 acres of land, zoned into five
46 acre lots. To allow this land to be developed, a rezone request to a smaller lot size is logical.
47 According to the Code, the reason for this rezone could fall under (b), that constraints and

1 natural characteristics of the land (wetlands) prevent it from being used in five-acre parcels.
2 Additionally, there are only 3 acres of A-5, limiting the use in a strictly agricultural sense.

3 **Discussion of any proposed concept plan and compatibility with Kamas City Zoning**
4 **Regulations and Restrictions**

5 Wetlands are prevalent in this parcel as well, but the goal of the developer is to have three or
6 four residential parcels in the back portion of this lot, around ½ to ¾ acre in size. A rezone into
7 R-A would allow for connectivity with infrastructure and allow a few homes to be built in the
8 back portion of this lot. UDOT access points do not fall in this parcel, so any development of that
9 nature would result in a temporary access with UDOT. Utilities would need to be brought on the
10 South side of 248, from the Kamas Commons area by the developer.

11 In the Entry Corridor Commercial part of this property, there would be the trail easement and
12 other connectivity required by the ECC zone. Use would be determined on the Allowed Use
13 Table.

14 **Recommendation for or Against Rezone and Description of Recommended Conditions on Any**
15 **Approval**

16 The back three acres of this parcel as currently zoned do not allow for building. The A-5 zone is a
17 five-acre minimum. The ECC portion does not allow a residence as a permitted use. A section of
18 that front part would need to be re-zoned to A-5 to allow for building in the A-5 section.

19 Rezoning to the Residential Agricultural zone would keep the agricultural, low-density feel of the
20 field intact while allowing some smaller lot growth potential.

21 Prior discussion from previous Commissioners is that the area beyond the ECC zone was zoned
22 with very low density to allow the City to have discussions with incoming projects as the request
23 for rezones occurred. There is some discussion that the A-5 was not meant to be the end result
24 of that area of Kamas City, but that it was meant as a place holder to allow for future
25 discussions.

26 The Planning Commission will make the best decision on this rezone by understanding the
27 nature of this request and by studying the General Plan.

28 Goals and Policies that would be supported by a rezone from A-5 to R-A (page 12-13)

- 29 • To be a beautiful, organized rural community based on its distinct history of agriculture,
30 open space and recreation.
- 31 • Identify and encourage the preservation of prime agricultural land and open space
32 within Kamas City.
- 33 • Encourage a family-oriented, clean, fun and friendly community that is a great place to
34 live.

35 Residential – Extremely Low A-5: The purpose of this category to provide land where agricultural
36 pursuits are supported within the municipality. This area will be used to maintain the “green
37 buffer.” (page 17)

38 Residential – Low R-A: The purpose of this category is to create a rural residential zone which is
39 intended as a permanent residential district for those areas of the community where it is
40 desirable to maintain low residential densities. (page 17).

41 **Planning Commission Public Hearing and Recommendation**

42 On July 7, 2020, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing to accept public comment about
43 this area.

44 Future roads were discussed, with the understanding that the Kamas Future
45 Transportation Plan and UDOT access agreement would be upheld with any incoming
46 development. Real Estate agents provided approximate costs for various sized lots with and

1 without utilities. Other public comments included questions from nearby property owners about
2 changing their septic to sewer and questions about the wetlands.

3 Density was discussed, with some Commissioners opposed to expensive five acre lots,
4 and other Commissioners opposed to still expensive one acre lots, and other Commissioners
5 opposed to half-acre lots. A Commissioner stated that perhaps the City needs a zone that could
6 be a placeholder for those lots that cannot be built on in the A-5 zone due to having less than
7 five acres in that portion of the parcel.

8 The Planning Commission Chair, Larry Gines, reminded the Commission that the A-5
9 designation was originally designed as a place holder for future growth, and that it was not
10 meant to remain there necessarily. Vice-Chair, Nate Miles, said that though the Utah Code is
11 clear that each parcel's request for a rezone is individual, he still felt it was a precedent set for
12 the whole A-5 area. Other Commissioners felt that each parcel would have individual
13 development goals and not all want to be rezoned the same.

