

**THE GENERAL PLAN
FOR
THE COMMUNITY OF
BROOKSIDE / PINE VALLEY MOUNTAIN FARMS
2010-2011**

**A PART OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY GENERAL PLAN
2010**

**Prepared by
The Washington County
Planning Department**

**THE BROOKSIDE / PINE MOUNTAIN VALLEY FARMS COMMUNITY
GENERAL PLAN
2010 - 2011**

Introduction:

The Brookside/Pine Valley Mountain Farms community is a part of the unincorporated part of Washington County. It is one of about twelve unincorporated communities in the county. Residents of this community, and others, should take time to review Section I of the County General Plan which discusses planning in general, the basis for planning, and the purpose of planning. Many of the things mentioned in the beginning of Section VII are also relevant to the residents of this part of the county. The General Plan provides guidelines for the future of this particular part of the county in addition to those things that are applied county-wide in the other sections of the General Plan.

The Brookside / Pine Valley Mountain Farms community is interesting inasmuch as the original development in Brookside took place prior to the county having any type of planning ordinances such as subdivision or detailed zoning regulations. On the other hand, the Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision development is among the more recent subdivisions in the unincorporated area of the county. Access to the Brookside area is through the Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision. Roads are paved in Pine Valley Mountain Farms and are dedicated county roads, while the roads in Brookside are unimproved and undedicated. While these areas are technically two separate developments, they are generally referred to as the Brookside development.

The first plat in Brookside was recorded on June 16, 1965, with two or three phases being added later. The Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision plat was recorded on April 19, 1976, with a smaller phase added at a later date. All of the Brookside subdivision plats contain a total of 108 recorded lots, and the Pine Valley Mountain Farms plats contain 43 lot. There is some land north of the Farms subdivision containing a farm house and one other home along with land acreage which combines with the subdivision areas to make up the community.

Geography and Topography:

Pine Valley Mountain Farms was developed alongside State Highway 18 between St. George and Enterprise in Washington County. The subdivision was located just a few miles north of the community of Veyo which is also unincorporated. The Brookside development originated at a lower elevation than its companion subdivision, and was platted in lots on both sides of the Santa Clara River. Because many of these lots back up to the river, the subsequent home development, in most cases, took place at the back of the lots with the homes being constructed immediately adjacent to the river.

The location of these homes are in a beautiful location and have especially been desirable to part time home owners who have developed their property as seasonal homes for

seasonal use as opposed to the year-around residents who live there. County records would indicate that about 45 - 50 lots in the Brookside area are second dwellings mostly for owners who spend a portion of the year in Brookside, but whose primary residence is outside of Washington County.

To the east of the Brookside development the topography rises quite quickly toward the Pine Valley Mountains. Not all of the Brookside lots are immediately adjacent to the river. Later development was still below the hill, and developed with private roads, but was removed from the river by some distance with some lots being located against the hillside.

The open land north of the Pine Valley Mountain Farms area also is adjacent to State Highway 18, and was the land originally settled in the area. At one time, the access to the Brookside development was through this land, along a road known as the Lucky 7 Ranch Road, which ran not far from the original farm home. The Brookside access was changed following the development of the Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision.

All of this community is located north of the community of Veyo, and is surrounded on three sides by public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and further to the east, the Dixie National Forest. There is private land on the south side of the community leading to the community of Veyo, which land is mostly undeveloped and primarily in an open space category.

Table I
Land Ownership in Brookside / Pine Valley Mountain Farms

Bureau of Land Management	660.99 acres	1.03 sq. miles
Private Land	861.13 acres	1.35 sq. miles
Total:	1,522.12 acres*	2.38 sq. miles*

* These totals reflect the area identified as a part of the community for General Plan purposes and does not reflect the total amount of BLM land surrounding the community for a significant distance on three sides of the community.

Table II
EXISTING LAND USE

Residential Development	257.25 acres	0.24 sq. miles
Agricultural Development		
Commercial Development		
Industrial Development	15.82 acres	0.02 sq. miles
Vacant, undeveloped, grazing	494.72 acres	0.77 sq. miles
Total:	762.79 acres	1.03 sq. miles

The above figures are does not survey accurate, but they do paint a relative picture as to the relationship between the various types of land use.

