

1 MINUTES
2 **KAMAS CITY COUNCIL MEETING**
3 **TUESDAY, JULY 28, 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/83370821204?pwd=WjVPcEtFa0xtOWNkQVlDaVZCSGpYQ>
12 [T09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83370821204?pwd=WjVPcEtFa0xtOWNkQVlDaVZCSGpYQ)

13 Meeting ID: 833 7082 1204

14 Passcode: 563211

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

20 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:** Commissioners Larry Gines, Leslie Staples, Nate
21 Miles.

22 **STAFF:** Recorder, Kim Peacock; City Planner, Natalie Souza; Engineer, Scott Kettle.

23 **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Chelsea Jones, Gracia Eisman,
24
25

26 **OPENING INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE**

27
28 Invocation by Councilor Kevan Todd

29 Mayor McCormick led the public in the Pledge of Allegiance
30
31

32 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

33
34 There were no public comments.
35
36

37 **APPROVAL OF THE JULY 14, 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

38
39 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to approve the City Council meeting minutes
40 dated July 14, 2020.

41 Councilor Garry Walker seconded the motion.

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

1 **APPROVAL OF THE INVOICE REGISTER DATED JULY 28, 2020**

2
3 **MOTION:** Councilor Allen McNeil moved to approve the invoice register dated July 28,
4 2020.

5 Councilor John Blazzard seconded the motion.

6 The vote was unanimous. Councilors Garry Walker, Kevan Todd, John
7 Blazzard, Allen McNeil, and Monica Blazzard voted aye. Motion passed.
8
9

10 **RESOLUTION 2020-08, A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO**
11 **SIGN AN ORDER RESTRICTING THE USE OF FIREWORKS AND OTHER**
12 **FIRE IGNITION DEVICES WITHIN AREAS OF KAMAS CITY**
13

14 Mayor McCormick explained the County adopted this last week and we didn't have time
15 to have a meeting and adopt this as a council. The conditions are really dry.

16 Councilor Todd feels this resolution is needed with the current dry conditions.

17 Councilor J. Blazzard asked if we have to have another resolution to rescind this or is
18 there a sunset period on it.

19 Mayor McCormick stated it's good for the year. He would like to address this earlier next
20 year if we have the same dry year.
21

22 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to approve Resolution 2020-08, A Resolution
23 authorizing the Mayor to sign an Order restricting the use of fireworks and
24 other fire ignition devices within areas of Kamas City.

25 Councilor Garry Walker seconded the motion.

26 Mayor McCormick asked for a roll call vote:

27 Councilor Walker voted "aye"

28 Councilor Todd voted "aye"

29 Councilor J. Blazzard voted "aye"

30 Councilor McNeil voted "aye"

31 Councilor M. Blazzard voted "aye"

32 The vote was unanimous. Motion passed.
33
34

35 **CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION**
36

37 Mayor McCormick stated there have been a couple of council members and planning
38 commission members that have requested a work session. In light of all the development
39 requests and rezoning requests we've been seeing we need to sit down as a group and
40 discuss what we feel like, as a Council and Planning Commission, is the best course of
41 action moving forward for Kamas City that will help us plan for the future.
42

43 Commissioner Gines feels with the votes from both the City Council and the Planning
44 Commission for the last rezone request, if the members that voted no changes are resolute
45 in keeping everything out there as 5-acre parcels. Then he's not sure if there needs to be
46 more discussion. The first thing we should do is get a vote from everybody and see

1 where they stand. If it's a majority that wants the 5 acres to stay, we just do that. If it's
2 open for discussion we'll go from there.

3
4 Mayor McCormick stated there was quite a bit of discussion in the City Council and
5 Planning Commission with a lot of points brought up. One of the things brought up at
6 City Council is we have conflicting thought processes about that area. We want wide
7 open spaces and 5-acres, but we also want places our people can afford. Another
8 comment is if we continue with the 5-acres in that area we're going to change the
9 demographics of the city. Mayor McCormick believes that will be a drastic change. He
10 doesn't know what the right number is but doesn't believe the 5-acres is the right answer
11 if we're encouraging some housing that teachers, police officers, fire fighters, and our
12 kids can afford. Mayor McCormick stated the question Commissioner Gines is asking if
13 the 5-acres is the answer or is there room for discussion. If the council is set on that then
14 this work session can be over.