14 After much discussion, a negative recommendation is being sent to the City Council with a 3-2
15 vote.

16 Options:

- 17 1. **Approve the Zone Amendment.** Does the amendment meet the requirements for a rezone?
18 2. **Deny the Zone Amendment.** There has not been a sufficient reason to re-zone.

19
20 Councilor Todd clarified Commissioner Gines' comment stating the A-5 zone was
21 designated originally for a place holder for future developments. This isn't really true.
22 The reason the council zoned it A-5 is because it was consistent with the surrounding
23 County area. It had nothing to do with what we wanted for future growth. It was just
24 consistent with what the county was doing at the time.

25
26 Mayor McCormick explained this is not a public hearing but would allow the members of
27 the group requesting the rezone a few minutes to make comments then turn the time back
28 to the council.

29
30 Bonnie Torres stated when they were annexed in to Kamas City, the city gave the
31 impression that they wanted to keep the Entry Corridor as commercial, but would still be
32 open to rezoning in the future. They've been trying to sell this property for a couple of
33 years now and keep running in to snags with the zoning. The proposed plan now is a
34 wonderful use of this property. There are wetlands and have had the delineation done.
35 They have talked to the Army Corps. of Engineers and were told there are places they can
36 develop, but have to take the wetlands in to consideration. If the council won't rezone
37 this property why did the council annex it in to the city.

38
39 Mayor McCormick clarified with Natalie Souza that there was discussion about the
40 commercial portion of this property and the idea of development. Mayor McCormick
41 asked Jason Gyllenskog to talk about this.

42
43 Jason Gyllenskog stated he would appreciate it if the Planning Commission had a little
44 more guidance. It seemed like they were deliberating pretty closely on whether this made
45 sense or not for an R-A zone. It was hard for them to make up their mind. It seems like
46 they need a little more guidance on some overall master plan. The subsequent project to

1 the east had a proposal and they spent a lot of money on engineering and design work and
2 it was a lot denser than the one he was asking for.

3 Gyllenskog explained in R-A, because of the wetland requirements, he would only be
4 able to build 3-4 homes. There was some confusion at the Planning Commission level on
5 the direction of what the City Council would like to see. They need guidance from the
6 council on what the overall concept is for this area. On the UDOT plan they show two
7 60' roads going through the 3-acre parcel. Maybe it was never planned to have houses
8 there, but that seems like excessive access if homes aren't allowed to be built there.

9
10 Mayor McCormick asked Gyllenskog to talk about the commercial part of this property.
11 Gyllenskog explained it's a little early in the game to come up with anything. The parcel
12 is small enough it just doesn't pencil with only 3 acres of commercial and 3 acres of
13 residential. Because of the cost of utilities, sewer and water, they're going to have to wait
14 and have shared cost and see what happens to the property on the east. They don't want
15 to see septic but across the street Weller's got to use septic. To make this work if they
16 don't get anything on the residential and have sit for years waiting for utilities then it's a
17 hard proposal for them. They love the piece of property and love Kamas. He wants to
18 build affordable houses in the back and keep the front commercial. It's such a small piece
19 they're not going to spend money on delineating the wetlands. They will not ask for a
20 rezone on the front part of the parcel. They would like to know what the vision is of the
21 City Council before they spend a lot of money on the plan. Even if there were 5-acres,
22 this doesn't seem like the best use for this land.

23
24 Tina Early introduced herself as the listing agent for Bonnie and Jerry Torres. She stated
25 she has had this lot listed for 5 years. The price has been lowered dramatically. They are
26 down to \$325,000 as list price. It's 6.16 acres and 1.7 acres is wetlands. There is 206
27 linear feet of highway frontage. She has had this property under contract numerous times
28 but because of the roads and wetlands it hasn't been cost effective. She feels the price is
29 good to where Gyllenskog can go in and put in the infrastructure after the Sharp's put in
30 their development. Everyone she has worked with that has wanted to purchase the land,
31 by the time you took out the wetlands, it just didn't work out.

32 Harriet Natter has a company called Wise Earth, she has come up with a plan to build
33 bridges over the wetlands so they won't be disturbed. Because of the UDOT setbacks,
34 wetlands, and zoning there's not much they can do. Tina stated she is at a loss on what to
35 do with the property to try to sell if for Bonnie and Jerry Torres. The owners have
36 dropped the price tremendously because of these issues. This land is not feasible the way
37 it is.