Open Space:

There is a significant amount of open space in the area surrounding the Brookside/Pine Valley Mountain Farms development. It is managed by the BLM, and the present open space use of land is not likely to change in the foreseeable future. The only current use is the small area used as a cinder pit lying to the west of the community. The part of the pit currently being used could be expanded, but the overall size of the cinder pit is what it is. It is not likely to get any larger.

There is a large parcel of private land lying toward the northern end of the community that is also mostly open space and land used for livestock grazing. There are currently two dwellings in this area. Agricultural use is not likely to expand beyond small areas currently being used. However, if services, particularly water, were available in large quantity, the area could be developed residentially similar to the other developments in the community.

Agricultural Land:

Other than individual home gardens, there is virtually no agricultural development in this community. The actual amount would be too small to calculate as a percentage of the total land area. There is not a lot of land area where agricultural pursuits could be pursued.

Residential Development:

The only type of residential development in the community is single family dwellings. This is the type of development that has been planned and carried out since the area was started. The soil condition in Pine Valley Mountain Farms does not lend itself to farming with a rather shallow layer of soil to absorb septic tank effluent.

In the case of the Brookside development, the dwellings are generally located close to the Santa Clara River which may cause septic tank problems by the proximity of the dwellings to the water course.

In order to support other types of residential development, i.e. townhomes, condominiums, apartments, etc., it would require an on-site treatment plant of some kind to take over the liquid waste requirements. This is not likely to happen any time soon. The General Plan discusses this situation further in the service section of this Plan.

There are a total of 43 lots in the Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision. There are still approximately 10 vacant lots in this development. The Pine Valley Mountain Farms development has essentially reached "build out." In the Brookside Development there are some 108 platted lots along with some lots sold by metes and bounds and not platted. In

the Brookside section of the community there are approximately 50 lots that are vacant and available for building.

With about 60 vacant lots in the entire community, the entire area is not far from "build-out." The actual number of building permits issued for dwelling units over the past ten years is shown Table III as follows:

**Table III
Residential Permits Issued 2001 - 2010**

<u>Year</u>	<u>PVM Farms</u>	<u>Brookside</u>	
2001	0	1	
2002	0	3	
2003	0	1	
2004	0	0	
2005	1	2	
2006	0	1	
2007	2	2	
2008	1	0	
2009	1	0	
2010	0	2	
Totals:	5	12	combined = 17

Over the past ten years there has been an average of almost 2 permits issued each year. With some 150 lots in the community and about 60 of them being vacant, and an average of 2 building permits being issued each year, the community could support further development of permits per year for another 30 years before reaching complete build-out. This projection does not anticipate a great amount of future growth to take place.

Current Population and Population Density:

As a part of the unincorporated area of the county, specific population figures for each of the individual unincorporated communities are not available. The total population for Washington County unincorporated, based upon the recent census information, was 7,606 residents, or a community about the size of the City of Ivins.

The average family size in the county is in the range of 2.8 to 3.2 residents per dwelling unit. This is a little less than the average family size found in the statistical information gathered for this community. However, using an average of the county figures and estimating about 3.0 residents per family, it can be estimated that the General Plan would project the current community population to be in the range of 270 residents. This would constitute a community between the size of the Town of Rockville, and the Town of Springdale. .

Future Growth and Development:

Projecting population over the next ten years is best done by using the average number of permits for the past ten years combined with possible future growth. Building permits could be expected to increase incrementally over a period of time. The desire for single family homes will likely continue even though the Vision Dixie Plan calls for a mixed use type of development with higher density interspersed with single family and commercial development. How quickly the economy rebounds will determine how quickly additional homes will be built in the community.

Using a projected annual growth similar to the average number of building permits of the 2001 to 2010 period, the General Plan would project an increase of 60 residents over the next ten years. This would make for a population growth in 10 years of about 300 more residents.

The General Plan also calls to the attention of the residents of the area; Brookside is home to a number, about 50, homes as second dwellings. This could reduce the permanent population over the next ten years to even less than 300 permanent residents.

