



Results of the 2008 Rockville Town Survey

**Presented to the
Rockville Planning Commission
Sharon Hatfield, Chair
April 9, 2009**

**Presented by
Southern Utah Newsline LLC
on behalf of
Southern Utah University Regional Services
Brian Cottam, Assistant Director**



SOUTHERN UTAH NEWSLINE
P.O. BOX 2321
CEDAR CITY, UTAH 84721

435/559-0495 cell
435/865-8352 fax
husselbee@bresnan.net

April 9, 2009

Mrs. Sharon Hatfield
Planning Commission Chair
Town of Rockville
P.O. Box 630206
Rockville, UT 84763

Dear Mrs. Hatfield,

It is my pleasure to present to you the findings from the 2008 Rockville Town Survey. Enclosed you will find my report on the results, which includes background information, a description of the survey document, information on the response rate and a description of the sample, findings for each of the eight sections of the survey, an interpretation of key findings, and two appendices containing a copy of the survey document and respondents' answers to the open-ended questions.

Survey findings include frequency and descriptive statistics (most often averages of scaled items). In addition, the interpretation of key findings employs inferential statistics upon which the Town Council and Planning Commission may base future decisions about Rockville planning, growth and development based on the residents' desires.

As is the case with any similar endeavor, the survey data are not flawless. We find ourselves at the mercy of respondents who sometimes do not answer certain questions. Therefore, even though we received 108 responses to the survey, some findings and tables do not contain 108 responses. The percentages provided in those findings and tables reflect what are known as "valid proportions." That is, they represent a proportion of all respondents who answered that particular question.

In most cases, I would conclude a survey report with recommendations based on the results. However, in this case, I was not asked to make recommendations. I was only asked to compile and interpret the survey results. I believe it would have been presumptuous of me to try to tell you what the people of your community want or expect of you, the Town Council and the other members of the Planning Commission. Therefore, the other "recommendations" I have made are conclusions based on the survey findings. I leave decisions about what the survey means and how it will be used in the capable hands of Rockville Town officials.

I have been pleased to work with the Planning Commission on this project, and I thank you for the opportunity. If you have questions about the survey or wish to discuss the results in greater detail, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Background

The Town of Rockville, Utah, began operating with a Master Plan in 1989; based on results of a survey of town residents, the plan was revised in 1997. At the direction of the Town Council, the Rockville Planning Commission conducted a second survey of Rockville property owners in 2001 to determine whether their ideas about land-use issues had changed since the 1997 survey. The 2001 survey indicated that, overall, property owners' ideas about land use in Rockville had not changed. As a result, the Planning Commission recommended to the Town Council that the Rockville General Plan not be changed.

The General Plan is the official document for Rockville's legislative body. It provides a long-term guide for decision-making. It documents the legal basis for land-use ordinances and establishes major policy issues regarding future development within the Town of Rockville. To be effective, a General Plan must reflect the attitudes and desires of the community.

For many years, Rockville has been governed as a rural, agricultural, low-density, single-family residential community that expresses a strong desire to maintain a small-town atmosphere. In the past, citizens have chosen to disallow commercial or industrial uses within the city limits. There are a limited number of home-based businesses that operate under Conditional-Use Permits. Other than that, commercial activity in the town has not been allowed.

Washington County became the fastest-growing county in Utah in the early 2000s and has remained so for most of the first decade of the new millennium. Increasing pressure to develop is fast approaching towns like Rockville. For obvious reasons, Rockville is seen as a desirable residential community. To gauge residents' attitudes about zoning and growth, the Rockville Town Council and Planning Commission determined that it was appropriate to survey residents again in 2008.

Led by Chair Sharon Hatfield and Commissioner Vivian Cropper, the Planning Commission sought help to design and conduct the survey from Southern Utah University Regional Services. The project was assigned to Brian Cottam, SUU Regional Services Regional Director. Mr. Cottam asked Dr. Paul Husselbee of the SUU Department of Communication for help constructing the survey document. Dr. Husselbee agreed to use resources of his consulting firm, Southern Utah Newslite LLC, to complete the survey. He met with members of the Planning Commission on July 8, 2008, to present a proposed survey document. After a discussion about the goals and purpose of the survey, the parties agreed to move forward and planned to distribute the survey to Rockville residents in October 2008.

The survey was intended to provide Rockville officials with information about current property owners' attitudes and beliefs. Residents were informed that completing the survey would help them tell the Town Council and Planning Commission what they believed about Rockville in 2008. It gave residents a chance to express their thoughts about the type of community they envision for Rockville in the future.

Because of an unavoidable delay, the survey was not distributed until December 2008. At that time, 247 surveys were distributed, and 108 were returned (a response rate of 43 percent). Dr. Michael Ostrowsky of the SUU Department of History & Sociology compiled the survey data and provided preliminary results. Meanwhile, Ms. Cropper compiled respondents' written comments. She and Mrs. Hatfield met with Mr. Cottam and Dr. Husselbee in February 2009. Dr. Husselbee then agreed to analyze the data in more detail and offer these findings at a Rockville Town Meeting scheduled for April 9, 2009. The report follows.

Description of the Survey Document

The survey consisted of 48 questions or statements and was divided into eight parts: General Information, Land Use, Planning Issues, Sense of Community, Transportation, Environment, Annexation, and Other Important Issues. Each of these topics was identified by the Planning Commission and Town Council as being significant factors in determining whether changes should be considered in the General Plan.

A copy of the survey document is provided in Appendix A (Pages 18-23).

Response Rate & Description of the Sample

The survey was distributed in December 2008. Some 247 surveys were distributed; 108 were returned for a response rate of 43 percent. Of the 108 surveys returned, 60 came from resident property-owners, 37 came from non-resident property owners, and 5 came from tenants or renters. The remaining 6 survey respondents did not designate their residency status. Overall, the sample appears to be consistent with the makeup of Rockville, although it may be lacking in per capita responses from tenants and renters.

Findings: General Information (Questions 1 through 3)

Question 1 asked respondents what they like most about Rockville. Resident property owners tended to use adjectives such as “rural,” “friendly,” “down-to-earth,” “quiet,” “unique,” “beautiful,” and “small-town atmosphere.” They also cited the Town’s proximity to Zion National Park, as well as other recreational and scenic lands. Non-resident property owners responded in similar fashion, emphasizing the Town’s location and peaceful, small-town environment, its beautiful scenery, and its commercial- and business-free zoning. They described Rockville as “neighborly,” and one property owner made a fond reference to the Town’s 40-watt street-light bulbs. Tenants and renters wrote that they liked Rockville for many of the same reasons: small size, proximity to Zion National Park, quiet community, natural beauty and friendly folks. All responses to Question 1 are found in Appendix B, Pages 25-26.

Question 2 asked respondents to name one thing they would like to change about Rockville. Predictably, resident property owners cited concerns about water. They also stated concerns about property-use, maintenance and clean-up, and requiring non-resident property owners to maintain their properties. Other common concerns included references to a desire for changing some Town officials (mayor, council or planning commission), alleged rigidity or discourtesy of a Town employee, and night-sky lighting. The most frequent answer was, “Nothing.” Non-resident property owners also discussed water concerns, especially pressurized irrigation, and a sense of fairness where water is concerned. Two respondents expressed concern about an allegedly pervasive attitude of “I’ve got my water, so no one else should have any.” Other concerns among non-resident property owners and tenants included speed and night-sky ordinances, as well as a desire to maintain the access road to Grafton. Among all respondents, the most frequent answer to Question 2 was, “Nothing.” All responses to Question 2 are found in Appendix B on Pages 26-27.

Question 3 asked respondents whether Rockville should continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses. Here is a summary of respondents’ answers:

Question 3: *Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	49	83.1	9	15.3	1	1.7
Non-resident Property Owners	27	73.0	6	16.2	4	10.8
Renters or Tenants	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	4	80.0	2	20.0	0	0.0
Totals	82	77.4	19	17.9	2	4.7

Question 3 also asked respondents to explain their answers. Overwhelmingly, resident property owners favored the status quo, with most respondents saying they like the quiet, small-town atmosphere the way it is. Some respondents qualified their affirmative responses with a suggestion that the land become “more self-sustaining.” Other respondents disagreed, suggesting that Rockville should allow businesses that don’t conflict with the Town’s “family atmosphere” as a means of increasing the tax base. One undecided resident said it would “be nice to have a store where we could get a loaf of bread or a quart of milk.” Non-resident property owners also favored the status quo, citing environmental concerns and a desire to preserve Rockville’s rural, residential nature, it’s “unique spirit” and sense of community. Dissenting voices among the non-resident property owners, tenants and renters, and other respondents expressed concerns about the absence of a tax base. One person argued in favor of changing the way the Town is governed because the Town Council “exercises dictatorial power.” Overall, respondents preferred governing the Town the way it has been governed in the interest of preserving the “pristine, non-commercial appeal.” All responses to the second part of Question 3 are found in Appendix B on Pages 27-29.

Findings: Land-Use (Questions 4 through 12)

Rockville’s General Plan allows for low-density residential and agricultural land uses while limiting home-based businesses. These questions were designed to solicit residents’ opinions about land use in the Town. Here are tables reflecting residents’ responses:

Question 4: *Should the Town allow duplexes or triplexes to be built?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	12	20.3	47	79.7	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	7	18.9	30	81.1	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	1	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	3	50.0	5	50.0	0	0.0
Totals	23	21.5	84	78.5	0	0.0

Question 5: *Should the Town allow apartment buildings to be built?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	3	5.0	57	95.0	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	3	8.1	34	91.9	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	1	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	2	33.3	4	66.7	0	0.0
Totals	9	8.3	99	91.7	0	0.0

Question 6: *Should the Town permit townhouses or condominiums to be built?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	10	16.7	44	73.3	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	7	18.9	30	81.1	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
Totals	20	19.6	82	80.4	0	0.0

Question 7: *Should the Town allow existing homes to create rental apartments within if the footprint of the home is not enlarged?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	37	62.7	22	37.3	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	18	50.0	18	50.0	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
Totals	65	61.3	41	38.7	0	0.0

Question 8: *Should the Town allow a secondary pre-existing building on an owner's property to be used as guest or living quarters for family and friends?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	45	75.0	15	25.0	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	30	81.1	7	19.9	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
Totals	84	77.8	24	22.2	0	0.0

Question 9: *Should the Town allow a secondary pre-existing building on an owner's property to be used as a rental property?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	33	55.0	27	45.0	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	19	51.4	18	48.6	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
Totals	61	56.5	47	43.5	0	0.0

Question 10: *Currently, the Town allows residents to raise farm animals in residential lots if they are at least a half-acre of land. Are you in favor of allowing farm animals on less than a half-acre of residential land?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	18	32.7	37	67.3	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	11	30.6	25	69.4	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	1	16.7	5	83.3	0	0.0
Totals	32	31.4	70	68.6	0	0.0

Question 11: Should the Town adopt a night-time (lighting) sky ordinance?

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	41	71.9	16	28.1	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	25	73.5	9	26.5	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
Totals	73	72.3	28	27.7	0	0.0

Question 12: Rockville's current population is about 250. Like any small community with a limited tax base, we provide only the most basic of services. What do you think Rockville's ideal population should be in the near future?

Status	200-299	%	300-499	%	500-1,000	%	Other	%
Resident Property Owners	35	58.3	17	28.3	4	6.7	4	7.7
Non-resident Property Owners	14	38.9	11	30.6	7	19.4	4	11.1
Renters or Tenants	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
Other (residency status unknown)	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	0.0	0.0
Totals	52	49.1	32	30.2	13	12.3	9	8.5

Based on these data, Rockville residents are overwhelmingly against the building of apartment buildings and do not favor construction of townhouses, condominiums, duplexes or triplexes. Most residents feel they should be able to create rental apartments in their own homes as long as they do not enlarge the footprint of the home. Also, a significant majority of respondents believe they should be able to use existing secondary buildings on their properties to house family or friends. A simple majority believes such structures can be used appropriately as rental properties. Most Rockville residents do not favor farm animals on less than a half-acre of residential property. A large majority of respondents favor a night-time sky ordinance. Finally, nearly half of the respondents believe the ideal population of Rockville in the near future should be between 200 and 299. Thirty percent of respondents suggested an ideal population of 300 to 499, while twelve percent said the population should be between 500 and 1,000.