38
39 Councilor J. Blazzard understands that any lot of record is entitled to one building permit.
40 Is this not true in Kamas. Mayor McCormick stated that is true but isn't sure if this is a
41 lot of record since it was annexed in to Kamas. Councilor J. Blazzard sometimes we have
42 to look at a parcel of ground that's small and skinny like that and just say maybe there's
43 room for a house, but disagrees that is was zoned A-5 with the purpose of being able to
44 change it. Councilor J. Blazzard thought the A-5 was put there to preserve our mission
45 statement of the City, which is to preserve the rural agricultural small-town appeal. If we
46 try to put houses on every square inch of property in the city it's not going to be like

1 Kamas for long. There was a parcel of ground on the west side of the valley that sold for
2 \$5,000 an acre not long ago. So, when it's said that \$50,000 per acre is a fair price for
3 that property, there's a misconception of what's fair. Councilor J. Blazzard doesn't
4 begrudge the owners for wanting to make money on the property, but he sees no benefit
5 to Kamas City to change the zoning from 1 to 5 or 4 for 2.5.
6

7 Councilor McNeil stated he has several questions and asked from reading the staff report
8 it says in order to build a house on here there needs to be a rezone. If the staff report is
9 referring to practical purposes because of the wetlands then it would need to be rezoned,
10 or municipal code restraint purposes it has to be rezoned. He would assume it meant the
11 latter. Under the former, even with a rezone, you would have to find a location within the
12 3 acres that wasn't subject to wetlands, that's why he assumes it meant the latter. It made
13 him wonder if every parcel is entitled, no matter what size or what zoning, to a building
14 lot. Then we get in to a gray area because we have half of a parcel zoned as commercial
15 and half zoned as agriculture. If you were to buy a pure commercial parcel you wouldn't
16 be entitled to build a residential home on there. Just because you're entitled to some
17 development rights doesn't necessarily mean you have a right to build a home on any
18 parcel of land that you buy. Are the owners allowed, on the 3 acres that is zoned
19 agriculture currently, to build one house on that portion that is zoned agriculture.
20

21 Souza stated A-5 means 5 acres minimum. You have to have a 5-acre area to build.
22

23 Councilor McNeil disagrees if we were talking about a 1-acre parcel that was purely
24 zoned 5 and no portion was zoned commercial. He would then agree with John's point
25 that every lot is entitled to one building lot. If our position is "that's not what our code
26 says" then that needs to be remedied immediately. Taking property out of the county and
27 bringing it in to the city and losing that right would be something we absolutely don't
28 want to do. It is clear under the county development code that any lot of record is entitled
29 to a building lot.
30

31 Souza stated it's one lot. You can build on the ECC portion, but the whole back half of
32 the property is zoned A-5, 5-acre parcels. Unless there's something she's totally missing,
33 they don't have 5 acres back there. They can't build back there. The back is not a lot of
34 record. It's not two lots, it's one lot.
35

36 Councilor McNeil stated he's fine if our answer is, they cannot build because of the
37 portion that is zoned commercial and the remainder does not allow them the 5 acres that
38 is necessary. Assuming that our code makes that clear, but he has his doubts.
39

40 Councilor McNeil asked about the staff report where it says a section of the front part
41 would have to be rezoned A-5 to allow for building in the A-5 section. Does this mean
42 enough would have to be rezoned to make it above 5 acres?
43

44 Souza explained they have 3.16 in the back, if they want to build a house then we'd have
45 to rezone part of the ECC so they would have 5 acres. The entire parcel is 6 acres.
46

1 Councilor McNeil stated to John's point of relevancy that the owners should be able to
2 profit on this. That argument holds absolutely no water whatsoever. There's no right for a
3 property owner to be able to rezone to maximize the value of their property. That's an
4 absurd argument.