Vision Dixie Principle Summary:

Along with recommendations for residential growth and future development in the valley, along with other types of development such as commercial growth, the Vision Dixie Project, which was sponsored by Washington County a few years ago, and which was adopted by the county upon completion, makes recommendations for many other phases of community development. A summary of the Vision Dixie Principles and their relationship to this area is shown as follows:

1. Plan regionally; implement locally - The General Plan for this community is a local plan for the residents of this area. It is also intended to be adopted as a part of the Washington County General Plan.
2. Maintain air and water quality, and conserve water - Air and water quality is very important to the residents of this combined community. Most of the people, who live in communities such as this area, are there because of the clean air that exists. Conservation is also evident because of the limited outdoor watering on individual lots and the amount of natural landscaping that exists. There are trees in the area to provide summer shade, but much landscaping is of a natural variety that does not require additional water.
3. Guard our signature landscapes - See the section of the plan dealing with open space development. Most of the land surrounding the community is under the direction of the BLM, with the mountains to the east controlled by the Forest Service. There are no plans for development on any of this land. The areas surrounding this community should protect the view shed of this area with the

possible exception of views to the south which contain a considerable amount of private land which could generate development.

4. Provide connected natural recreation areas and open spaces - There is no shortage of natural open space recreation areas surrounding Pine Valley Mountain Farms/Brookside. This area is available for open space recreation activities. There is no significant desire on the part of residents to develop additional recreation facilities within the community, but there are natural and developed recreation areas within a close distance to this area already existing.
5. Build a balanced transportation system - The county has developed a county-wide transportation plan. See Section III of the General Plan for further information the county transportation plan. As far as such things as a commuter bus system connecting St. George City and Enterprise, that service is still many years in the future, but could become a reality at some future time with stops along the way in the various communities between the two cities.
6. Get centered by focusing on growth in walkable mixed use centers - In a community such as this one, that was developed prior to the Vision Dixie Plan being developed, it is difficult to retrofit the community into a mixed use center now that it has been almost fully completed. The community is compact enough that it could be considered to be generally walkable as it is currently developed. Residents responding to the county questionnaire were not in favor of developing any system of walking or bicycle trails, as such. But those things are available in the community as it is currently developed without any special consideration to those services.

It is not a mixed use community in the true sense of mixed use, although the two aspects of the community do provide a variety of living experiences, either on the bench adjacent to Highway 18, or in the Santa Clara River valley below the rim. It would be difficult at this time to identify areas for a true mixed use of residences to be developed. Unless a sewage system was installed for the entire community, it would be difficult to develop lots of a mixed use nature using septic tanks as the means of waste disposal even if there was still an undeveloped part of the community where it could be done. To develop mixed use in the open space area north of Pine Valley Mountain Farms would require a system of waste disposal as well as a source of culinary water. It could happen, but is not likely in the near future.

The future of commercial development as a part of a mixed use center is discussed in a future section concerned with commercial development.

7. Direct Growth Inward - The area has developed with relative compact growth. This community, as well as all other unincorporated communities, has not been able to support a higher mixed use density using septic tanks. On-site treatment systems have not been available for use in Utah until recent years. There are

currently no such facilities in use in the county except for a large common septic tank system in the Pinion Hills area of Dammeron Valley.

8. Provide a broad range of housing types - This element has been discussed previously. As far as the unincorporated communities of the county are concerned, the variety of housing types is definitely limited. As far as housing types are concerned, the county approves conventionally built homes and modular homes. There are probably more modular homes in the county than in any of the cities and towns. However, all of these types of dwellings are of a single family residential nature. The limitations to mixed use housing are discussed above.
9. Reserve areas for industry - The residents of this area have strongly indicated that they are not in favor of industrial development. One industrial development does exist to the west of the community in the form of a cinder pit leased by the Bureau of Land Management as a community pit with a portion leased for commercial use to a business in the St. George area. Such things as a cinder pit or gravel pit are located where they are, but to locate various types of industrial business in this area is not feasible because of the distance to freeway travel and to the markets that are associated with long distance transportation. Any additional industrial use of land in this community is not proposed by the General Plan and is not likely to happen.
10. Public land conversion - No conversion of public land is needed for the build-out or additional growth of this community. The only potential for future development in the valley which would include more land being added to the existing development lies to the north and south of the current development, all of which are already on private land. While the acquisition of some public land for future use might be possible, it does not appear to be a feasible, or needed, alternative in the case of Brookside or Pine Valley Mountain Farms. .