Findings: Planning Issues (Questions 13 through 33)

The Rockville Planning Commission faces several decisions related to development in the coming years. This section of the survey was designed to seek community input that will help the Planning Commission set planning priorities. Residents were asked to rate the importance of a list of issues on a seven-point scale where 1 represents "not at all important" and 7 represents "urgently important." A table reflecting residents' responses appears at the top of Page 6.

Rockville residents' top priority is clear: preservation of the Town's natural landscape. Preserving the Town's historic buildings and features is also high on the priority list. Growth and new construction are significant concerns, as four growth-related items are found among the top six priorities. These priorities include new growth paying for its infrastructure, requiring underground utilities for new construction, planning for future growth and charging impact fees for new construction. Residents also seem interested in creating a bike trail between Rockville and Springdale, increasing regulations on development, improving road maintenance and seeking funding to upgrade fire protection infrastructure.

Questions 13 through 33: *How important are the following issues on a seven-point scale where 1 = “not at all important” and 7 = “urgently important”?*

Issue	Resident Owners	Non-Resident Owners	Tenants or Renters	Overall Totals
13. Plan for future growth	5.6	5.9	6.4	5.6
14. Create a commercially zoned area	2.6	3.7	4.2	3.1
15. Improvements to Community Center & Town Park	3.1	4.0	4.0	3.4
16. Upgrade street lighting	1.8	2.4	2.6	2.1
17. Cemetery improvements	3.1	3.4	2.4	3.1
18. Permit mobile homes in designated areas	1.8	2.5	3.2	2.1
19. Preserve historic buildings and features	5.7	5.9	6.0	5.7
20. Improve road maintenance	4.5	4.2	4.6	4.4
21. Improve sidewalks	4.1	3.7	4.6	3.9
22. New growth should pay for its own infrastructure	6.3	6.0	6.0	6.1
23. Seek culinary water to allow new growth	3.9	4.6	5.8	4.3
24. Seeking funding to upgrade fire protection	4.4	4.2	5.6	4.4
25. Decrease regulations on development	3.1	3.4	4.4	3.4
26. Require new multi-unit development to be clustered	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.0
27. Charge impact fees for new construction	5.3	5.3	6.2	5.4
28. New construction should require underground utilities	5.8	5.9	6.0	5.8
29. Increase regulations on development	4.5	4.6	5.2	4.5
30. Pay more taxes/fees to fund capital improvements	2.8	3.1	4.0	2.9
31. Establish a contingency fund for legal fees	3.3	3.4	3.0	3.3
32. Preserve Rockville’s natural landscape	6.6	6.4	6.4	6.5
33. Pursue biking trail between Rockville & Springdale	4.7	4.5	6.6	4.6

Findings: Sense of Community (Questions 34 through 39)

Members of the Town Council and Planning Commission are interested in understanding residents’ feelings about Rockville. The survey included five statements about respondents’ “sense of community,” and respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each statement on a seven-point scale where 1 represents “strongest disagreement” and 7 represents “strongest agreement.” Here is a table reflecting residents’ responses to these five statements:

Questions 34 through 38: *Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with these statements on a seven-point scale where 1 = “strongest disagreement” and 7 = “strongest agreement.”*

Statement	Resident Owners	Non-Resident Owners	Tenants or Renters	Overall Totals
34. If there is a Rockville Town problem, the people who live here can handle it.	6.0	5.5	5.4	5.8
35. I expect to live in Rockville for a long time.	6.4	5.3	4.8	5.9
36. It is important to participate in Town events.	5.5	5.5	4.6	5.4
37. Town officials, board members and other officials are doing a good job	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.3
38. I volunteer for Town activities.	4.2	2.5	3.8	3.6

Question 39 asked respondents if they had other comments or suggestions for Town officials. Resident property owners' responses were dominated by comments on volunteerism and Town events. Several responses indicated that too much is asked of residents in the way of volunteer labor or participation in Town-sponsored civic events. Although a few people expressed appreciation for the mayor and other Town officials, several comments addressed perceived bias and unfairness in the way Town officials grant or deny privileges or services. Also, one response expressed a desire for term-limits on public office, and another addressed concerns about power granted to the Town Clerk. The dominant theme of responses from non-resident property owners reflected a concern about the perceived unfairness of Town leaders with arbitrary enforcement of Town ordinances when officials or their friends are involved. All responses to Question 39 are found in Appendix B on Page 29-30.

Findings: Transportation (Question 40)

State Highway 9 runs through Rockville and has an average traffic count of some 2,000 vehicles per day. The primary function of other Rockville roads is to service existing residential and agricultural uses. Question 40 asked respondents for their recommendations for the Town's streets with regard to safety, layout and other conditions.

Most resident property owners expressed concern about one of two topics: road maintenance or speed enforcement and precautions. One respondent suggested requiring adherence to easements on roads and improved maintenance of "lesser-tended" roads. Another suggested paving all Town roads. Another significant concern seems to be speed limits, especially on State Highway 9, as well as crosswalks and signage to protect children, pedestrians and cyclists from fast-moving traffic. Other resident property owners said the Town is "fine with what we have." One wrote, "Don't spend money." Non-resident property owners also expressed concerns about road maintenance. One went so far as to suggest that all new roads should be paved and construct curb-and-gutter. Another suggested magnesium chloride as a dust-suppressant on unpaved streets. Non-resident property owners also wrote of speed limits, especially for the sake of children's safety, and other speed-related precautions. Tenants and renters agreed. One tenant suggested maintaining paint and reflectors on roads that have them. All responses to Question 40 are found in Appendix B on Pages 30-31.

Findings: Environment (Questions 41 and 42)

Much of the appeal of Rockville has to do with the physical characteristics and idyllic setting. The quality of this environment can be either diminished or enhanced, depending on how, when and if development takes place. Question 41 asked respondents to identify areas in and around Rockville they believe are environmentally sensitive or significant in ways that should be preserved or protected.

Several resident property owners identified the following areas: north and south benches; ridgelines and hillsides, especially those with Native American dwellings; the Virgin River, its banks and corresponding basin; Grafton and the road leading to it; and all scenic vistas in the Town. Some residents voiced concern for "the whole town," while one resident wrote, "None." Non-resident property owners expressed similar concerns. One response suggested keeping all-terrain vehicles and motorcycles away from hiking trails. Another identified Horse Valley Wash as an environmentally sensitive area requiring attention. Non-resident property owners and tenants expressed particular concern about maintaining Grafton.

Question 42 asked respondents to identify areas with potential natural hazards that should be excluded from development for the protection of current and future residents. Resident property owners pointed to areas along the Virgin River, dry washes, flood plains, and areas prone to rock fall, especially along the north bench. One observation suggested a no-development zone along the river corridor “to allow for natural ‘winding-river’ variations.” Non-resident property owners and tenants/renters expressed concerns about areas along the Virgin River, dry washes and the 100-year flood plain.

Responses to Questions 41 and 42 are found in Appendix B on Pages 31-33.

Findings: Annexation (Question 43)

Annexation requests must be initiated by property owners under Utah law. As communities grow, a need may develop to extend the boundaries of the Town. Question 43 asked respondents whether they would favor annexing additional land into Rockville. Respondents who answered “yes” were asked to explain their answers. Respondents’ answers are provided in this table:

Question 43: *Do you favor annexing additional land into Rockville?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
Resident Property Owners	19	33.9	37	66.1	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	15	48.4	16	51.6	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Totals	39	40.2	58	59.8	0	0.0

Resident property owners who answered “yes” to the annexation question justified their responses based on a perceived need for a “regulated buffer zone from Virgin and Springdale” and impending growth. Other responses argued in favor of annexing land only to protect wells, watershed and other potential sources of water. Others still advocated annexing on a case-by-case analysis “based on individual applications and circumstances,” and “depending on where and who.” One resident wrote, “Only if they accept our rules, we do not relax our rules to accommodate them and they bring their own water.” A minority argued against annexation as “costly” and noted, “Without additional water, the land would be of no use.”

Non-resident property owners who responded affirmatively to the annexation question wrote that annexing land could protect the town from outside development that could impact the Town. Others argued that development is inevitable, and the Town will someday need land it could annex now. Interestingly, several non-resident property owners seem to believe that annexation will provide additional water while protecting watersheds and scenic vistas. However, one respondent suggested that the question was moot: “If it don’t have water, why annex?” A property owner objecting to annexation argued in favor of developing water for 60 waterless lots in town. Tenants and renters seemed to accept the inevitability of future development. One renter wrote, “I’m not sure we have a choice if we grew.” Another wrote, “If consideration is given to the economic impact on current residents is concerned.” The third tenant said, “If the Town wants to grow, land will be needed.” One of the residents who did not specify residency wrote that annexing land must be accompanied by surrounding aquifer to protect the Town. Another wrote that if Rockville does not control the land that surrounds it, someone else will.

All responses to Question 43 are found in Appendix B on Pages 33-34.

Findings: Other Important Issues (Questions 44 through 48)

Questions 44 and 45 asked respondents for their opinions about the Rockville Land Use Code. Question 44 asked whether the code should remain as it is today, become more flexible or become more regulatory. Question 45 asked respondents to explain their answers to Question 44. Answers to Question 44 appear in this table:

Question 44: *In my opinion, the Rockville Land Use Codes should . . .*

Status	Remain as It is today	%	Be more flexible	%	Be more regulatory	%
Resident Property Owners	31	55.4	21	37.5	4	7.1
Non-resident Property Owners	10	31.3	17	53.1	5	15.6
Renters or Tenants	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Other (residency status unknown)	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Totals	39	40.2	58	59.8	0	0.0

A majority of resident property owners (55 percent) favor maintaining the status quo with respect to the Land Use Code, while a majority of non-resident property owners prefer greater flexibility in the code, as do tenants, renters and “other” respondents (who did not specify a residential status).

In response to Question 45, resident property owners who favor no change in the Code said it is sufficient to serve the Town’s needs while maintaining the “current atmosphere and feel of Rockville.” One resident suggested tightening loopholes in the Code, while another seemed to summarize the argument in a simple statement: “It works for me.” Resident property owners who argued for greater flexibility justified their position on a variety of fronts. A few cited inevitable growth and suggested that other uses of land needed to be allowed. Others seemed to resent the lack of freedom to use their own land as they pleased. One resident wrote, “Sometimes I feel the Town owns my land, not me.” Another wrote, “It seems for a small town, we have some awfully stringent ordinances.” Yet another wrote, “Quit nitpicking every little thing,” while another suggested that some public officials enforce or interpret the Code “in order to harass individuals.” Another comment said simply, “We live in America.”

Non-resident property owners voicing support for the Code as it is presently constituted said the Town is well-managed under existing law. They suggested the Code “works well for Rockville.” Two non-resident owners wrote that the current Code protects the pristine area that makes Rockville an enjoyable place to live and different from other small towns.

Non-resident owners who advocated more flexibility offered arguments similar to those of the resident property owners: personal freedom, inevitable growth and the perceived overbearance of public officials who dictate policy “under the guise of this is what the people want.” One resident wrote, “We should pretty much do what we want on our own land as long as it’s not hurting anyone.” Other non-resident owners took the opposite position — that strict land-use policies are needed to rein in development and preserve the rural nature of Rockville. Another resident owner wrote restricting rules, such as to “. . . eliminate conflict, legal issues and make governing and stability more likely.”

Both tenant/renters and status-unspecified respondents justified their positions in the same manner as property owners. All responses to Question 45 are found in Appendix B on Pages 34-36.

Question 46 asked respondents to offer opinions about Rockville’s most significant challenge in the future and how the Town should deal with it.

Resident property owners overwhelmingly identified water scarcity as Rockville’s most significant future challenge. Few respondents offered solutions to the water problem; two residents suggested purchasing water from Springdale. Others advocated treatment plants to turn irrigation water into culinary water. The other major concern of resident property owners is growth. Resident owners appear to be eager to prevent additional growth in the Town. One resident advocated a “zero-growth policy,” while another suggested electing a “like-minded” mayor when the current mayor retires. Another resident suggested encouraging would-be move-ins to “go live in Virgin.” A related concern among resident property owners is maintaining Rockville’s small-town atmosphere.