15
16 Commissioner Gines stated yes, if that's it then when anyone comes in for a rezone it will
17 be denied. We'll tell them this is what it's going to be.

18
19 Mayor McCormick stated in our General Plan, and this has probably been the case since
20 he was on the council in 1998, it suggests that you develop from the inside out. Some of
21 our requests are for development from the outside in. Maybe it just depends on when and
22 how the developments happen.

23
24 Councilor Todd explained when that was annexed in to Kamas, the council zoned these 5
25 acres because that's what was consistent with what the county and surrounding areas.
26 We annexed it as a holding zone to give the city some negotiating power for whatever we
27 decided we wanted to do out there. 5-acres is negotiable out there.

28 Councilor Todd doesn't feel we need to rewrite our code to accommodate developers. We
29 just need to make everyone follow what our code requires. There may be a need for spot
30 zoning. Councilor Todd feels we can come up with a good consistent way of building out
31 there. Councilor Todd also wants to be as fair as he can.

32
33 Councilor Walker agrees with Councilor Todd. He has had concerns that we're going to
34 change the demographics to the point to where we have nothing but multi-million dollar
35 homes and the tax base will drive us out of here. Councilor Walker feels like we should
36 be able to come up with a compromise with the developers but they want too much
37 density. We should come up with a good solid idea of what we want that we're all in
38 agreement with. We can then let the developers know we've zoned this for a reason and
39 we're sticking by the decision and won't rezone.

40
41 Councilor McNeil is on the complete opposite side of Councilor Todd and Councilor
42 Walker on this. Councilor McNeil feels the half acre isn't too dense, but not dense
43 enough for what we're trying to accomplish. The bigger lot sizes will bring in more
44 houses of the demographic that we're not looking for. The demographic we're looking
45 for are the people that grew up here. With the bigger lots this will turn in to an extension
46 of Park City. With more rooftops we're still preserving a greater area of open space. If we

1 want to see fields, we need to consolidate homes in a denser area so the remaining area
2 can remain open. The more we limit the higher the values go. We can't tell developers
3 we've made up our minds. That's not what our code says. Our code allows people to
4 rezone if they meet certain criteria.

5
6 Councilor Walker stated he disagrees with Councilor McNeil. What are we planning for
7 then?

8 Councilor McNeil stated we have a rezoning ordinance and it states what the criteria is
9 for rezoning.

10 Councilor Walker just wants to make a plan and follow the plan. Why do we have to
11 change just because a developer asks.

12
13 Councilor Todd stated we only have so much water and so much sewer capacity. We
14 need to plan to minimize the impact or we're going to end up like Oakley or Francis and
15 have to tell people not to water their lawns because the water tank is empty. We need to
16 plan for what our capacity can afford, not what people can afford to build. Councilor
17 Todd agrees with the idea to have affordable housing you need more density, but he is
18 not willing to sacrifice our system. We need to plan to have the development meet our
19 infrastructure and not expand past that.

20
21 Mayor McCormick feels our water and sewer system are going to be impacted regardless.
22 It's just a matter of when. It's going to matter how many times we're going to split the
23 cost. There might be a solution that more closely meets what the General Plan has said
24 when it talks about developing inward out, instead of outward in. Maybe with first come
25 first serve or spot zoning with zoning outward in. Maybe our plan is to address
26 developers that come that are an extension to the city, not out in the meadow working
27 back towards the city. Maybe the plan addresses how we work with those situations and
28 maintain different numbers out further until the development reaches out there.

29
30 Councilor Todd explained in all the meetings he's sat in over the years with Utah League
31 of Cities and Towns and Meg Ryan you start with commercial if that's what we want.
32 You then have the high density abutting the commercial and expand out to the bigger
33 lots. Councilor Todd is in favor of that.

34 Mayor McCormick stated that's exactly what the entry corridor is.

35 Councilor Todd is going to be very careful on what density is allowed out there. He
36 doesn't want to pay \$100 for water or sewer in 10-15 years. If we do what Councilor
37 McNeil says that's what we're looking at, a huge increase on sewer and water.