5 Councilor McNeil stated his bottom line and his main point in this rezone is the same as
6 it was months ago when we were presented with another rezone. We always have two
7 competing arguments. We don't want to disturb the open feel of Kamas, on the other
8 hand we do want to be able to have our generational families stay in Kamas. These are
9 competing interests. We are going so far to the anti-density argument that we are actually
10 accomplishing the very thing that we say we don't want. We say we don't want to turn in
11 to our neighbors, we don't want to turn in to Park City. We are refusing to allow any
12 development because we want to maintain the open agricultural rural feel of Kamas.
13 What that does then is affects the demographics of our residents. The 5-acre parcels will
14 have very big, expensive, most likely part time homes on it that probably is a different
15 demographic then what we're all shooting for. We are turning our perimeter area into a
16 type of High Star where we have enormous million-dollar homes on mini ranches. We're
17 not allowing anything else to happen. If we want affordability in our valley we have to
18 have development. It's the only way to bring the price to where it's somewhat affordable.
19 Councilor McNeil is in favor of rezoning the back portion to allow for half acre lots. He
20 doesn't care right now what the developer is saying his plan is. He has to assume there
21 will be 6 half acre lots on there.

22
23 Councilor Walker has been listening to Councilor McNeil and he has expressed some of
24 his concerns. We can price ourselves out of a place to live. Councilor Walker is
25 concerned with the idea of continuity along that area. Councilor Walker asked Mayor
26 McCormick if he has talked to the neighboring development and if they are still planning
27 on 5 acre lots.

28 Mayor McCormick stated the proposal they presented at the Planning Commission
29 meeting was not the 5 acre lots, it was presented with 188 units and commercial. The
30 question about the lot of record, Mayor McCormick feels Natalie Souza is correct. It's
31 only one lot, it's not divided in to two lots.

32 Councilor Walker feels Councilor McNeil is right. These are competing issues and it's
33 making it tough to make a decision. Councilor Walker doesn't want to see us price
34 ourselves out of a place to live. He is not opposed to rezoning the back part, but would
35 like to discuss the size of lots being presented to rezone.

36
37 Councilor Todd explained he was on the council when this was annexed. The council
38 didn't annex any lots in that were less than 5 acres. Our interpretation of that was the
39 Entry Corridor was an overlay zone and the A-5 is underlying. If it's only 3 acres they
40 should be allowed one home on it. There are numerous problems with this piece of
41 property. We only have so many access points off of Hwy 248. He's not sure where these
42 land on this property. The development would have to put in a frontage road for access.
43 Councilor Todd feels another issue is if we rezone to half acre lots, we are setting a
44 precedence. Half acre lots are too dense, but is willing to discuss lot sizes. Would spot
45 zoning be okay on a first come first serve basis.

1 Councilor Todd doesn't want to over inundate services to our current residences. There
2 are a lot of issues, including sewer capacity and water distribution, we're forced to deal
3 with when determining how much density we want to allow on this. Councilor Todd
4 believes these people are allowed one building lot on these 3 acres. Another thing is how
5 are they going to access this piece of property. There's a lot of unforeseen.

6
7 Councilor M. Blazzard agrees with Councilor McNeil. She has a daycare owner that lives
8 on 300 North and she can't get State funding for her daycare because she lives too close
9 to High Star. Another daycare that lives a little further away can get all the assistance she
10 needs. Kamas is staring to out price ourselves.

11
12 Councilor Todd stated we wrote the code, we shouldn't be having developers or
13 landowners dictating our code to what they need or want. When people buy property and
14 find out it can't be changed and it turns into a hardship, they should've checked on it
15 before it was purchased. When we annexed the property the majority of the people were
16 in favor of being annexed in to Kamas. They knew what was going on at the time.

17
18 Councilor Walker is concerned about setting a precedence. There are a number of pieces
19 of property that are the same size along there and we would have a hard time turning
20 them down. We need to do something to help ourselves out, but no the half acre density.

21
22 Councilor J. Blazzard remembers when this was annexed in to Kamas the City wanted to
23 have control of the entry corridor going in to Kamas. He keeps going back to the City
24 mission statement. Right at the beginning of the General Plan it says we want to be able
25 to preserve our agricultural small-town atmosphere. We want to have a little bit of open
26 space. If we zone this half acre lots, we're going to set a precedence that's going to create
27 a city on the entry corridor that's more dense and has more residents in it than Kamas
28 City itself has right now. Councilor J. Blazzard knows it is state law that any parcel of
29 ground is allowed one building lot. Councilor J. Blazzard is opposed to rezoning with the
30 idea that they are entitled to one building lot.