Non-resident property owners are also concerned about water; however, their overarching concern seems to be managing growth and related infrastructure costs. Some non-resident property owners seem to be open to the idea of managed, controlled growth in the interest of bringing commercial business to town. However, most non-resident property owners seem concerned with maintaining the status quo. One non-resident owner suggested Rockville’s biggest challenge is “to not give away its ‘magic.’ Don’t become a Park City South; don’t follow Springdale.”

Likewise, Rockville’s tenants and renters who responded to the survey emphasized planning ahead to manage growth while “remaining small and beautiful.” Another tenant wrote of the challenge of “attracting tourism while keeping pristine; keep a prudent plan for future growth.” Respondents who did not reveal their residency status also emphasized growth concerns and a desire to minimize development. All responses to Question 46 are found in Appendix B on Pages 36-37.

Question 47 asked respondents whether they would support the idea of the Town Council sponsoring a public-information meeting with the potential participation of state and local water experts to discuss the Town’s water circumstance. It also asked respondents whether they would attend such a meeting. This table provides respondents’ answers to Question 47:

Question 47a: *Do you support the idea of the Town Council sponsoring a public information meeting with the potential participation of state and local water experts to discuss the Town’s water circumstance?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don’t Know	%
Resident Property Owners	56	93.3	4	6.7	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	33	94.3	2	5.7	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	5	100.0	0	00.0	0	0.0
Totals	99	94.3	6	5.7	0	0.0

Question 47b: *Would you attend such a meeting?*

Status	Yes	%	No	%	Don’t Know	%
Resident Property Owners	54	93.1	4	6.9	0	0.0
Non-resident Property Owners	23	74.2	8	25.8	0	0.0
Renters or Tenants	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Other (residency status unknown)	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Totals	85	85.9	14	14.1	0	0.0

Question 48 asks respondents whether there are questions they would like to have seen on the survey, whether they have comments about the survey, or if they desire to comment on other Town issues.

Predictably, responses to this final survey question are varied. Resident property owners pointed out several concerns: the need for a noise ordinance to cover such things as barking dogs and loud parties; display of the Town flag on holidays; pressure to render volunteer service; police protection; safety inspection of rental properties; energy conservation; and nepotism in Town government. Several residents thanked the Town Council and Planning Commission for administering the survey, and one suggested that the survey needs to be repeated regularly. Another resident disagreed: "This survey is unnecessary. The questions are slanted toward pro-growth and development. The Town has spoken repeatedly to reject growth and this survey represents a failure of certain politicians to accept those past findings." Finally, several respondents echoed earlier comments about the difficulty of working with a particular Town employee; two others cautioned against having Town records under the control of that employee in her private residence.

Non-resident property owners repeated concerns about culinary and irrigation water. Several owners expressed frustration over their inability to build homes on their own properties without access to water. Other non-resident owners praised the work of the mayor and town council, and thanked them for their work and for conducting the survey. A comment from one such property owner: "Keep up the good work!" Another wrote, "Thank you for asking and for protecting Rockville for future generations." On the other hand, a few respondents lashed out at Town leadership over perceived inequalities in regulation and enforcement of Rockville ordinances. One non-resident owner wrote, "Property rights should be respected."

One tenant praised the survey as being well-written and clear while suggesting that the Town needs to get younger people involved in town activities. That will require personal contact rather than general chiding in the Town newsletter, the writer observed. Another tenant expressed concern about several things: the lack of information about water shares; bright lights on a particular property interfering with the night sky; signage alerting tourists and drivers to bicyclists; and the need for a Town employee to receive training in communication skills. All responses to Question 48 are found in Appendix B on Pages 37-39.

Interpreting the Findings

Most of the frequency and descriptive data offered in the findings speaks for themselves. Although the Town of Rockville undoubtedly is inhabited by pockets of residents who are prepared for the Town to grow and who would welcome certain types of businesses to the community, the majority of respondents are not in favor of growth, especially if said growth results in the building of multi-unit dwellings (apartment, townhouse, condominium, duplex or triplex units) or if it disturbs the small-town atmosphere so many residents treasure. At the same time, it is clear that many residents — particularly resident property owners — are frustrated at their inability to make decisions about their own property because the Land Use Code, Town ordinances and Town officials and employees seem to be heavy-handed in their application of the rules.

Statistical analysis of the survey findings may suggest priorities and a sense of direction as the Town Council and Planning Commission attempt to use the findings in the service of Town residents. However, before such analyses are undertaken, it will be necessary to pare 11 responses from the sample.

Table 1
Rockville Survey Respondents' Residency Status

Residency Status	f	%	Cum %
Resident Property Owners	60	55.6	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners	37	34.3	89.9
Tenants or Renters	5	4.6	10.1
Did not respond (residency status unknown)	6	5.5	5.5
Total	n = 108	100.0	

Table 1 above demonstrates that tenants and renters comprise less than 5 percent of the sample. Of 108 survey responses, we received only 5 responses from tenants and renters. Realistically, then, the survey is truly only a survey of property owners — and that is particularly true if tenants and renters comprise more than 5 percent of the Town’s overall population. As that information was not available, the only responsible course of action for the purpose of statistical analysis is to drop the tenants and renters from the survey sample. Likewise, the respondents who did not declare their status (as resident property owners, non-resident property owners, or tenants/renters) should be dropped because there is no way to be certain of their status in the community. Thus, all statistical analysis that follows has been done with a trimmed sample consisting of 60 resident property owners and 37 non-resident property owners.

The most important thing a survey such as this can accomplish is guide future decision-making of civic leaders. With that in mind, we generated Tables 2 (below) and 3 (top of Page 13) to help the Rockville

Table 2
Importance of Issues to Property Owners (Organized by Survey Item)

Item	Description	Resident	Non-resident	Overall	Rank
13	Plan for future growth	5.6	5.9	5.68	5
14	Create a commercially zoned area	2.6	3.7	3.03	18
15	Improvements to Community Center & Town Park	3.1	4.0	3.42	14
16	Upgrade street lighting	1.8	2.4	2.03	21
17	Cemetery improvements	3.1	3.4	3.22	17
18	Permit mobile homes in designated areas	1.8	2.5	2.10	20
19	Preserve historic buildings and features	5.7	5.9	5.80	4
20	Improve road maintenance	4.5	4.2	4.42	9
21	Improve sidewalks	4.1	3.7	3.90	13
22	New growth should pay for its own infrastructure	6.3	6.0	6.15	2
23	Seek culinary water to allow new growth	3.9	4.6	4.15	11
24	Seek funding to upgrade fire protection infrastructure	4.4	4.2	4.35	10
25	Decrease regulations on development	3.1	3.4	3.24	16
26	Require new multi-unit development to be clustered	3.8	4.2	3.99	12
27	Charge impact fees for new construction	5.3	5.3	5.31	6
28	New construction should require underground utilities	5.8	5.9	5.83	3
29	Increase regulations on development	4.5	4.6	4.56	8
30	Pay additional taxes/fees to fund capital improvements	2.8	3.1	2.91	19
31	Establish a legal contingency fund for potential legal fees	3.3	3.4	3.35	15
32	Preserve Rockville’s natural landscape	6.6	6.4	6.52	1
33	Pursue biking trail between Rockville & Springdale	4.7	4.5	4.61	7

Respondents were asked, “How important are the following issues?” Responses were based on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1= “not at all important” and 7= “urgently important.” Figures in each column are averages. For residents, n = 60; for non-residents, n = 37.

Town Council and Planning Commission identify the most important issues to resident and non-resident property owners. Table 2 reflects 21 planning issues (Questions 13 through 33) in the same order they appeared in the survey; the final column gives the rank of that issue based on its overall value on the scale we used to determine relative importance. Table 3 reorganizes Table 2 by ranking the 21 planning issues in order of importance to resident and non-resident property owners. If the Town Council and Planning Commission allow themselves to be guided by this table, they will concentrate on preserving Rockville's natural landscape, historic buildings and other significant features, and they will plan for future growth and development in a manner that ensures that growth and development are carefully managed.

Table 3
Importance of Issues to Property Owners (Organized by Rank)

Rank	Description	Non-		Overall	Item
		Resident	resident		
1	Preserve Rockville's natural landscape	6.6	6.4	6.52	32
2	New growth should pay for its own infrastructure	6.3	6.0	6.15	22
3	New construction should require underground utilities	5.8	5.9	5.83	28
4	Preserve historic buildings and features	5.7	5.9	5.80	19
5	Plan for future growth	5.6	5.9	5.68	13
6	Charge impact fees for new construction	5.3	5.3	5.31	27
7	Pursue biking trail between Rockville & Springdale	4.7	4.5	4.61	33
8	Increase regulations on development	4.5	4.6	4.56	29
9	Improve road maintenance	4.5	4.2	4.42	20
10	Seek funding to upgrade fire protection infrastructure	4.4	4.2	4.35	24
11	Seek culinary water to allow new growth	3.9	4.6	4.15	23
12	Require new multi-unit development to be clustered	3.8	4.2	3.99	26
13	Improve sidewalks	4.1	3.7	3.90	21
14	Improvements to Community Center & Town Park	3.1	4.0	3.42	15
15	Establish a legal contingency fund for potential legal fees	3.3	3.4	3.35	31
16	Decrease regulations on development	3.1	3.4	3.24	25
17	Cemetery improvements	3.1	3.4	3.22	17
18	Create a commercially zoned area	2.6	3.7	3.03	14
19	Pay additional taxes/fees to fund capital improvements	2.8	3.1	2.91	30
20	Permit mobile homes in designated areas	1.8	2.5	2.10	18
21	Upgrade street lighting	1.8	2.4	2.03	16

Respondents were asked, "How important are the following issues?" Responses were based on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1= "not at all important" and 7= "urgently important." Figures in each column are averages. For residents, n = 60; for non-residents, n = 37.

To ensure that these rankings were statistically significant (meaning they were not the result of chance or sampling error), we correlated apparently related pairs at various locations in the rankings. For example, Item 22 (New growth should pay for its own infrastructure) is related to Item 28 (New construction should require underground utilities), and they are ranked 2 and 3, respectively. Therefore, it stands to reason that they should correlate positively (meaning that as one value increases, the other does, also). For the correlation of these two items, we ran both parametric and non-parametric tests, and both tests were statistically significant (Pearson's $r = .453$, $p < .01$; Spearman's $\rho = .485$, $p < .01$). Similarly, we correlated Item 32 (Preserve Rockville's natural landscape) with Item 19 (Preserve historic buildings and features), which ranked 1 and 4, respectively. This pair also yielded statistically significant correlations (Pearson's $r = .267$, $p < .01$; Spearman's $\rho = .244$, $p < .05$). We also correlated two related items found in opposite ends of the rankings to determine whether they yielded negative correlations (as one value increases, the other decreases). The correlation of Item 29 (Increase regulations on development) and Item 25 (Decrease regulations on development) — ranked 8 and 16, respectively — yielded a strong negative

correlation that was statistically significant (Pearson’s $r = -.517$, $p < .01$; Spearman’s $\rho = -.499$, $p < .01$). The practical value of these tests is that they demonstrate that the way the items were ranked was not the result of chance or sampling error. Statistical significance in this case indicates that these issues are ranked in the order that Town property owners would like to see them addressed. The bottom line is that Table 3 provides a clear set of marching orders for the Town Council and Planning Commission based on the concerns of Rockville residents and property owners.

In examining the data, we spent considerable time cross-tabulating related items to determine whether significant patterns and relationships exist between property owners’ attitudes on those subjects. For example, we cross-tabulated Item 11 (Should the Town adopt a nighttime sky lighting ordinance?) with Item 16 (How important is it to ungrade street lighting?) In order to do so and achieve an easily explainable result, we collapsed the scale data for Item 16 into three general categories: “not important,” “somewhat important,” and “very important.” The result is found in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Cross-tabulation: Nighttime Sky Ordinance by Upgrade Street Lighting

		How important is it to upgrade street lighting?			
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Totals
Should the Town adopt a nighttime sky lighting ordinance?	Yes	54 82%	8 12%	4 6%	66 100%
	No	18 72%	4 16%	3 12%	25 100%
Total		72 79%	12 13%	7 8%	91 100%

The cross-tabulation of these data suggests a clear pattern. Rockville property owners tend to desire a night-sky ordinance that keeps the Town dark, and they do not want to replace the 40-watt bulbs that serve as the Town’s street lights.