Commercial Development:

Commercial development is mostly non-existent in this community. Those responding to the county questionnaire were nearly unanimous in their recommendation against any significant commercial business in the area. In terms of the Vision Dixie Project, the recommendation relative to commercial development was to identify an area in the community center within 3/4 mile of all of the residential development and to combine commercial development with a mixture of residential development.

The General Plan, in identifying an area where a commercial center could exist, would be on the land north of Pine Valley Mountain Farms. However, a true mixed use of residential and commercial use would not be possible without the construction of an on-site waste disposal system.

The General Plan suggests that to locate business along the State Highway in an effort to attract travelers to stop along the Highway would not be successful. Economics

determines the decision to create a commercial center. That demand would not appear to exist at this time in this area.

Residents suggested that commercial development be left to the desire of residents as whether or not to develop commercially. The General Plan would generally support this policy. If commercial development did take place, the General Plan recommends that it be done to serve the residents and not to cater to the traveling public, therefore a Highway location would not be necessary or useful. Many of the residents suggested that the convenience commercial facilities currently located close by in Veyo, were sufficient to fill the needs of residents of this area.

A very small commercial business was started years ago and was zoned commercially at that time. It involved a commercial fishing operation which was not successful. A small gift shop exists along the highway today, also in a commercial zone. By themselves, without being part of a larger commercial center, neither of these commercial businesses could be projected to generate a lot of commercial activity.

There are many home occupations in Washington County. There are most likely home occupations existing in this community. More of the home occupation types of business can be expected to continue and are regularly licensed by the county.

Public Services:

A section of the General Plan relative to public services in the county is contained at the beginning of Section VII of the county General Plan. Many comments are re-stated here as they specifically apply to this part of the county.

Electricity:

Electric service is provided by the Rocky Mountain Power Company. Some years ago, a major sub-station was constructed near the Dixie Deer Subdivision. At the present time, the power company is planning another major expansion of the sub-station with another transmission line being brought from the facility in Sigurd, Utah, to the facility near Dixie Deer Estates. When this facility is completed in about 3 to 4 years, the west side communities of Washington County should be provided with good electrical service for many years into the future.

Natural Gas:

A number of years ago the Questar Gas Company installed a natural gas line from a point near the town of Central, running parallel to State Highway 18 southward toward the City of St. George. The installation of this line made natural gas service available to communities along the way. This line connects with the other major supply line serving the St. George Valley from the east, giving service to most of the county from either direction. This supply of natural gas should be sufficient to serve all of the communities connected to the system for both current demand and for future growth.

Water:

The water in this community is provided from two separate sources. In the Brookside subdivision portion of the community, water is provided by the Veyo Water Company. This supply is sufficient for all of the currently subdivided property. It is not sufficient for any significant growth and expansion anywhere in the water company area of service. In the case of the Pine Valley Mountain Farms subdivision, water was provided from a mutual water company created to serve this particular subdivision. Again, the supply of water is sufficient for the needs of the subdivision area, but would not provide for significant expansion into currently undeveloped areas.

Both of these water companies appear to be well managed and have a good record in providing service to each of the areas that they serve. The citizens comments submitted to the county indicate good satisfaction on the part of the residents for the service presently being provided. The General Plan expects that this level of service will continue to both of these areas as they currently exist.

There is the potential in future years for water to be obtained from the Washington County Water Conservancy District as is being made available to other incorporated and unincorporated communities in the county. The Water Company is continually extending their service line further north along Highway 18, and could well be available to this area in the future so that supplementary water could be obtained by either water company should it become feasible and desirable to do so.