38
39 Mayor McCormick stated we are encouraging commercial in the entry corridor and we
40 have all agreed we want a nice commercial entry. Mayor McCormick suggests that the
41 commercial will determine what we have to do with utilities. If that's truly what we want
42 it may tell us what needs to be done with our water and sewer and we will address the
43 housing concerns after the fact that we've addressed the commercial. This will change
44 what we can actually do. Mayor McCormick agrees with Councilor Todd that it is a
45 concern but is not sure the housing development is going to drive it.

46

1 Councilor Walker wants Councilor McNeil to know that he's willing to compromise
2 here. Councilor Walker likes his thoughts and plans for a dense area and an open area if
3 we can determine how it happens. Every time a developer comes in, they basically want
4 to develop the whole parcel with it being dense. Somehow, we need to come to a
5 compromise with developers and say they can have their density but they're going to
6 have to give up some of the land and leave it open if that's what we want to do.

7
8 Mayor McCormick stated that's what our hope was with the PUD ordinance. We would
9 have more opportunity to have more input on what the density was, what areas are open,
10 and how that connected with the existing city and utilities. This brings up another
11 question. Do we ask that people request a PUD rezone so we can have that input? We
12 adopted that ordinance to give us that tool.

13
14 Councilor Todd asked if a PUD goes with a development agreement. Mayor McCormick
15 stated yes. Councilor Todd said the development agreement is a very good tool for the
16 city. We can request certain things in a development agreement to safe guard the city. It
17 also gives a little bit of flexibility.

18
19 Mayor McCormick stated that's his understanding and asked Scott Kettle to chime in.

20
21 Scott Kettle stated that's correct. When setting up the A-5 and Entry Corridor, like
22 Councilor Todd said, it was a place holder. We did that so we could have these
23 negotiations and work through a PUD and a development agreement. Similar to what we
24 did with High Star.

25
26 Councilor M. Blazzard stated when she first came on to council the city was in the
27 middle of the High Star Ranch agreement. She really likes this process. It gives the city
28 more negotiating power. The city is more involved with the development and in the end
29 both the city and developer usually get what they want. With regard to the sewer, the
30 sewer is inevitable. We're going to have to do something, we've been at capacity now
31 since she's been on council. Councilor M. Blazzard agrees with Mayor McCormick that
32 it's not as big of an issue as all the density. On the other hand, Councilor M. Blazzard
33 doesn't believe the 5-acre lots are the answer either. She would like to go with a
34 development agreement.

35
36 Mayor McCormick we do have a development with a proposal, but this discussion isn't
37 about a development in particular. It's an overall thought process on how we want to
38 approach this.

39 Mayor McCormick told Councilor Todd that he feels the council did some amazing
40 things with the development agreement and the city actually benefited in a lot of ways
41 from what was negotiated with High Star Ranch. This is an example of what we can do in
42 the future if we use the tools we have.

43
44 Councilor Todd stated if we're going to go that route, we cannot have Councilor
45 McNeil's attitude of bring it in and we'll take it all. We need to stick to our guns and
46 negotiate with these people. Councilor Todd doesn't believe current residents should pay

1 for the cost of new development. If these developers come in and want maximum density
2 and the council wants low income housing then they will have to pitch in and help with
3 upgrading sewer and water. We had some long meetings with High Star negotiating,
4 we're going to have to stick to our guns. We need to at least have some kind of an idea of
5 where collectively we all want to go. Development agreements should benefit both the
6 City and the developer. They can be ever changing documents.

7
8 Mayor McCormick feels Councilor Todd's experience in this area will be invaluable.
9 He's done the negotiating and seen the benefit to the city which will be a big help as we
10 move forward. Assuming everyone else is on board with working with PUD's and
11 working from the City outward.

12
13 Councilor J. Blazzard stated Councilor McNeil was talking about cluster bonus to get
14 smaller lots and have open space. We still need to think about the benefits to Kamas City
15 whenever we talk about this. What do we want Kamas City to be and what do we want it
16 to look like? Councilor J. Blazzard stated High Star Ranch's original development
17 agreement was for 76 lots. The last time he talked to Tom Grimmett he talked like they
18 were going to be at 400 or 440. Development agreements are only as good as we can
19 stick together as a city council for.

20 Councilor J. Blazzard commented in Park City there are some really high-density housing
21 units. He is wondering how affordable they are. Councilor J. Blazzard isn't sure if what
22 we think is affordable will work out as affordable housing.