Because property owners expressed such strong feelings about growth, development and regulation of their own property use, we cross-tabulated Item 3 (Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses?) with Item 25 (How important is it to decrease regulations on development?) and with Item 29 (How important is it to increase regulations on development?). As with Table 4, we collapsed the scale data for Item 25 and Item 29 into three general categories: “not important,” “somewhat important,” and “very important.” We found statistically significant patterns in both cross-tabulations.

Table 5 (at the top of Page 15) shows the cross-tabulation of Item 3 (Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses?) with Item 29 (How important is it to increase regulations on development?). It shows that Rockville property owners overwhelmingly favor the status quo in Town government with increased regulation on development. The cross-tabulation yielded a chi-square value of 25.4, which is significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 5
Cross-tabulation: Continue Governed by Increased Regulation on Development

		How important is it to increase regulations on development?			Totals
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	
Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural, and residential town with limited home-based businesses?	Yes	8 11%	25 35%	38 54%	71 100%
	No	10 72%	2 14%	2 14%	14 100%
	Total	18 21%	27 32%	40 47%	85 100%

$\chi^2 = 25.4, df = 2, p < .01$

Table 6 below shows a similar pattern in reverse by cross-tabulating Item 3 (Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses?) with Item 25 (How important is it to decrease regulations on development?). Table 6 shows that Rockville property owners overwhelmingly favor that status quo in Town government with decreased regulation on development. The cross-tabulation yielded a chi-square value of 15.2, which is significant at the .01 alpha level.

Table 6
Cross-tabulation: Continue Governed by Decreased Regulation on Development

		How important is it to decrease regulations on development?			Totals
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	
Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural, and residential town with limited home-based businesses?	Yes	43 58%	19 26%	12 16%	74 100%
	No	1 7%	5 36%	8 57%	14 100%
	Total	44 50%	24 27%	20 23%	88 100%

$\chi^2 = 15.2, df = 2, p < .01$

We also ran a series of *t* tests to seek significant differences between resident property owners and non-resident property owners, but the only significant differences between the two groups were found for Item 35 (I expect to live in Rockville for a long time) and Item 38 (I volunteer for Town activities). These differences are predictable; therefore, they are not practically significant. The lack of statistically significant differences between the two groups is an important finding. It means that resident and non-resident property owners tend to be like-minded on most important issues in the Town, and that information should prove instructive to Town officials as they put the results of this survey to use.

Appendix A
Survey Document

Rockville Town Community Survey 2008

Overview and Directions

The Town of Rockville has operated with a Master Plan since 1989; the plan was revised in 1997. At the direction of the Town Council, the Planning Commission conducted a second survey of Rockville property owners in 2001 to determine whether their ideas about land-use issues had changed since the 1997 survey. The 2001 survey indicated that, overall, property owners' ideas about land use in Rockville had not changed. As a result, the Planning Commission recommended to the Town Council that the Rockville General Plan not be changed at that time.

The General Plan is the official document for Rockville's legislative body. It provides a long-term guide for decision-making. It documents the legal basis for land-use ordinances and establishes major policy issues regarding future development within the Town of Rockville. To be effective, a General Plan must reflect the attitudes and desires of the community.

The enclosed survey is intended to provide Rockville officials with information about current property owners' attitudes and beliefs. This is your opportunity to let us know how you feel about the Rockville of today; it's your chance to express your thoughts about the type of community you envision for Rockville in the future.

Presently, Rockville is governed as a rural, agricultural, low-density, single-family residential community that expresses a strong desire to maintain a small-town atmosphere. In the past, citizens have chosen to disallow commercial or industrial uses within the city limits. There are a limited number of home-based businesses which operate under Conditional-Use Permits.

Increasing pressure to develop is fast approaching towns like Rockville, as Washington County remains the fastest growing county in Utah, as well as one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. For obvious reasons, Rockville is seen as a desirable residential community.

The Planning Commission and Town Council ask that you respond to the survey questions thoughtfully. The answers you give will guide the future of Rockville. Your answers are anonymous and invaluable as a planning guide. Thank you for your time and support.

Other Important Information About the Survey

Each survey has a control number. The control number is not connected to an address or a person. Your answers remain anonymous.

More information about survey questions is available in these sections of the General Plan:

For information on land-use issues (Questions 4-12), see Page 3.

For information on community services (Question 13), see Page 7.

For information on transportation (Question 41), see Page 9.

For information on community environment (Question 42), see Page 11.

For information on annexation (Question 44), see Page 17.

The General Plan and Land-Use Code are available online: www.infowest.com/personal/r/rockville

The Town Clerk, Elaine Harris, has copies of The General Plan and Land-Use Code if you do not have Internet access. Her phone number is 435-772-0992, or you can pick up copies at the city office in her home at 188 W. Main St., Monday-Friday from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Upon request, copies can be mailed to you if you are unable to pick them up.

The person completing this survey must be at least 18 years old.

Rockville Town Community Survey 2008

Before beginning, please read the attached survey overview and directions. Thank you.

Please indicate whether you are . . .

- Resident Property Owner (1) Non-Resident Property Owner (2) Tenant or Renter (3)

General Information

1. What do you like most about Rockville? _____

2. What one thing would you most like to change about Rockville? _____

3. Should Rockville continue to be governed as a rural, agricultural and residential town with limited home-based businesses? Yes (1) No (2) Don't Know (3)

Why? Why not? _____

Land Use

Currently, Rockville's General Plan allows for low-density residential and agricultural land uses while limiting home-based businesses. These questions address residents' opinions about land use in the community.

4. Should the Town allow duplexes or triplexes to be built? Yes (1) No (2)

If permitted, where should they be built? _____

5. Should the Town allow apartment buildings to be built? Yes (1) No (2)

If permitted, where should they be built? _____

6. Should the Town allow townhouses or condominiums to be built? Yes (1) No (2)

If permitted, where should they be built? _____

7. Should the Town allow existing homes to create rental apartments within if the foot print of the home is not enlarged? Yes (1) No (2)

8. Should the Town allow a secondary pre-existing building on an owner's property to be used as guest or living quarters for family or friends? Yes (1) No (2)

9. Should the Town allow a secondary pre-existing building on an owner's property to be used as a rental property? Yes (1) No (2)

10. Currently, the Town allows residents to raise farm animals in residential areas if they at least ½-acre of land. Are you in favor of allowing farm animals on less than ½-acre of residential land? Yes (1) No (2) _____
11. Should the Town adopt a nighttime (lighting) sky ordinance? Yes (1) No (2) _____
12. Rockville’s current population is about 250. Like any small community with a limited tax base, we provide only the most basic of services. What do you think Rockville’s ideal population should be in the near future?
 200-299 (1) 300-499 (2) 500-1,000 (3) Other (please specify) _____ (4) _____

Planning Issues

The Rockville Planning Commission faces several decisions related to development in the coming years. We need community input to set planning priorities. Please rate the importance of the issues listed below on a 7-point scale where 1 represents “not at all important” and 7 represents “urgently important.” Please circle your choice.

13. Plan for future growth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
14. Create a commercially zoned area	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
15. Improvements to Community Center & Town Park	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
16. Upgrade street lighting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
17. Cemetery improvements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
18. Permit mobile homes in designated areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
19. Preserve historic buildings and features	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
20. Improve road maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
21. Improve sidewalks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
22. New growth should pay its own way	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
23. Seek culinary water to allow new growth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
24. Seek funding to upgrade fire protection infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
25. Decrease regulations on development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
26. Require new multi-unit development to be “clustered”	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
27. Charge impact fees for new construction	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
28. New construction should require underground utilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
29. Increase regulations on development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
30. Pay additional taxes/fees to fund capital improvements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
31. Establish a legal contingency fund for potential legal fees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
32. Preserve Rockville’s natural landscape	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
33. Pursue biking trails between Rockville and Springdale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____

Annexation

Annexation requests must be initiated by property owners. As communities grow, a need may develop to extend the boundaries of the Town.

43. Do you favor annexing additional land into Rockville? Yes (1) No (2)

If yes, please explain: _____

Other Important Issues

44. In my opinion, the Rockville Land Use Code should . . .
 be remain as it is today (1) become more flexible (2) become more regulatory (3)

45. Please take a minute to explain the reasoning behind your response to Question 45:

46. What do you think will be Rockville’s most significant challenge in the future?

How should we deal with this challenge? _____

47. Do you support the idea of the Town Council sponsoring a public information meeting, with the potential participation of state and local water experts, to discuss the Town’s water circumstance? Yes (1) No (2)

Would you attend such a meeting? Yes (1) No (2)

48. Are there questions you would like to have seen on this survey that we failed to ask? Do you have comments about this survey or other Town issues? Please tell us here:

Thank you for helping us guide the future of our beautiful Town of Rockville!

Appendix B

Essays Questions and Verbatim Responses

Essay Questions and Verbatim Responses

QUESTION 1: WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT ROCKVILLE?

Responses of Resident Property Owners:

- Small, rural and for the most part friendly
- Beauty, small town and the great people
- Beauty of the mountains and clean air
- Small, quiet, beautiful community
- Quiet, residential, non-commercial setting—safe place to walk and ride a bicycle
- Small town feel and character. Not dictated paint color and landscape requirements. Each house looks different and owners can express their own preferences.
- Small town—not a business district
- Small town and friendly people—a great mayor
- Beauty
- Small town
- The small town, quiet rural feeling; lack of commercial hustle and bustle; the beauty that surrounds the town; especially the people-
- Small town rural setting-- the amazingly beautiful scenery
- Quite dark at night—small town—non-commercial
- Quiet family-oriented community
- Quiet, secluded and beautiful scenery
- Quiet, black skies beautiful for stars with telescope, proximity to Zion
- No commercial development
- The environment and the people; the peace and quiet
- Small town feel—safe, clean, and beautiful
- Small town feel, no light pollution, no businesses, part residential and part farming and livestock and friendliness of residents
- The reason I moved to Rockville and recycled an existing home here is because it is a rural, agricultural, low density single-family residential community that is unique.
- Quiet small town
- Rural, agricultural, historic, slow moving, friendly, scenic little town
- Small town, rural community
- Beauty, community spirit
- Quiet, rural, unspoiled place to live without commercial intrusion
- Location to recreational and scenic lands (NFS, BLM, etc.)
- Its laid-back down-to-earth people and setting
- Location
- Small home town atmosphere
- Quiet, night sky, beautiful environs, no billboards etc., etc,
- Quiet, rural, agricultural, non-commercial, slow
- Quiet, night sky, non-commercial, lack of crime, unspoiled river
- No growth, no commercial property, small town
- Unique setting, green space, quiet, friendly
- Rural atmosphere- scenic beauty- slower pace
- Quiet, small town
- Quiet, small town feel
- Beauty, size
- Hometown
- It is representative of a simpler way of life
- Small town and proximity to Zion and other points of interest
- The small town atmosphere, rural lifestyle, ability to still have farm

- animals and the lack of non-commercial activities
- Small, quiet, no commercial, rural atmosphere, one residence per parcel (no multiple housing)
- Its rural environment
- That we live one mile away
- Clean air, quietness, lack of congestion, night sky unpoluted by lights
- The weather
- The beautiful scenery
- The scenic beauty, quiet, peaceful, rural atmosphere
- It's quiet, country appeal. Keeping our tree-lined streets as is and us adapting to them- not the other way around
- The views, the tree lined streets and the kind people, the proximity to Zion, the clear sky, the climate. I love Rockville.
- Small town feel
- The setting and the people
- Quite small community
- small town
- Open Space
- Its beauty
- The rural lifestyle
- Its small town ruralness, limited commercial and well controlled development

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- The existing walking rim trails and wilderness side canyons to explore with pollen chill for walking trails to Virgin on south side of river
- Climate
- Small town rural surroundings
- Location next to Zion National Park
- Small town status—proximity to Zion--eclectic
- Scenic location
- The peaceful feel to the town and great climate
- Small town feel- trees- tranquility
- It is my heritage. I was raised there. The surrounding hills, mountains and river
- Small rural town- Excellent neighbors- Lack of business- Location
- The views, quietness, memories and neighbors. My father settled here over 50 years ago.
- Town is not commercial. A good town to raise children.
- It's beautiful
- Small town atmosphere
- Beautiful scenery and rural living
- Quiet town environment
- I have never lived there so I can't know. We visited one time.
- Peaceful small town environment- Natural beauty and community feeling
- Clean, friendly, green
- The sky, the river, the quiet, the simplicity, the street lights, trees, birds circling in the sky, the color and beautiful mountains and the magic

- Natural beauty
- Rural small town atmosphere
- The rural/agricultural area amid the beauty of the canyon, feeling of pioneer heritage
- The rural agricultural setting where farm animals can be raised and life is a little more like the pioneer spirit of the past
- Setting
- Scenery and climate
- Zion
- Its peaceful non-commercial atmosphere- the absence of the massive pretentious houses that are being built in so many other communities.
- Practical and beautiful properties in an environment that is not overcrowded and proximity to Zion NP
- Its bucolic, quiet, unchanged and noncommercial atmosphere
- Scenery, proximity to Zion Park, natural surroundings
- Lack of businesses, small size, and the way that residents really have pride of ownership in their properties which is reflected in the cleanliness and charm of the town

- Location, character including size, its charm, the 40 watt light bulbs! The community neighborly feel

Tenants and Renters:

- Its size and proximity to Zion- it is green and most people who live here love it
- Small town, beautiful location
- It's a quiet community
- Natural beauty, small population
- Its natural beauty and genuinely friendly folks

Other Respondents:

- Mountains, river and small town atmosphere
- Quiet and rural
- Its location
- Rural, quiet, non-commercial community with single family homes
- The location, climate and wildlife
- Clean and friendly

QUESTION 2: WHAT ONE THING WOULD YOU MOST LIKE TO CHANGE ABOUT ROCKVILLE?