Sewage Disposal:

Presently, liquid waste is disposed of through the use of individual septic tanks. This system seems to have served the valley well up to this point. There are some concerns about long-term use of septic tanks in the community because of shallow soil levels in the Pine Valley Mountain Farms area, and proximity to the Santa Clara River in the Brookside part of the community.

The General Plan recommends that consideration be given in the future to developing a system in the community in which property owners could pay a fee similar to fees charged in areas where sewage systems exist, and to use these funds for regular inspection of septic tanks and to provide for pumping, or making repairs to any system in the community that was in need of repair or maintenance at no additional cost to the homeowner. By using such a system, the Department of Environmental Quality would feel that septic tanks can continue to be used in this area safely for many years.

It is much easier to eliminate the possible effects from septic tank failure by taking a proactive position rather than waiting until problems surface, and then trying to find a good solution.

Roads:

Road maintenance for the roads in Washington County is done by the Washington County road department. These roads are classified as "Class B" roads by the State of Utah. Depending upon the degree of improvement, the county receives funds from the State for maintenance purposes. This amount is subject to change from year to year with the funds coming from the gasoline tax applied to all gasoline purchased throughout the country.

Dirt roads receive the least amount; paved roads receive the most money. In Washington County roads have historically been maintained with the money received from the State gasoline tax. Property tax money has not been used for road maintenance in this county.

It has long been the county policy to maintain roads in essentially the condition in which they were created. If property owners want to have their roads improved to a higher standard, the position of the county has been that when the owners of an area bring their roads up to that higher level, the county will then maintain them at the new standard. This is sometimes done through an improvement district that spreads the cost of improvement over a period of time, usually not more than ten years, instead of a one-time payment up front from the property owners.

In the case of the Brookside area, the property owners appear to be strongly opposed to dedication of their roads if it means bring them up to the current county standard. However it would appear that many of these same residents would favor having the county do some routine maintenance of their roads.

Many of these roads have no established right-of-way, although the most recent addition to the Brookside does have an identified right-of-way even though the roads are still private.

The General Plan makes a recommendation that representatives from Brookside meet with county officials to explore the possibilities of dedicating the Brookside roads in their current condition, and that they will be maintained in their current condition without any effort to improve or upgrade them.

Citizens of Brookside living on the far side of the Santa Clara River have expressed a desire to have a second way out of this area in time of flood or disaster. The General Plan points out that the north-south road east of the river was the original road from the Pine Valley area to the St. George valley. This road was used until such time as State Highway 18 was constructed. Therefore, it is likely a county road by right of use based upon its historical use in the county. The General Plan recommends that the county should explore what it would involve to open the road from Brookside to Veyo, Dammeron Valley, or to Baker Dam for emergency use. This road could be maintained in a dirt condition unless upgraded at a future time by the residents of Brookside. The most feasible route would appear to be a distance of about six miles via the Bonnie Springs Road to Dammeron Valley.

Another issue raised by residents is the desire for a larger bridge crossing over the Santa Clara River in the Brookside area. The General Plan could support such a request, but does raise the concern that if such a bridge was constructed and it was clogged during a flood period by a large tree, or other debris, the resulting flood in the valley would be much greater than it is with the current crossing. Again, the county could not consider a new bridge unless the roads were public roads. In the short term, it may be a wiser decision to improve a secondary access out of the area than to get into a discussion of how best to improve the river crossing. Such a discussion cannot begin until such time as the roads have been dedicated to the public.

Fire Protection:

Fire protection in the community is provided by the volunteer fire department in the community which is a part of the Northwest Fire District in Washington County. A fire station was constructed several years ago on a parcel of BLM land in the Pine Valley Mountain Farms area. The fire department members receive training within the Northwest Fire District and from county-wide training that is available. The fire district participates with the fire chiefs association on a county-wide basis. It would currently appear to be adequate for the needs of the community as it can continue from this time to enlarge and get even better over the years.

Public Safety:

Police protection is provided by the Washington County Sheriffs' Office. This service will continue as long as the valley continues as an unincorporated part of Washington County. This method of police protection would continue even if the valley was incorporated until such time as the incorporated town created their own law enforcement department. Some communities have contracted with the county for an increased visibility of officers in their community through a contract with the county calling for more visibility of sheriff's officers through a specific contract, and with the additional funds being raised by the community.