23
24 Councilor Todd told Councilor J. Blazzard there's no way there are 440 homes in High
25 Star Ranch. Originally, they were allowed 72 lots. They also fell in to the old code for
26 Kamas and they have a lot of commercial and residential that was allowed in commercial
27 at the time. When we negotiated the second time, we allowed more density but they
28 aren't allowed homes in the middle bench or south bench above the canal. The city
29 allowed them to cluster more density below the canal to preserve our view shed. We
30 should be benefiting from these developers when allowing more density.

31
32 Mayor McCormick doesn't feel we can compare home values in Park City to Kamas.
33 They are completely different. Councilor J. Blazzard feels Park City buyer will be buying
34 these homes. Mayor McCormick stated they will be if they're on 5-acre lots. Councilor J.
35 Blazzard feels even with smaller lots unless there's a way to phase the development to
36 give us the opportunity to fit more of our families and children in to these houses as the
37 need arises. Mayor McCormick agrees and feels this can be handled with a development
38 agreement.

39
40 Councilor Todd doesn't want to see more apartments but feels we could use some more
41 townhomes, 4-plexes, smaller homes, and smaller development. Something people can
42 afford. There's a lot of infrastructure that needs to happen in the entry corridor. A lot of
43 issues with the roads. The road master plan, the frontage road, and UDOT only gave 4-5
44 access points off of Hwy 248.

1 Mayor McCormick asked if he's hearing that there's more in favor for a PUD and a
2 development agreement then individual guys coming in and asking for rezones.
3 Something where the city has an opportunity to have the least impact to the current
4 residents and impact the developments as they come. Is that what's being said?

5
6 Councilor M. Blazzard stated yes, that's what she would be for.

7
8 Councilor Walker stated that's the kind of compromise that he envisioned. Something
9 where we could negotiate with them and come to a consensus between them and us. Not
10 just us saying go ahead and not us rezoning to something we don't really want.

11
12 Mayor McCormick explained the first step will be for the request for a rezone to PUD.
13 Then we start negotiating and building a development agreement to put in everything the
14 city wants and make sure the residents are taken care of. The thought is we all have to be
15 on the same page so when that comes, we all know what we're talking about.

16
17 Councilor Walker knows he's going to have to give in sometimes for things that they
18 want to get things the city wants. He would like to maintain those open spaces and
19 doesn't think we can unless we do something like we've been talking about.

20
21 Mayor McCormick asked for comments from the Planning Commission.

22
23 Commissioner Miles disagrees with higher density to lower the prices. The more
24 development we have, as fast as they sell, the price will be driven up. There's not enough
25 land in the valley to bring enough building lots in here to truly bring down the price of a
26 unit. If we're going to go with a PUD and a development agreement, we're still going to
27 be bringing in a lot more density than we have now. If those agreements can be structured
28 to a point where there's a guarantee that a certain number of homes go to family of
29 Kamas City residents, then that's great. Commissioner Miles doesn't feel a lot of the
30 residents have taken advantage of the affordable housing, self help units, that have gone
31 up in this valley. They're being bought by other people and after a couple years being
32 sold for big investments.

33 Commissioner Miles stated the argument that we can't bring in good teachers and what
34 not to live here, he has no sympathy. He drives to Salt Lake City everyday to work. 80%-
35 90% of the valley does.

36 Commissioner Miles understands there is some compromise that needs to be made and he is
37 willing to go with the majority. If we are going to rezone it needs to be more on the
38 development agreement side to get out of it for what we need for the city. He agrees with
39 those that have said it's not fair for the infrastructure and the change of sewer and water
40 to be tasked for the current residents to pay for.

41
42 Commissioner Gines doesn't know if a PUD can have the sweat equity homes that you
43 build as a co-op, but disagrees with Commissioner Miles. He has four relatives that have
44 built in this program and that's the only way they got to live here. It does help locals.
45 Commissioner Gines asked after the PUD is approved, do they come back with proposals
46 inside of that?

1 Scott Kettle replied as part of the PUD approval process we want to know the layout up
2 front. We want to have it all decided so once we're done, the PUD is approved and the
3 development agreement is signed we know what we've got and we're moving forward
4 with building that subdivision. The PUD negotiations would all be up front.