Resident Property Owners

- More water
- Have a gathering place (coffee shop)
- We don't like all the makeshift rentals on peoples' property. That should not be allowed.
- Nothing
- Get rid of pro-growth mayor and council members
- Attitude when public/citizens deal with ordinances. Individuals need to feel town officials/employees are there to help one another not control others.
- Property owners clean up (non-resident owners) and dogs to be controlled
- Nothing
- Nothing
- Nothing significant—the people who come drawn by the rural feel and then expect big city services
- Nothing! Every effort that can be made to maintain Rockville's current status
- Get pressurized irrigation water lines into lots without it and make it darker (less lights) at night
- The air of rigidity that pervades the political process and the office of the town clerk
- Nothing
- More available outside water and more frequent dumpster days
- Better roads and sewer service
- Nothing!!!
- Would like to have culinary water
- Ordinance to enforce yard cleanup and maintenance-- residents should show pride in their homes and town.
- Use of the lights at the 2 Feathers Ranch (too bright)
- Creation of a Grafton access at the east end of town, to decrease traffic on Highway 9 and Bridge Road
- Some flexibility allowing rentals on property with existing buildings
- Get rid of commercialized B & Bs and the ever-increasing glaring lights

- Traffic and noise is horrible- can't really change I guess
- A greater bond of friendship without having to look over your shoulder to check for compliance factors
- The ability of the leaders to be more open minded
- Nothing
- Nothing! Concerned that bridge is maintained and that growth is minimal
- Get rid of flags- remove flood lights- change bike policy
- Clean up some of the properties- - more pride of ownership
- Junk yards, barking dogs
- Attitude. Volunteers make a small town run. We have too many whiners, not enough doers
- Lower speed limits- 30 MPH- speed indicator flashers at both ends. Light pollution by 2 Feathers Ranch
- Town clerk replaced with someone who is courteous and personable realizing they serve the town's people; not the other way around
- Few people in charge of whole town!!!
- Remove housing size limitations, promote quality growth
- For those that want to change it to move
- Rudeness of city secretary. Pettiness of council and planning commission
- More involvement from the citizenry. Town clean up and other activities
- Cleanup of nuisance properties
- Two of the "power heads" that have been there too long
- That we have more civility and tolerance in the way residents are treated by governing boards
- Have cars that are no longer drivable removed. Have designated area you _____
- The Dictators on the Town Council and Planning Commission
- More water for residences
- Limitations that I feel are unconstitutional for our residents (i.e. # of B & Bs, # of home-based business) and not putting a sink or toilet in your garage

- The speeding traffic on highway 9. The strict ordinances about what I may do with my own home. The bright lights at 2 Feathers
- The new residents wanting to change the town. Mostly the agricultural and western heritage
- The unwillingness to change and grow
- The ability for the land owners to use their land
- Nothing
- Allow more residential sites on a 5 acre lot—2 sites on 5 acres
- Treat all permanent residents with fairness and courtesy
- “Big brother is watching you” mentality

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- Road base on the gravel roads so they could be graded in season
- Allow nearby shopping and medical facilities to reduce driving distance
- A by-pass road around the town to reduce traffic
- Availability of water
- Nothing
- A city council that would not be aimed at no growth and socialistic mentality
- A better water system- pressurized irrigation- bike paths
- Culinary water. The need is of utmost importance. There is a definite lack of culinary water.
- Nothing
- For your sake more community participation! Be careful and vigilant and watchful with growth!!
- Water
- A market added and improved utilities
- Get water rights to 60 waterless lots
- I couldn't say
- Speed limit- 30 MPH
- Allow some support commercial on each end of town to help support our infrastructure

- I would like to change the minds of people who want to change Rockville
- Nothing- but that's impossible so I suggest that you create a business area to generate a sales tax income to be able to handle the infrastructure
- Less street lights
- More available culinary water; water company should be owned by town; too much feeling of “I've got mine but I don't want anyone else to have.”
- Make more water available for those who own land. Too much of “I have mine so no one else should be able to have any.”
- Too easy to make new regulations. Should allow diversity and revenue from business
- Promote quality residential growth and remove limits on home sizes
- More freedom
- I like it the way it is now.
- An encouragement to preserve the existing barns and houses and fields
- Help make it possible for me to get a building permit for my lot (R-1308-9) so I can live in Rockville
- I wouldn't change anything; I love it the way it is.

Tenants and Renters:

- HWY 9 speed limit
- People should volunteer more to help the city
- Reasonable rent rates
- Have the Grafton Road paved all the way

Other Respondents:

- Obnoxious light at horse fence on the west end of town that impairs night sky visibility; display of 100s of flags in highway right-of-way
- City controls
- Some retail business- grocery store

QUESTION 3: SHOULD ROCKVILLE CONTINUE TO BE GOVERNED AS A RURAL, AGRICULTURAL AND RESIDENTIAL TOWN WITH LIMITED HOME-BASED BUSINESSES? WHY OR WHY NOT?

Resident Property Owners:

- Not sure. It would be nice to have a store where we could get a loaf of bread or a quart of milk.
- Yes. -Rockville is wonderful the way it is.
- Yes. Limited water and cheap property taxes. Leave Rockville alone
- We will continue to have increasing demands for improvements and services. Property taxes alone are too burdensome on residents as the sole source of funding. We must encourage additional residential and business development for these requirements.
- Keep our small town
- Nice buffer to Springdale business. Virgin is only getting bigger.
- Rockville is unique and special and we want to stay that way
- With the increasing number of businesses in surrounding cities, we need to preserve special rural, agricultural residential towns. Those of us who moved here did so because of the rural atmosphere and beauty
- Yes, because that is the atmosphere I want in this town
- No, allowing businesses which don't conflict with (quiet family-oriented) community should be welcomed thus increasing our tax base. Additionally, our charm could be increased (i.e. winery)
- Yes, to maintain quiet, secluded feel of town

- Yes, to minimize traffic and outside travel
- Yes, it has worked very well this way for many years. Rockville is unique, Utah's last treasure, and I hope it remains so
- Yes, because this is what makes Rockville unique among other places in the state. Also, Rockville does not have enough water (culinary) for expanding a great deal for single-family dwellings and certainly not for business outside a home-base type. We have already had to buy water from Springdale.
- Yes. Keeps with quiet small town character
- Yes. I like it
- Yes. Rockville is a very special place, currently I do not wish to see us become like “everyone else” and ruin what we have
- Yes. It is the only way to preserve that which makes it unique and enjoyable. “Regulating” business never works, it is too easy to compromise and be tolerant; just say “No” and it works
- Yes. Business, industries would increase traffic and transient use- not good overall for a family-friendly safe town
- Yes. I would love to see people use the land to become more self sustaining
- No. The town needs to grow very carefully

- Yes. Because it is precious and easy to love
- Yes. Rural setting, beauty, quiet, less traffic
- Yes. But it was most unfortunate that the Sanchez's business on Grafton could not continue having town permission. That operation did not harm or damage. There should have been a special permit for them.
- Yes. Home based businesses are fine, no storefronts
- No. Home based businesses should be allowed for income. Rental of out buildings should be allowed. Too strict!!! No reason
- No. I would like limited business (country store, winery, nursery) but retain rural agricultural town
- Yes. That is what makes Rockville so appealing to us
- Yes. The only way to preserve it
- Yes. However I believe that in order to keep our green spaces we must move forward with sustainable agriculture. It's too bad we lost the winery. Small farms, nurseries, organic farming types of businesses need to be allowed. Our wonderful gentlemen cattle/ hay farmers are leaving us.
- Yes. Provided outlying properties with farm-like acreages are not shackled with codes and requirement designed for "in-town" master planning
- Yes. It works. Don't ruin it
- No. We ought to have a little freedom from somewhere on our own property instead of the town telling what you can do and can't do. We paid for it.
- Yes. Yes, all current businesses should remain the same.
- Yes. There is not enough room for businesses or a commercial zone. It would spoil the rural atmosphere and distract from the beauty
- Yes. Because residential, rural and agricultural are some of the main qualities that make Rockville a lovely, unique and pastoral place to live
- Yes. But I would like to see more freedom in the home-based businesses and a lifting of the strict ordinances about who may live in your home. If we are concerned about impact on our resources, limit the number of people at a residence.
- Yes. That is what makes the town so wonderful
- No. I feel it should be managed not so limited
- What is considered a home-based business? No foot traffic, mail or computer based businesses
- Yes. If I want to live in the city I'd move there
- No. Limit Yes! with more growth
- No. We should allow business that benefit the town to exist, to serve the public for building good health
- Yes. But . . . a few well chosen businesses would be preferred over more residential development, i.e. subdivisions
- Yes. It would be sad to lose the charm of the community. Free standing businesses would definitely change the town forever.
- Yes. But I would love to see some small commercial businesses- a store – coffee shop- a restaurant or two. It can enhance a community if done right. Control it.
- No. The Town Council exercises dictatorial power. Case in point: A resident wanted to water her studio. The Council rejected her request. Unbelievable!
- Yes. I have seen so many places destroyed by growth, developers and change. This place you can truly go back into time a little bit!
- Yes. So we don't become so commercial
- Yes. To maintain small town atmosphere while growing in outlying areas. New construction should blend with environment and older construction.
- Yes. I would say don't change a good thing. Don't let Big City people change it to their way, If the original people like it the way it is, keep it that way.
- Yes. Current business is acceptable with small additions OK (possible corner store). Overall objective to maintain small town feel
- Yes. Once Pandora's Box is opened- even slightly- there is NO RETURN. The spirit is dead!
- Yes. Home based businesses do not create much revenue and cause parking problems. The town would be better served having a designated commercial area. As a former Washington City Council member, I suggest take your time and be selective as to what kind of businesses you approve
- Yes. It's unique in an ever changing world of uncontrolled growth
- Yes. That's what's so essential to Rockville remaining what it is- we don't want to be Springdale!
- Yes. To keep the town like it has been and not to become a tourist trap business area.
- No. Quaint retail along HWY 9 would provide funds to help with town maintenance. Unique stores with old-fashioned storefronts would be an asset.
- Yes. Preserve Rockville's unique spirit and community sense
- Yes. There are few places in America that have reasonably close access to necessary service providers (i.e. groceries, healthcare) and provide a rural environment with "healthy" space. Don't change.
- Yes. It's just right the way it is
- Yes. That is exactly what attracted us to Rockville, and it is rare now to see entirely single-family residences, limited home-based businesses, and such a great small town atmosphere
- Yes. It would change too much

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- Yes. The scenic involvement is way too sensitive for any large influxes of earth moving going on there
- Yes. Because there is less and less rural, agricultural and residential towns left. It's all becoming vanilla, look-alike towns and cities.
- No. Springdale is progressive and development has provided jobs
- Yes. Its uniqueness depends on it—let other communities have the commercial aspects—they already do—such are sufficiently convenient for Rockville residents
- No. A town with some commercial is good for the tax base and can be done in a classy way- it could add charm to the town

Tenants and Renters:

- No. I believe that keeping the town residential with limited home-based businesses is good, but I also think it would be good to entertain some commercial that is appropriate to boost visitorship and not infringe.
- Yes. Limit growth, run by local residents
- No. More businesses would create more tax revenue for the town so it could have more employees to run it since the volunteer program does not work
- No. Home based businesses ought to be expanded. A small grocery store or fruit/bread/milk/cheese stands
- Yes. We are close enough to Springdale to keep a pristine, non-commercial appeal in this town

Other Respondents:

- No. We need home businesses to keep up with raising taxes
- Yes. This is a core value of Rockville; makes it the "Last Great Treasure."