Solid Waste:

A Solid Waste Board made up of one representative from each city or town in the county, along with one member of the county, oversee the collection of solid waste in the county. This board contracts with a private collection company to provide the collection of waste throughout the county. There is a central land fill location which is owned by the county, and is managed by the solid waste company. That site is expected to be sufficient for many years to come. This system of management and oversight is also expected to continue, and appears to be adequate to serve the community.

Some residents have requested door to door pickup which would obviously cost the residents an increased fee from the current charge. Most citizens appeared to be quite satisfied with the satellite facility that is located close by for the use of residents.

Building Inspection:

Inspection of new construction is provided by the county Building Department. With the low number of permits being issued, the General Plan would recommend that this method of inspection continue. The cost of county building permits is significantly less than comparable costs in most of the incorporated cities and towns.

Communication:

Most of the county is served by the CenturyLink communication company. In addition to CenturyLink services there are a number of private cellular companies providing service within the county. Except for the possibility of adding additional cellular towers over time, most residents expressed a generally favorable opinion with the current level of telephone service. This level of service will likely continue with improvements from time to time by private cellular companies.

Flood Control:

Flood control has not been a major problem in the Pine Valley Mountain area of the community. Flooding does take place from time to time in the Brookside subdivision area. Many of the original lots and homes built in Brookside are shown to be in the flood plain area as shown on the Federal flood maps. This area was subdivided, or sold by metes and bounds, prior to the county developing its first subdivision ordinance and flood control ordinance. However, those living along the river enjoy the beauty and tranquility that exists in that area most of the time. Flooding does take place along the river from time to time. This issue was discussed previously in the section dealing with roads in the community. There is probably not a good answer to this problem with the lots and homes being where they are, and with the river being subject to flooding from time to time.

Annexation / Incorporation:

As far as this community annexing to another city or town, there is no incorporated city or town to which this area could annex. Incorporation of an unincorporated area into a town is always a possibility. The position of the county has been that government that is closest to the people is usually the best form of government. There are towns in the county, notably Rockville and Springdale that have a population that is less than the population of this development. On the other hand, with the size of this community in the county, and the projected slow level of growth that is likely to take place in the future, there would appear to be no good reason for the General Plan to recommend that the community seriously consider incorporation at this time. Whether or not to incorporate is a local decision. The county will continue to support each area of the county as an unincorporated part of the county, and does not attempt to influence any area of the county as to whether or not to incorporate.

**WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMUNITY SURVEY ANALYSIS
FOR
THE COMMUNITY OF BROOKSIDE / PINE VALLEY MOUNTAIN FARMS
2010-2011**

On August 12, 2010, members of the Washington County Planning Department met with the residents of the community of Brookside/Pine Valley Mountain Farms at the Pine Valley Mountain Farms Fire Station. The group was not large. However, in reviewing the questionnaires returned, it can be assumed that the number of questionnaires filled out would represent a valid cross-section of residents of the entire community. The feelings of one part of the community are not that far distant from the feelings of residents of the entire area.

Following is a summary of the questions asked, and the comments that were responded to by those present at the community meeting along with other copies of the questionnaire submitted directly to the planning office via the internet, or otherwise.

Residency Status:

The average time of residency by those responding to the questionnaire was 9.5 years. This figure indicates a stable population base in the community, many of whom have lived there for upwards of 15 years. The average family size of those responding was 3.6 which is slightly larger the average family size in the county. Most residents live on platted subdivision lots with 2 or 3 indicating that they have acreage up to almost twenty acres in a couple of cases. Most of the land, in the larger parcels, is used for livestock grazing with very little actually used for farming. All except for one respondent indicated that they were a home owner as opposed to a land owner only.

2. Characteristics that cause you to live or own property this community.

Many characteristics were listed as being reasons for people wanting to live in this area. The most identified being close to the mountains and parks, the opportunity to keep livestock animals, desire to have open space, a safe living environment, and a small town atmosphere. All of these are factors are indications of a desire for maintenance of a rural community atmosphere away from many of the characteristics of city living.