5
6 Commissioner Gines asked if a portion is supposed to be moderate income housing?
7 Mayor McCormick replied yes, 20%.

8 Commissioner Gines feels this helps some. Commissioner Gines personally feels we can
9 be hypocritical, we've already built our houses and now we don't want anyone else to
10 build here. Looking at the options for the PUD where we do have some townhomes, it's
11 got to be spread out through the wetlands then we're on the right track. 5-acre lots aren't
12 the way to go.

13 Commissioner Gines commented that the 6-acre lot that was denied, he's locked. If it's a
14 5-acre they don't have enough to build on. Something should be agreed upon there so
15 they can do something. The guy proposing that wasn't going to start right away. He was
16 just trying to get an idea of what he could work with.

17 Commissioner Gines would like to see a chance for people to live here and maybe a PUD
18 could help. He wants options for people that want to live here.

19
20 Commissioner Staples wants to make sure she understands. The requests we have been
21 getting are all over Kamas. The entry corridor as you come into Kamas you see at the top
22 of the hill. Commissioner Staples is not opposed to PUD or to development agreements
23 to go along with those, but would like to see some strategic growth. Not spaced out all
24 over the entry corridor. It makes more sense to start where the homes are now and build
25 out. Commissioner Staples does not like the tight 188 home developments and will never
26 agree to something like that, but would talk about something more reasonable. We can't
27 restrict people coming to this valley and you also pick where you want to live. We will
28 never be able to accommodate everybody that wants to live in the Kamas Valley. We just
29 need to plan for what we want Kamas to look like.

30
31 Commissioner Gines feels we've had discussion about PUD, but do we know what we
32 want to have in there regarding density. As a Planning Commission it would be nice to
33 know what the City Council thinks they would like. We're probably never going to be on
34 the same page, but we can compromise.

35
36 Mayor McCormick doesn't feel you can put a number on it. You're going to know it
37 when you see it. There are enough people on the board that will know.

38 Commissioner Gines isn't looking for exact numbers, but would like to know if we want
39 half acre, quarter acre, or a variety. We don't have to lock it in, but we could come up
40 with an idea from City Council.

41 Mayor McCormick feels he's heard a variety. We have the entry corridor and then the
42 higher density abutting the entry corridor, working the lower density away from the entry
43 corridor.

44
45 Councilor Todd feels there are key elements that you based what you want to see. The
46 frontage and setbacks need to be met. It's up to the developer to come to us with a plan

1 based upon this. The other big thing is the development agreement. We can't determine
2 the size until it's presented.

3
4 Councilor McNeil commented he has been consistent every time we have something of
5 this matter. He feels like our general approach when governing the city is whatever
6 makes us feel good, we'll look at it and if it makes sense to us, we'll do it and if it
7 doesn't, we won't do it. We just completely toss to the side our code, which we're
8 actually bound to. We have a rezoning code. A PUD is a rezone. What would the
9 explanation be for someone that comes in for half acre lots under a PUD and it's
10 approved, then someone comes in for just a half acre rezone and we deny. Looking at our
11 criteria that we have to apply and we have to follow the code. The first step would be to
12 look at our code and our criteria for zoning and change that. That would be the first
13 step before this subjective decision making.

14 Councilor McNeil stated we are required by law to have a capital facilities plan and we
15 have impact fees. This takes in to account the anticipated impact. That is intended to
16 encompass new growth and expansion. The need for facility growth needs to be paid for
17 by impact fees. It's not anticipated that we force a developer to do it by coming in with a
18 PUD application.

19 Councilor McNeil isn't suggesting that we'll ever get our home prices down to a level
20 where anyone can buy in Kamas. The economics of supply and demand will help the
21 costs. With a bigger supply the prices will drop.

22 Councilor McNeil asked Scott Kettle if he had anything to weigh in about the impact
23 fees.

24
25 Scott Kettle replied the capital facilities plan and the impact fees will help with the
26 construction of the ponds. As far as the majority of the infrastructure going out on Hwy
27 248, we've left that up to the developers. We helped out with the water line a little bit,
28 but the majority will be built as development happens. We can change that, we can put all
29 that infrastructure in and bond for it. We haven't in the past decided to do that. As far as
30 sewer ponds we are collecting impact fees to expand those. As part of the development
31 agreement with High Star Ranch we receive extra money from them for each home they
32 build to help with the sewer. There are things that help with this but the majority of the
33 infrastructure on Hwy 248 was planned to be as development happens.