- Yes. Times are hard. If you can make money from home you can stay home with family

QUESTION 39: ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY SECTION (QUESTIONS 34-39)?

Resident Property Owners:

- We do not feel it's important to attend all the goings on in the town.
- Get rid of the flags on State Highway 9—stop wasting fund raisers for things like the "town clock"
- Too many committees and tasks for such a small town is draining for the same people. Perhaps we should do less and not complain about not having participation. Less done better could be more enjoyed.
- Someone to fly the flag at the cemetery on special days
- The volunteer base is active but too small
- Being a small community, volunteerism is almost mandated in some form to provide services and care for the town and its citizens
- Maybe there could be more activities to bring residents together more—but I don't know what they would be. I participated in a work project and liked it, but I don't go to other activities
- Love the place!
- It will be sad if current residents desire significant change to our unique town. If they want growth, etc., simply move to a place which they desire.
- I agree residents should get involved and volunteer when they can or if health issues do not allow or work hours do not allow, people shouldn't be chastised for not helping.
- Town leaders need to recognize that all town events, whether legally mandated or fellowship events, do not interest the majority of town residents.
- We have some amazing volunteers- our mayor is the best
- Night sky ordinance is essential. We must prohibit unacceptable commercialization and lighting for ego.
- We should have community projects to clean cemetery 3 or 4 times a year. I am greatly opposed to letters with threats of lawsuits for non-compliance -- what happened to communication?
- Appreciate our terrific mayor
- Stupid questions above (34-39)
- Try to keep town as is
- We need more town participation in activities
- Limit the power given to town clerk
- Why do town leaders have water hookups before others? I would volunteer if I felt officials and board members were polite and fair.
- Every citizen should read and understand Rockville's Land Use Code
- It is important to encourage a close-knit, honest and caring community
- I think people that have not been involved with the town would participate if a couple of those that have been in power were to retire. These 2 have insulted, intimidated and offended a lot of citizens to the point of not participating for fear of reprisal.
- Would like to see term limits on local boards and appointed offices
- We don't like to be treated like trash are dictated to. The town everyone needs to know what's going on instead of just a few.
- Keep Nancy's Place (The Bridge)

- Pursue funding for a bridge to be built from SR9 to Grafton and reduce Grafton/Gooseberry traffic on Grafton Road
- There are 2 areas that people should do when their lives lead them that way. Some people who are active now either weren't years ago or didn't live here then. This "judgment" by town officials is "beneath" the spirit of community.
- Volunteering is a personal choice and cannot be forced. Springdale and Rockville have many ways people can volunteer.
- This is a rural area and new residents that move here need to remember that and not try to change it
- The current land owners not so much individuals who rent could be some real assets to the Rockville community
- I'm too old to help, but I would if I could
- Keep up the good work!!
- All town members should be treated equally
- I found the town people to be very unaccepting of new people. They ask for volunteers, but never make you feel welcomed. Going on 4 years—still feel like an outsider

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- For the locals to allow new faces to enjoy this Heaven on earth
- Keep tax low as income taxes are going to increase
- Develop better storm drainage to protect homes/property
- I am glad that you are asking questions like this. I feel the old anti-growth families or liberal control growth people have been in charge way too long. That kind of mentality doesn't work long-term.
- At one time I wanted to return to my home. But after one Town Council meeting I concluded I was not going to be governed by small minded Council members.
- Enjoyed your newsletter- if I ever lived here I would be very supportive... this is always done by a handful . Sad!
- The 60 waterless lots would allow sufficient growth for now. Retirement homes
- I shouldn't have a say. I don't live there and never will.
- Hope to live there and participate in town activities in the future
- If I was allowed to build on the property I presently own in Rockville I would be happy to be involved with the town and live there until I die
- The town officials tend to be self serving and overlook or don't enforce ordinances if their interests or those of their "circle" are involved
- Town officials do a good job, but seem to put themselves and their friends wants first.
- Many of the decisions being made for Rockville are being made by town clerk/sec. instead of town council- legal parameters need to be established for her job
- From newsletters sent out there appears to be less service and volunteerism than is needed/desired. What are the reasons? Apathy? Overloaded needs on population of 250? Can non-residents help?

- Even though we are non-resident (43 years) property owners, we care deeply about preserving (not developing) Rockville

- Seems like most people do not participate in town events
- Additional social and cultural events would be appreciated

Tenants and Renters:

- It is a small town- there will only be so many who get involved and others that work. Life!

Other Respondents:

- Seek culinary water to allow owners of empty lots to build a home
- Do not allow flags or signs in SR 9 right of way

QUESTION 40: STATE HIGHWAY 9 RUNS THROUGH ROCKVILLE AND HAS AN AVERAGE TRAFFIC COUNT OF SOME 2,000 VEHICLES PER DAY. THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF OTHER ROCKVILLE ROADS IS TO SERVICE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AND AGRICULTURAL USES. WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR THE TOWN'S STREETS WITH REGARD TO SAFETY, LAYOUT AND OTHER CONDITIONS?

Resident Property Owners:

- We need cross walk lanes by the post office-- is important
- Save the old bridge over the Virgin River--restore it with strict weight restrictions and route to Hwy 59—build new access bridge through Grafton
- Require adherence to easements at roads and better maintenance of some of the lesser tended roads. I think overall, the roads are pretty good, but we need slower speed through town. Since we pay more for police, can they enforce more?
- Speed bump on Bridge Road
- Take care of Rockville Mt. Road
- Continue to maintain to the level the town can afford; improve as funds become available
- More speed control on roads serving local heritage sites and visitor access is necessary (i.e. Gooseberry Mesa bike trails and Grafton townsite)
- Twenty-five MPH speed limit on Highway 9 through Rockville
- Slow traffic down to 30 MPH on all Rockville roads and 20 MPH for Highway 9 to the bridge over the Virgin River
- Pave them all
- None
- The town does a fine job maintaining our roads
- Residents should not be allowed to park rec. and work vehicles in the street
- I would like to see sidewalks extended to the ends of Rockville so children didn't have to walk in the weeds along the highway to get to and from the bus stop. "Children playing" signs along SR9 and back streets are a good idea to remind motorists that children may be present. Speed limit signs remain and lower speeds for motorists to remain same or lower through Rockville along SR9 and back roads.
- Road repairs could be funded by the residents that use them the most (i.e. pothole patching)
- We need a bike trail to Springdale, off the highway, ASAP, or a bike lane on the highway
- Too many cars on Bridge Road accessing Grafton, Highway 59 and drug treatment facility
- Leave them alone. Do not widen. Do not improve. Do not straighten.
- Traffic on Bridge Road towards the mesa and towards Grafton sometimes seems unsafe for walkers and cyclers. Thought should be given to signage or other ways of keeping the area pedestrian friendly.
- Put a road above Park Boundary from west Rockville to Springdale
- More regular repairing (potholes)

- Leave streets as they are, improvements such as Eagle Crag Road should be done residents. Lower speed to 15 mph between Route 9 and Bridge on Bridge Road
- A cross walk in front of community center/post office
- White lines across for pedestrian traffic lower speed limit to 30 MPH on Highway 9, love the single light bulbs over Highway 9, cars go fast on Grafton
- Extend sidewalks, pave side streets
- Lower Main Street speed limit to 30 MPH so visitors will drive 40 instead of 50
- None- don't spend money
- Lower speeds should be maintained, homeowner on under developed should pay to upgrade (not all residents)
- None- willing to live with what we have
- Decrease speed limit to 30 or 35 MPH. Add a crosswalk at post office. Have "speed determining" blinking sign on each end of town.
- See that motorists obey speed limits not only on SR9 but on auxiliary roads
- A scenic route on top of Rockville Mountain and bike trail
- More lights
- Put in a crosswalk or 2
- Lower speed limits on all roads (other than #9)
- Try to control the speed of heavy trucks and buses. They shake the ground at 40. Slower speed limit
- Enforce the speed limit
- Putting sealer on the roads will provide longer life. Budget for sealer and cycle re-topping over many years
- Nothing
- Make sure those who want paved roads and pay taxes can have them
- None

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- Keep existing roads in good shape
- The town needs some equipment to maintain the existing roads
- None
- Slower speed limit through town
- Map secure legal rights of way better
- OK as is
- Haven't studied the problem
- There should be signs to warn people of the irrigation culverts
- Safety for children- speed controls
- More bike-friendly riding paths
- They should be kept up
- Have a visible presence

- Highway 9 slower speed limit. Fix roads according to needs.
- The roads being built should have curb and gutters, good visibility onto SR9 from secondary roads, and paving to cut the dust and noise pollution
- Grade and gravel until finances become available
- Washington Mayor Clove and I were elected at the same time and we took the stance of developing slowly with having good sales tax producing businesses that would bring it to the town. Now we get our existing streets paved for free and many services are paid without tax increases.
- Keep them rural. Make mesa road more safe.
- Speed
- From SR(to bridge- eliminate on street parking (safety), keep roads graveled and use magnesium chloride as dust suppressant on unpaved streets
- This seems to work fine for us- no big issues
- Would it be practical to encourage visitors to park vehicles down canyon (e.g. in Hurricane) and extend shuttle service?

- Enforce speed limits!
- Lower speed limit on 9 to 30 mph
- Speed bump on Bridge Road

Tenants and Renters:

- Lower speed limit on highway 9 to 30 mph
- Keep maintaining paint and reflectors on roadway
- Lower speed limit to 35 mph
- Clearly marked bike path for commute to Springdale given that the road is windy
- Have noticed a fair amount of tourist traffic towards Grafton Road which could use improvement

Other Respondents:

- Let property owners repair roads that serve their property
- Do not allow flags or signs in SR 9 right of way- continue controlling speeding cars
- Speed control for safety

QUESTION 41: WHICH AREAS IN AND AROUND ROCKVILLE DO YOU FEEL ARE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE OR SIGNIFICANT IN WAYS THAT SHOULD BE PRESERVED OR PROTECTED?

Resident Property Owners:

- Ridgelines, view corridors and unstable hillsides
- The road to Grafton should be kept up.
- All areas in and around Rockville are sensitive, great care needs to be taken with any development
- All scenic vistas with strict "no-build" codes, sensitive soils, washes and erosive cliffs, watershed, no floodplain building
- Main Street—maintain "rustic" settings, encourage craftsman style, but not exclude all other styles. Rockville's character has always been the individuality of its residents.
- The whole town
- Grafton
- No development on slopes; no development where silhouette of a house can be seen on the skyline; protect watershed; protect riparian areas
- River basin, agricultural fields, benches and mesas
- The cliff faces, north and south, the river and remaining agricultural land
- Anything along the river corridor in central Rockville
- Limit big crazy homes on Anasazi—wrecks the natural landscape
- It's all sensitive. Grafton preservation is great
- The cliffs above the town and along the Virgin River and Grafton Road
- Most actually! Given the geography of the land, the river shed is important to maintain. Don't allow for "implosion" of buildings.
- All existing open spaces should be protected as much as possible
- The open space both east and west of Rockville along SR9 should be protected and left as a buffer between the towns of Virgin and Springdale.
- Both benches—build out within valley floor
- The bridge, Grafton, Horse Valley Wash, light bulbs on Main Street and the North Bench
- The bench and the mesa are important direct impacts on town. The entry corridor from Virgin is aesthetically important to preserve.