31
32 Councilor McNeil explained the difference in the scenarios Councilor J. Blazzard is
33 talking about is he's talking about a parcel that otherwise would be under the minimum
34 density requirement but is completely encompassed by one type of zoning, whereas here
35 we have a couple different types of zoning. Councilor McNeil has been researching the
36 code to try to get some kind of reconciliation on the overlay versus the zone. He hasn't
37 been able to find it yet. It's questionable that they have one building lot on the 3 acres.
38 It's going to come down to if we're going to want to live among multi-millionaire homes
39 on mini ranches where everyone is priced out of the valley. This is the way our valley is
40 going to go if we keep denying reasonable development. It's laughable to continue to talk
41 about trying to find a solution to affordable housing if this is the way we're going to go.

42
43 Councilor J. Blazzard stated we're not saying this is the only thing we're going to have.
44 The last several subdivisions that have gone in have been Mountainland homes, so we
45 have a good mix. Kamas City is not picking on high density housing. We have a pretty
46 good mix.

1 Mayor McCormick stated some of those developments are nice and have provided a
2 home for those who other wise wouldn't have been able to afford a home. The argument
3 could be for a little more density because those high-density subdivisions have provided a
4 need for our valley.

5
6 Councilor M. Blazzard asked what would be a use for this property now.

7
8 Mayor McCormick doesn't know the answer to that. It depends on the zoning. Councilor
9 J. Blazzard asked what it's being used for now. Mayor McCormick stated as far as he
10 knows grazing.

11
12 Councilor Todd asked if we rezone from A-5 to 1/3 acre, and someone on the other side
13 of the road wants to rezone. Do you feel like we have to rezone to the same density?

14
15 Mayor McCormick stated the Planning Commission and the City Council can make that
16 decision based on individual and unique properties. There will be properties where higher
17 density seems to make sense and properties where high density doesn't make sense. This
18 is why we have a Planning Commission and a City Council. Which plans best meet our
19 general plan and code.

20
21 Councilor McNeil stated we would not be locked in to follow a precedence. That would
22 actually violate our responsibility as a council. Individually for every application we
23 should analyze it under the criteria to determine if it should be rezoned or not. It should
24 not be a factor for consideration of neighboring developments.

25
26 Councilor Todd stated his argument would then be it makes sense on the north side of
27 Hwy 248 to put the density because it's closer to our sewer pond. Keep the density less
28 on the south side. If we're just going to rezone it because it's a first come first serve
29 basis, he's not okay with that. 5 acre lots probably isn't feasible and it brings a different
30 cliental in to Kamas. That's why the developer comes to the council so we can let them
31 know if we like it or not. Kamas City doesn't have water on the south side of Hwy 248,
32 only the north side.

33
34 Councilor McNeil stated we review the criteria as it comes in and see if it meets the
35 criteria. If it does it's rezoned, if it doesn't then we don't rezone it. Councilor McNeil
36 feels the last two rezone applications have met the first criteria.

37
38 Councilor J. Blazzard doesn't believe it's Kamas City's responsibility or obligation to
39 provide affordable housing to people who are not going to live and work here. If we put
40 in high density, we'll be putting in more affordable housing for people who aren't a part
41 of our community.

42
43 **MOTION:** Councilor John Blazzard moved to deny this rezone based on the fact that
44 there's not a sufficient reason to rezone to that high of density and we would
45 support the Planning Commission's decision.
46 Councilor Kevan Todd seconded the motion.