34
35 Councilor McNeil replies he's not trying to say developers shouldn't. What is our legal
36 basis if a developer comes to us and asks why he has to pay for this when the City has a
37 capital facilities plan with impact fees based on that plan to cover anticipated growth.

38
39 Scott Kettle stated he would have to look in to that a little closer. We do have impact fees
40 to help with some of it, but the minor infrastructure inside the subdivisions, the
41 developers are responsible for that. We haven't collected impact fees for those types of
42 things. Scott Kettle will look at this closer and look at the capital facilities plan to see
43 where we're at as far as expanding major infrastructure. A lot of the stuff developers are
44 required to put in. With the PUD going from the A-5 to a higher density, those are the
45 kinds of things we can negotiate and say if we're approving a higher density you need to

1 put in a 10" line versus an 8" line. Those are examples of what we can work with to help
2 fund the infrastructure.

3
4 Councilor McNeil said it makes sense but isn't sure what our response would be if
5 approached by a developer. There is an interplay with our current rezoning criteria where
6 we say we don't have to allow someone to come in here, if we're going to allow you to
7 come in here then you're going to put it in. Councilor McNeil isn't opposed to require the
8 developer, but doesn't want to be requiring a developer if under the law it is something
9 that we should be anticipating with our capital facilities plan.

10
11 Commissioner Miles asked if anyone knows how much impact fees we've collected and
12 how close we are to a new sewer pond.

13 Councilor Todd explained once we've collected it, we have a certain amount of time
14 where we have to spend it. We can't just hold money in an account and let it sit there and
15 accrue. We continually upgrade our sewer, water, parks and roads. Councilor Todd
16 asked Scott Kettle if it was 7 years.

17 Scott Kettle replied it's 6 years, but sometimes you can go past that little bit if you have a
18 plan. We've done that and have had a plan in place stating how we're going to spend the
19 money.

20
21 Mayor McCormick stated we've had a lot of good discussion tonight and told
22 Commissioner Gines he's not sure if he got the direction he was hoping to get with his
23 question. It's more difficult and not really black and white. Do we feel like we have any
24 idea on what we're thinking or do we need to continue this discussion for a longer period
25 of time?

26
27 Councilor Todd thinks it would be beneficial to have Meg Ryan up for discussion to ask
28 her what other communities like Kamas are doing. We're unique in this valley. We used
29 to be agricultural but that all changed. Now we're more of a tourist community. Maybe
30 even Natalie Souza can have discussion with Meg Ryan to get some direction.

31
32 Mayor McCormick thinks this a great idea. If everyone is committed to come then he will
33 schedule with Meg Ryan.

34
35 Councilor Todd thinks we should all sit down and read the PUD section of our code and
36 make sure we're all comfortable with that.

37 Councilor Todd feels from his past experience's development agreements work well. If
38 we want higher density out there then he suggests pushing people to a PUD with a
39 development agreement. This helps safeguard the city.

40
41 Councilor J. Blazzard feels we've discussed a lot of things tonight and we need to do
42 some homework to educate ourselves before we can come up with a number. There's a
43 lot of questions still. We want what we do to benefit Kamas City to the best possible
44 amount. Councilor J. Blazzard is not in favor of really high density in Kamas and would
45 like to have Meg Ryan come up and provide training.

1 Councilor Todd asked Natalie Souza to put the PUD ordinance in Dropbox.
2 Natalie Souza explained it is all online but she will send the link for reference. It's
3 chapter 15.20. The only thing that changed the last time we amended this was the
4 minimum was changed to be a smaller acreage, to be the size of a major subdivision.
5 Everything has been there since before the code was online. It's an old ordinance.
6
7 Mayor McCormick will reach out to Meg Ryan and asked for a presentation on land use
8 planning and land use development.
9

10
11 **ADJOURN**

12
13 **MOTION:** Councilor Kevan Todd moved to adjourn at 8:40 p.m.
14
15

16 *The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim*
17 *transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at*
18 *the meeting.*
19

20 Approved on the 11th day of August, 2020.
21
22
23

24 _____
25 Matt McCormick
26 Mayor

Kim Peacock
City Recorder