- Hillsides, slopes, cliff edges, riparian areas, scenic ridges, agricultural, Grafton
- All of it
- All. The surrounding desert, whether NFS or BLM, is very sensitive. Also the river should be protected.
- The areas of farms and lots that can be used for crops and grazing
- Grafton
- Not too much growth near the main street. That's the towns appeal. Small town. Homey
- Bridge and surrounding area including river bank
- Washes/drainages, river corridor, skyline, cliff/mesa edges, slopes below cliffs/mesas
- Whole town
- Would prefer not to see the highway or the river with any development
- The bench areas
- North bench, Rockville bridge, south bench
- Bridge Street and Grafton Road- all of Rockville and Grafton. The old gravel pit on Grafton is becoming a junk yard as well as land in front of gravel pit.
- Make graveyard nicer
- Hilltops should be preserved
- A bike trail along the river would not be a good idea. Put the trail along the road.
- Less houses, more green businesses that take up space leaving more green land
- Benches, Grafton, river corridor, entry corridors
- Skyline, entry corridors
- Virgin River and all washes leading to the river. Flood plains
- The rights of citizens to own and use their own property is paramount and not to be infringed
- North slope
- None
- The river

- The rivers meander corridor protected. Bridge on Bridge Road preserved. Town of Grafton
- Scenery (cliffs, trees, etc.). Especially HUGE lights from west end of Town (Terry Sanchez's Old place- 2 Feathers). On North Cliffs in warm months or any other time
- The trees, the irrigation ditches, the quaint lighting (our little street lights are perfect), the mesas
- Grafton area
- The Virgin River
- Need to protect river park and development of a river park
- The mountain—don't want houses on the skyline
- Do not build heavy along State Highway 9
- The hills with Native American pit houses, etc.
- Both banks of the river (flood plain); the north and south mountain faces, the north mountain plateau

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- The area on the north side under the rock ledges
- Keep the motorized ATV and biking off the highly sensitive _____ walking trails
- The cliffs
- Virgin River area- cliff areas- boulders north part of boundary
- Virgin River water way and ridgelines
- All
- Areas that are close to beautiful rock formations or that block the views of others or affect their views
- The water ways
- All areas bordering the Virgin River. Areas bordering the Rockville mesa (North side of town). The Rockville Bridge
- None
- Rockville bench (North)- eliminate bicycles- restrict trail up to bench behind Wilma _____ house
- Everything! The river especially, old trees, quaintness of old houses, etc. Ridges, etc. So sad Grafton was not preserved better
- Grafton
- Bridge, river, town center and post office, ditch
- They should be taken care of so as to not destroy an area but build-

- ing can be done in harmony with surroundings
- All areas above the "white" ledges- currently there are over 60 building sites on the north mt. that should not be!
- I have property on Rockville mesa (the old Terry subdivision). I can envision a high end (such as Kinesava _____ type subdivision) in this area bringing in large property taxes. I think large projects such as this should be considered.
- All areas
- Hillside- water ways
- Should control residential density by restricting growth "across the river". Keep large lot size of fields.
- The fields over the river should stay in the large land zoning to control the agricultural areas from density.
- Main Street should remain quaint, but allow some unique retail
- Preserve hillsides/hilltops from construction
- Most of the area, especially approaches to Grafton and Grafton itself
- All reasonable efforts should be made to protect Virgin River from erosion, pollution, diversion, etc.
- The fields on the road to Grafton
- Don't know
- All surrounding areas should be preserved
- Grafton and the road to it, Horse Valley Wash, all mesa tops and river

Tenants and Renters:

- Probably out along Grafton Way, but enhanced building would be ideal
- Development on high areas should not be permitted- care should be taken of river
- The Virgin River , the bridge and Grafton
- The Virgin River banks are being choked by Russian Olive and Tamarisk
- Grafton Road area past the last cattle guard

Other Respondents:

- No new development except for existing empty lots
- Cliffs, floodplains and historic ditches

QUESTION 42: WHICH AREAS IN AND AROUND ROCKVILLE DO YOU FEEL PRESENT POTENTIAL NATURAL HAZARDS AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR EXCLUSION FROM DEVELOPMENT FOR THE PROTECTION OF CURRENT AND FUTURE RESIDENTS?

Resident Property Owners:

- Below Rockville bench
- The road to Grafton has a lot of traffic—it should be better taken care of
- Flood plains and hillside _____ hill tops
- No development (commercial) in Grafton—floodplains, washes, sensitive cliff edges and cliff band erosion should all be excluded --no commercial
- Natural washes—unless engineered to accommodate adequate run-off—mitigate diversion to adjacent lots; areas too close to Virgin River to allow for natural "winding river" variations
- The north cliffs and flood plain
- Blue clay areas and North Mt.
- Flood plain; steep slopes; immediately below cliff faces (rock fall);

- areas affected by runoff flooding from mesas
- River flood plains, mesa edges, areas prone to rock fall and landslide and development on mesas only with self supplied fire protection
- River and cliffs
- Anything along the river corridor in central Rockville
- North side of highway west end of town—rock fall potential is excessive
- The areas below the cliffs and the ground on both sides of the Virgin River
- Obviously the "river" and "drainages." Building too close to the cliffs presents potential problems.
- Prevent buildings on (DeMille Lane?) back road where Jack Burns' home is located and the far west end of town

- Do not allow home development within 100 year flood plain
- Flood plain near the river and dry washes
- Flood plain
- Hillsides, cliff edges, ridges, slopes, flood plain
- Rock falls along northern bench. Flooding along Virgin River
- Additional houses directly next to the Virgin River should not be allowed due to flood potential
- The river and ridges
- Next to the mountains
- No construction on north side against bench hillside which seemingly could become less stable
- Washes/drainages, river corridor, slopes below cliffs/mesas
- River corridor within 200' of cliffs
- Hillside and the top of the mesa
- North bench
- Rocks falling on north side of Highway 9- Jack Burns area. The old bridge should have lower and Enforceable weight limits (i.e. no gravel), reattach bolts- they are bent
- Below benches and in flood plains
- Block off entrance to Grafton- - no income only vandalism
- Too close to the river and too close to rock cliffs
- Benches and mesas, under steep slopes where rock falls are a real danger, flood plain
- Skyline, flood plain
- The fields around Grafton, Rockville bench skylines, hillsides
- Presently large unprotected flood lights on private property at west end of town blind eastbound traffic on SR9 and neighboring residents
- There's no potential hazards except right by the mountains
- All the "High Ground"
- The huge rock cliff on the North Side seems unstable as boulders come down into residential areas
- Building on the flood plain and building under the rocky cliffs
- North Mountain, South Mountain and property close to the Virgin River in the flood plain
- The Virgin River. Permanent structures should not be allowed on the river's edge
- The river bridge and an emergency crossing area
- Flood plain and base of mountains
- Preserve area adjacent to Highway 9. Build higher density away from Highway 9
- Grafton
- Both banks of the river (flood plain); the north and south faces

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- Building along the Virgin River
- To upgrade the existing roads to keep them _____
- The cliffs
- Virgin River flash flooding- drainage areas- ditches that run under

- Highway 9- farm land on north and south banks of river
- Roadway up to south mesa
- None
- Don't know
- The north part of town up against the Rockville Mesa (large slides, boulders etc.)
- None
- Flood plain
- Areas around river because with growth stilt, pesticides, etc. can destroy the river. A lot of the plateaus. Avoid what happened to St. George's ridges. Horrible; destroys natural beauty
- Grafton
- North mountain and river area
- Proximity to Rockville bench, river
- River bottoms and wash _____
- South Mountain road hazard
- I do not have sufficient knowledge of the boundaries of Rockville to give too much comment on this. I know there is a canyon just beyond Rockville going toward Springdale that had an old town and a graveyard is still there in that area I would say, should be preserved.
- Areas susceptible to rock slides or flooding
- Rock faces- flood plains
- Hillsides, flood zone, area below ledges
- The hillsides- drainage areas- flood plain areas
- Private property should be respected
- Flood plains around river and areas too close to cliffs
- Land adjacent to the Virgin River- both sides, land up against the cliffs behind the town to the north
- "At risk" flood zones can/should be defined and limits on development established. Harder to define "at risk" rock slide zones- develop maximum slope grade limits???
- Below the boulder strewn cliffs and mesa on north side. The river banks also
- The river and surrounding rock cliffs provide potential hazards
- Developing the mesas, more concrete (roads, etc.), bad run-off potential and flooding damage

Tenants and Renters:

- Back around DeMille Lane (rock slides)
- Flood areas- no new development
- The ridge north of Rockville due to potential rock slides, water runoff and close to the Virgin River
- Flood plain should not be built on or mesa edges
- Anything close to the Virgin River

Other Respondents:

- Cliffs, mesa tops and floodplains

QUESTION 43: ANNEXATION REQUESTS MUST BE INITIATED BY PROPERTY OWNERS. AS COMMUNITIES GROW, A NEED MAY DEVELOP TO EXTEND THE BOUNDARIES OF THE TOWN. DO YOU FAVOR ANNEXING ADDITIONAL LAND INTO ROCKVILLE. IF YES, PLEASE EXPLAIN?

Resident Property Owners:

- Yes. Have a regulated buffer zone from virgin and Springdale
- No clue
- Maybe. pros and cons to annexing land into the town limits

- No annexation. horse Valley Wash is too remote and unstable soils and road is too steep
- Yes. As necessary and based on individual applications and circumstances

- Only if we need to annex to provide adequate water for existing residents (not for development); only to act as a barrier from development encroaching from another community
- Don't know. I don't know where the present town extends to and where it might extend to
- Important if for reasons to improve our infrastructure
- No. This issue has been addressed. We have a natural buffer from impending growth.
- Yes. Annex land west of town as a buffer for the town, areas should be left rural agricultural
- Yes. We can protect and control growth of surrounding areas
- Yes. The Anasazi development in Springdale is a perfect example of growth impacts from outside of town limits.
- No. It just depends on where and who
- Yes. But only if they accept our rules and we do not relax our rules to accommodate them and they bring their own water
- No. There is no need for Rockville to grow. Land and water are limited.
- Yes. Tax base
- No. I should be more aware of precise city boundaries
- No. Annexation is costly. Without additional water the land would be of no use.
- Yes. As needed
- Yes. Annex property where our water wells and watersheds are
- Yes. However, this depends entirely on the circumstances of the project. Not just carte-blanc
- No. We cannot afford that responsibility. The cost of living here should not go up for this purpose. I have friends who were annexed into our town without notification. Seems illegal to me
- No. Rockville has plenty of land within its boundaries
- Yes. Only to protect the boundaries of Rockville
- Yes. Only if services can be provided! otherwise NO!
- Yes. Higher density away from Highway 9 will help growth and preserve history and town prestige
- Yes. Why not
- Yes. Increases the tax base

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- No. The land in the town is ample for these needs
- Yes. If quick access to land I favor it
- Yes. Just to control what happens there
- Yes. If it makes sense or if it is an advantage-yes. If it doesn't hurt or negatively affect anybody then why not?
- Yes. This question moot. If it don't have water, why annex?
- No. (Allow water) Just open the 60 waterless lots
- Yes. Don't want Rockville to get too big- permitted if needed
- Yes. If you decide to have commercial property, you will have a need to expand to have a place for it
- Yes. If annexation could provide protection against outside development that could impact Rockville
- Yes. If it is needed to have a sales tax producing area which does not comprise the existing town
- Yes. If it provides water and to protect scenic vistas
- Yes. For the potential of more water for the town watershed protection and scenic preservation
- Yes. As requested for development
- No. Let's have the town take care of what it now has. The only contrary point would be if annexation would expand Rockville's preservation spirit to surrounding lands
- Yes. In order to protect surrounding land from development
- Yes. We will need it sooner or later with the growth in the area

Tenants and Renters:

- Yes. I'm not sure we have a choice if we grew- not too much though
- Yes. If consideration is given to economic impact of current residents is considered
- Yes. If the town wants to grow land will be needed

Unspecified Respondents:

- Yes. Town well and surrounding aquifer should be included in and protected by the town
- Yes. If Rockville does not control additional land some other city will

QUESTION 45: THE PREVIOUS QUESTION ASKS WHETHER THE ROCKVILLE LAND-USE CODE SHOULD (1) REMAIN AS IT IS TODAY; (2) BECOME MORE FLEXIBLE; OR (3) BECOME MORE REGULATORY. THIS QUESTION ASKS YOU TO EXPLAIN THE REASONING BEHIND YOUR RESPONSE?