3. Should the rural atmosphere be preserved?

The answer is one hundred percent yes by those responding. A few ways to maintain the rural atmosphere were given and include the following: Keep farm animals, don't tax so high that property owners have to sell their land to pay taxes, keep things as they are with no major changes.

4. Should farm land be preserved?

Again there was a strong feeling to preserve farmland, even though realistically, farming in the community is not very great. Those who responded with a "NO" answer were really saying, whether to farm or not to farm is up to the land owner. They should be allowed to farm as long as they desired to do so, but only if that is what they want to do.

5. The question related to developing walking or bicycle trails in the community.

A few favored such development along existing roads. In the Brookside area, such trails should remain a "dirt" condition without any paving. Most residents however, were not in favor of creating a system of trails or bike trails in the community. Obviously, walking along existing roads, or bicycling along existing roads as they are, can be done without making any special effort to identify a specific or separate trail or bicycle system.

6. Mark concerns about each of the following conditions:

Off highway vehicle use received mostly comments of no concern. Speed and traffic control did not receive a significantly higher concern with only a few respondents indicating even a slight concern. The same mild concern was relative to unsafe use of such vehicles. Most residents indicated no concern relative to dedicating roads. The roads in Pine Valley Mountain Farms were dedicated when the subdivision plat was recorded. The roads in Brookside are private roads. The responses may indicate that there is no desire to have the county take over the maintenance of these roads if improvement of them was a condition of dedication. Dedication would have to be done before any county maintenance would have to precede any county involvement.

7. Commercial and Industrial development.

The responses would indicate that there is no desire to have commercial or industrial development take place in the community. Some said to leave it up to the land owner whether or not to develop commercial or industrial development. Most felt that St. George was near enough for this type of development to take place.

8. A similar response to the question asked above.

9. Rate local services as they relate to your area.

Most citizens either had no experience with ambulance service, or felt that the service was excellent. Water service was generally rated as adequate. Electrical power was rated about the same as for water service. Generally okay, but not great. Most felt that garbage collection was excellent because of the disposal site near the community. A few would prefer door to door pickup, but were not totally opposed to the disposal site nearby. Law enforcement was rated as adequate, if not excellent. The post office

delivery was given high ratings as was telephone service. The quality of cell phone service appeared to depend upon the type of cellular service being used.

10. Should recreation services be provided?

The answer to this question was strongly NO. Very few felt that some recreation would be good, and at least one said maybe. Facilities suggested included baseball fields. Others suggested using existing facilities in other areas such as Pine Valley or Baker Dam.

11. This question is covered in the previous response.

12. How can you best be informed about meetings?

Word of mouth and the use of the mail boxes were the highest methods suggested. Many said to put notices at a store, if it existed, but at this time, no such facility is proposed. A few were in favor of using the county web site, which is already being used, and a few would prefer having notices mailed, which, because of cost, is probably the least likely method to happen.

13. Did you participate in the Vision Dixie Program?

The 100 % answer was No, even though there were some comments about the county not buying into the program, even though the county adopted the results.

14. No comments relative to the Vision Dixie plan in the community were made.

15. Some final comments were made and can be found at the end of the statistical summary.

**WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMUNITY STATISTICAL SURVEY
FOR
THE COMMUNITY OF BROOKSIDE/ PINE VALLEY MOUNTAIN FARMS
2010-2011**

1. Residency Status
 - a. How long have you lived in this location? 9.5 years average
 - b. Number in family: 3.6 persons, average
 - c. Homeowners 92.9 %
 - d. Land owner only 7.1 %

2. Characteristics that you value or that help you choose to live or own property in this area:
 - a. Born or raised in the area 7.1 %
 - b. Close to family, friends, or neighbors 4.3 %
 - c. Close to mountains, etc. 78.6 %
 - d. Like open space 71.4 %
 - e. Opportunity to keep horses, animals, etc. 64.3 %
 - f. Quiet community 78.6 %
 - g. Recreational opportunities 50.0 %
 - h. Safe environment 85.7 %
 - i. Small town atmosphere 85.7 %
 - j. Other reasons: dirt roads, dark night sky - stars, slower pace of life, a garbage collection station nearby, away from the city, good neighbors, no curb & gutter, no concrete, county feel, beauty, peace, and tranquility