1 Mayor McCormick asked for a roll call vote:
2 Councilor Walker voted “aye”
3 Councilor Todd voted “aye”
4 Councilor J. Blazzard voted “aye”
5 Councilor McNeil voted “nay”
6 Councilor M. Blazzard voted “nay”
7 Motion to deny rezone passed 3-2.
8
9

10 **KAMAS CITY WELCOME SIGN DISCUSSION**

11
12 Mayor McCormick stated in Dropbox there is a proposal for a new Kamas City Welcome
13 sign. The family donating the sign and has given design ideas.
14 Councilor Todd stated when Mike Crystal was on the City Council he worked diligently
15 with UDOT and the County. Where the current sign is, is not really the entrance of
16 Kamas. We would have to contact Mike Crystal and see what was approved.
17 Mayor McCormick will talk to Mike and see what he found out.
18 Councilor J. Blazzard feels we need to do something. Our old sign looks pretty rustic.
19 Mayor McCormick showed the council the ideas from the family that would like to
20 donate the sign.
21 Councilor McNeil feels if someone wants to donate a sign, we should pursue it.
22 Councilor M. Blazzard agrees and would also like to see a couple more design options.
23 Councilor Walker agrees. Mayor McCormick will contact the family and start moving
24 forward with this.
25
26

27 **FIESTA DAYS DISCUSSION**

28
29 Mayor McCormick asked if any of the council had anything to discuss or pass along to
30 Cindy. The council had no questions.
31
32 Matt Crittenden asked the council since we’re having vendors at the park do we need to
33 have additional bathrooms with running water.
34 Mayor McCormick feels if we are having vendors we should have restrooms available.
35 Crittenden will get the prices and make arrangements.
36
37 Councilor Todd gave an update on the hamburger shack remodel.
38
39

40 **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

41
42 Natalie Souza reported she has the updated concept chart in Dropbox for the council to
43 review.
44
45 Scott Kettle reported we’ve been busy with the sidewalk and asphalt projects. Kettle will
46 have costs for playground equipment at the next meeting.

1 Councilor M. Blazzard asked Kettle about the planter strips on 100 South. Kettle stated
2 they are working on that. Orma Smith wants concrete in there so Geneva will be doing
3 that. We're getting a landscaper to come in and finish up the rest of residents to put in the
4 irrigation and sod. The residents will be responsible for paying for the water to upkeep
5 the sod in the plant strips. Councilor Todd asked if there are utilities in the park strip.
6 Kettle told him yes. Councilor Todd asked at who's cost is it if we ever have to tear it
7 out. Kettle stated in the past we try to put it back to the condition it was before.

8
9 Crittenden reported they have been working with Kettle. They have been relocating a
10 service to get it out of the way of the sidewalk project.

11 Councilor M. Blazzard asked if we could put flags all the way down main street. Do we
12 have to get permission to do this?

13 Crittenden replied yes, they do. They could do it, but they would have to build more
14 brackets. He will get a hold of Rocky Mountain Power to get approval.

15
16 Mayor McCormick reported for Chief Brad Smith. They have responded to 62 calls for
17 service, 2 DUI's, and they're currently working on 3 active felonies.

18
19
20 **APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 9, 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

21
22 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to approve the City Council meeting minutes
23 dated June 9, 2020.

24 Councilor Allen McNeil seconded the motion.

25 The vote was unanimous. Councilors Garry Walker, Kevan Todd, John
26 Blazzard, Allen McNeil, and Monica Blazzard voted aye. Motion passed.

27
28
29 **APPROVAL OF THE INVOICE REGISTER DATED JULY 13, 2020**

30
31 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to approve the invoice register dated July 13,
32 2020.

33 Councilor John Blazzard seconded the motion.

34 The vote was unanimous. Councilors Garry Walker, Kevan Todd, John
35 Blazzard, Allen McNeil, and Monica Blazzard voted aye. Motion passed.

36
37
38 Councilor J. Blazzard would like to get back to meetings in person City Council even if it
39 is just the council. We could live stream to the public. Councilor McNeil would prefer to
40 keep them on zoom as long as there is a mandatory mask order. Mayor McCormick stated
41 that's where he's at. We do have some options to upgrade our zoom to allow Facebook
42 live at the same time. Based on the numbers and the continued rise of cases we should
43 stay on zoom. There's definitely some concern and we should set an example.
44 Councilor M. Blazzard would like to update to the Facebook live.

1 **ADJOURN**

2
3 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to adjourn at 9:00 p.m.

4
5 *The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim*
6 *transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at*
7 *the meeting.*

8
9 Approved on the 28th day of July, 2020.

10
11
12
13
14 _____
15 Matt McCormick
Mayor

Kim Peacock
City Recorder