3. Should the rural atmosphere be preserved?
 - a. Yes 100 % No _____
 - b. How should it be done? Keep farm animals, don't tax so high that owners have to sell, keep things as they are no major land use changes
 - c. Should existing farm land be preserved? Yes 85.7% No 14.3 %
How should it be done? Better planning, Vision Dixie Principles buy it or lease it, let farmers keep farming, preserve it only if the farmer wants to, let the owners do what they decide to do

5. Would you favor developing a system of walking/bicycle trails throughout the community? Yes 23.1 % No 76.1 %
Dirt trails only, locate along roads

6. Mark on a scale of 1 to 5, your concerns on each of the following: Traffic safety, street and road conditions, unsafe ORV use, and street dedication. Most concerned = 5, least concerned = 1, no problem = 0
- Off-highways vehicles on streets - 0 = 64.3 %, 2 = 14.3 %, 5 = 14.3 %
 - Speed/traffic control - 0 = 28.6 %, 2 = 21.4 %, 3 = 42.9 %
 - Road conditions - 0 = 42.9 %, 2 = 35.7 %, 3 = 7.1 %, 5 = 7.1 %
 - Unsafe ORV use - 0 = 42.8 %, 2 = 21.4 %, 3 = 7.1 %, 5 = 7.1 %
 - Road dedication - 0 = 71.4 %, 1 = 7.1 %, 5 = 7.1 %
 - Other - don't pave roads, develop a second exit from Brookside, for fire and safety purposes, use Mt. View Lane to Veyo
7. Desired commercial or industrial business - None, whatever people want to do, small growth, no big industry, small business only, home occupations only, we like it how it is
8. Where should commercial or industrial uses be located - along main roads, below Winchester, downtown Saint George, wherever people want it if neighbors are okay
9. Rate your experience with local services as they relate to your area - Excellent = 5, Poor = 1, No experience = 0
- Ambulance - 0 = 43.8 %, 5 = 35.7 %, 4 = 7.1 %, 3 = 7.1 %, 1 = 7.1 %
 - Drinking water service and quality - 0 = 14.3 %, 5 = 28.6 %, 4 = 21.4 %, 3 = 7.1 %, 1 = 7.1 %
 - Electrical Power - 0 = 7.1 %, 5 = 14.3 %, 4 = 28.6 %, 3 = 42.9 %
 - Fire protection - 5 = 35.7 %, 4 = 21.4 %, 3 = 14.3 %, 2 = 7.1 %
 - Garbage collection - 0 = 35.7 %, 5 = 7.1 %, 4 = 14.3 %, 3 = 14.3 %, 1 = 7.1 %
 - Law enforcement - 0 = 7.1 %, 5 = 28.6 %, 3 = 35.7 %, 1 = 7.1 %
 - Postal Service - 5 = 64.3 %, 4 = 28.5 %
 - School Transportation - 0 = 21.4 %, 5 = 50.0 %, 4 = 21.4 %
 - Telephone service - 5 = 85.7 %, 3 = 14.3 %
 - Cell phone service - 5 = 42.9 %, 4 = 28.5 %, 3 = 28.5 %
 - Other services desired - DSL service, more internet access, garbage pickup at homes,
10. Should the community consider providing recreation services - yes - 7.1 %
No - 71.4 % Maybe - 7.1 %
11. List facilities that could be provided - None, Pine Valley, Baker Reservoir, Veyo Park, Water at Baker campground, baseball fields

12. How can you best be informed about meetings, etc?

- a. Word of mouth 71.4 %
- b. Fire Station 28.5 %
- c. Store if constructed 50.0 %
- d. Mail boxes 100 %
- e. County web site 21.4 %
- f. E - mail 14.3 %
- g. Mail

13. Did you Participate in the Vision Dixie planning program Yes 0 No. 14

14. None

15. Any final comments - No curb and gutter or street lights, have the county maintain the dirt roads, put a bridge over the river crossing, limit growth because of limited water, pave the main roads only.