Resident Property Owners:

- (Remain) I believe the Land Use Code is efficient for our small town
- (More regulatory) No water, or if it becomes necessary to buy from Washington County Conservancy it will become too expensive for agricultural use
- (More flexible) Growth is essential to increase tax base. We need appropriate business taxes and income and housing to encourage families who can live and work here year round.
- (Remain) Everything seems to be working well
- (Remain) Will become congested
- (Remain) It seems to be fairly administered at present time; we don't want to be too regulatory or too lax
- (Remain) It seems to be working well with the General Plan
- (More Flexible) Nothing endures but change. We must be dynamic in our approach to regulation.
- (Remain) To maintain current atmosphere and feel of Rockville

- (Remain) Works for me
- (More regulatory) Increased regulation limits development. Limited development is good.
- (More flexible) Some uses should be allowed if they don't have any serious impact on the environment
- (Remain) It is working just fine. Possibly tighten up "loopholes" for wealthy developers to bring in water from external sources.
- (Remain) Growth should be held at a minimum
- (Remain). I'd like to see Rockville remain unique in that it keeps growth to a minimum, and remain a rural, agricultural, low-density, single-family residential community.
- (Remain) It has served us well but we need to address building on mesa edges (that should not be allowed)
- (Remain) It seems to work
- (More flexible) It seems for a small town we have some awfully stringent ordinances

- (More regulatory) Present code not working. B & Bs without a single blade of grass because entire front yard has become gravel parking lot is clear example of failure
- (More flexible) There is already too much regulation. Become more self sustaining.
- (More flexible) We need to be flexible in order to survive
- (Remain) I'm happy with the present requirements at this time.
- (Remain) We like present town conditions
- (Remain) It is good, but allow for minor changes
- (Remain) We moved here because of what it is; we want it to stay that way
- (More flexible) Quit nitpicking every little thing
- (Remain) Planning and zoning is doing a good job. They are making changes as necessary.
- (Remain) It is good
- (More flexible) Not necessarily the code as much as the people enforcing/interpreting it in office in order to harass individuals
- (More flexible) I would like the opportunity to rent any building on my property without problems with town council
- (Remain) If it ain't broke, don't fix it
- (More flexible) We live in America
- (More regulatory) The Land Use Code needs to be more specific so there is no doubt in its interpretation
- (Remain) If the Code can keep Rockville as it is, it is sufficient
- (Remain & Flexible) There are changes that need to be made. Grandfathering, for one
- (More flexible) Our property was illegally annexed without any notification and without permission!!!
- (Remain) We are trying to exist on our culinary water supply. We can't expand and provide water to more residences
- (More flexible) Too much ground now should govern Rockville instead of Time Buck Two
- (More flexible) When too much is regulated it can't be controlled
- (Remain) It has worked well
- (Remain) Honestly, I have not had time to look all the references to the "General Plan" up online so I guess I go for the status quo
- (More flexible) Sometimes I feel the town owns my land not me
- (Remain) The Land Use Code seems to be working to limit growth the best we can
- (More flexible) Listening with open minds. Coming up with ways for property owners to do what they would like to do
- (More flexible) Zoning and land use should be covered under a "Blanket Zoning Plan" with exceptions that would be a benefit to the land owner and Rockville
- (More flexible) The world needs to grow with control. Rockville is like Heaven to me but needs to grow a little
- (More flexible) New people are usually treated poorly and put through hoops over and over
- (Remain) However, our code specifies agricultural use...yet the winery was denied. The winery would have been a nice fit for the town
- (More regulatory) Need strict land use codes because without it development is free to do whatever. Preserve the rural nature of Rockville!
- (More flexible) Too anti-growth
- (More flexible) Too many regulations hamper growth and cities can die—growth if done right can be a positive thing
- (More flexible) Future needs are unknown. The land use code should accommodate unknown future conditions.
- (Remain) There is sufficient land available (lots, etc.) for Rockville to continue reasonable growth. The Land Use Code should not change until that changes.
- (More flexible) Currently the Council has dictatorial power. A small click controls all aspects relative to Rockville under the guise of this is what people want.
- (More regulatory) Strict rules eliminate conflict, legal issues and make governing and stability more likely
- (More flexible) We should pretty much do what we want on our own land as long as it's not hurting anyone
- (More regulatory) The area will expand and regulations need to be in place that protects our quality of life without making change impossible.
- (More flexible) Allow water to waterless subdivision (build retirement home). Keep tight building codes.
- (More flexible) What do the people want?
- (More flexible) Allowing more flexibility for property owners for personal uses
- (More flexible) We should be willing to help people secure homes and businesses (if approved). We came, what right do we have to shut the door?
- (More regulatory) Architecture should be southwestern or pioneer. Colors should be earth tones, non-reflective and heights limited to two story
- (Remain) Pristine area is why we own property in Rockville
- (Remain) That's what people enjoy about Rockville and what makes it different from other small towns
- (Remain) I think it is fine as is
- (More flexible) Private property should be respected
- (More flexible) Building lot requirements across the river are too large. Clustering is important and light commercial will be necessary to provide tax base
- (Unknown) I don't know details of current Land Use Code. In general I do not suggest changes of the code that would allow increased development, especially without developers providing ALL infrastructure resources and guarantees for development
- (Remain) Assuming the existing plan protects the agricultural and residential use sufficiently. Otherwise more regulatory
- (Remain) The original Land Use Code works well for Rockville

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- (Remain) It is well managed under existing standards
- (More flexible) It would be nice if they would allow a person to frequent their land
- (More flexible) Allow nearby essential shopping and services—food, fuel and medical

Tenants and Renters:

- (More flexible) Just be clear and careful (learn from Springdale's mistakes)
- (More flexible) The existing code is too rigid to the point of ridiculous
- (Unknown) No ATVs at all unless used for ranch work
- (Remain) Current regulation seems adequate for our future

Other Respondents:

- (Remain) I don't like change
- (More flexible) Too Rigid
- (More regulatory) As development pressure increases the Code needs to be continually strengthened to adapt
- (More flexible) Things are too restricted now

QUESTION 46: WHAT DO YOU THINK WILL BE ROCKVILLE'S MOST SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGE IN THE FUTURE? HOW SHOULD WE DEAL WITH THIS CHALLENGE?

Resident Property Owners:

- Water
- Water and growth-- up-grade water system to allow building on existing developed lots
- Water—no clue (how to deal with it)
- Water and growth—deal with it carefully and head on
- Stopping pro-growth developers from taking over our open space and private ditch water companies
- Water and funding for basic town services to residents. Taxes are rising—but incomes are not. Affordability and availability of housing. Join water conservancy district or encourage business that can pay for these improvements.
- Water—do not know (how to deal with it)
- Staying small—adhere to our Land Use Code
- Water—work with Springdale
- Water-- ??
- Too maintain unique character and avoid over development and commercial zones. Continue to support present ordinances which are intended to control growth, especially commercial
- Providing culinary water to its residents. Zero growth and converting unused irrigation water rights to culinary
- Large land holders trying to subdivide their properties and develop them—sprawl and water issues. Keep the growth near zero.
- Fighting lawsuits against inflexible regulations and directing the path of development. Allow some development where appropriate and charge impact fees for business and development.
- Water and improvements to maintain infrastructure. Charge use fees.
- Growth—encourage them to live in Virgin
- Adopt a zero growth policy
- Quality people to volunteer for the Town's Business/Government. The talk of wanting to change. Make sure that elected officials speak for the people of the community and not their self interests.
- Water - - seek new water sources and seek grants for water treatment facilities
- To resist from turning into "any town, Utah." People who move into town and then want to change the ordinances so Rockville can be just like the town they moved from. Protect the Land Use Code as it is or perhaps make it more regulatory.
- Providing adequate water for the existing homes and water share holders. Conservation (should be) first and negotiations with Springdale
- Water
- Limiting growth. strict Land Use Codes, annexation, limiting culinary water sources
- Community participation—don't give up
- Saying "no" to those who want to bring their \$ to town and change our rules to allow their pet projects. Just have the moral courage to say "No"!
- Additional traffic on Highway 9
- I would like to see absentee owners more responsible for their property. Especially with culinary water use. During rainstorms sprinklers are left in use.
- Water. make an attempt to obtain water now
- Too much growth. Growth brings more crime. Future town meetings for discussing things.
- Preventing growth, replacing mayor with like-minded person when he chooses to retire. Continue recruiting residents to be involved and town maintenance budget may need to expand.
- Water, outside development pressure, illegal 2nd rentals. Be consistent in application of ordinances.
- Staying the way it is. Leave zoning the way it is.
- Water. Pressurized irrigation. Irrigation treated for culinary use.
- Water. Buy water from Springdale
- Allowing residents/owners of property with no water to gain water so that they can build. Find ways allowing people to get water.
- Sophisticated input for slow growth and realistic guidelines. New council members—welcome newcomers to council/fresh blood
- Water. Purchase water rights and make water connections available
- Exactly what is being addressed here. . . change. Continue with this survey until a majority want it.
- Realize it's a town with 3 million people driving through it
- Enough water for existing residents and growth
- Growth, development. Make sure the Land Use Code is adhered to.
- Water. Start looking—lots of towns in So. Utah are getting water. Why not Rockville? Not a lot, but some to get us out of this crunch.
- Preserving balance between individual rights and perceived need to impose regulations
- Water and greedy developers. Keep things as they currently are
- Water for residents
- Water. Get current residents more
- Water sources. Buy water from Springdale
- Large developers with much \$ trying to do the same as the Anasazi Plateau. By keeping our general plan and zoning limiting such developments
- Stopping big money from coming in with big housing developments. Keep the vision of Rockville in your sight
- Limit growth
- Growth and mentality of some. Rockville can still be a treasure with managed growth. Change is inevitable- nothing stays the same
- Staying small in keeping with long range planning and stop any greediness. Do not let developers or greed override common sense
- Water. Limit building
- Water?? Growth/ yes or no? Detailed group meetings. Take our time. Young minded opinions
- To be fair to all residents. Learn how to listen.
- Stopping the growth of subdivisions—keeping the small town atmosphere. Absolutely prohibit subdivisions and multiple housing units through zoning.

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- Water supply (domestic)
- Better access to enjoy more fully what is there. Keep the unnecessary costs down the simple way
- Coping with economic change. Increase the tax base.
- Development- commercial and residential. Have strict land use codes
- Water and sewer. Support a Lake Powell pipeline and procure additional rights
- Avoiding commercialism. Don't allow it.
- Obtaining water and a sewer system. Create some growth giving the town revenue
- To retain the idyllic atmosphere. Clearly define what the town is and its destiny
- Water- water-water. Increase storage- improve efficiency (pressurized irrigation)
- A more flexible land use ordinance which allows for some growth
- Water and growth- active, civil and knowledgeable government
- Growth and business
- Growth. Balance commercial vs. homes. Limit homes attracting unemployed.
- Growth. Good luck.
- Water. Limiting culinary water for landscaping/outdoor use. Rewards for making the change.
- Infrastructure. Higher fees on water, etc.
- To not give away its "magic." Don't become a Park City South- Don't follow Springdale
- Growth and infrastructure costs, government mandates that will require sales tax revenues that property tax cannot generate. Stop growth completely or set up a commercial area to generate sales tax income.
- Controlling growth and commercial interests. Deal with it boldly.
- Growth. Slowly with open minds
- Resisting pressure for commercial development and interests. Enforce existing ordinances and zoning

- Resisting commercial development- keep zoning as it is currently and enforce existing zoning
- Balanced growth- caution with establishing rules
- Adequate supply of water and allowing quality growth. Purchase water rights and make water available- be more open minded for moderate residential/commercial growth
- Water resources due to climate change and holding development at bay. Political lobbying for responsible environmental policies and maintain "political will" to resist development even at expense of his/her service fees or other
- To remain as it is- limit construction growth absolutely
- Handling growth while preserving character and natural beauty-- This survey is a good start. Keep up the good work.
- To maintain the small-town, single-family residential atmosphere it has now. Continue supporting the original Rockville Master Plan.
- Protecting its character

Tenants and Renters:

- Purposeful growth- planning ahead
- Remaining small and beautiful- open spaces
- People leaving because it's too expensive to live here and no basic facilities—create a lid on property taxes in the county
- Light pollution- (need) strict codes or perseverance
- Attracting tourism while keeping pristine- keep a prudent plan for future growth

Unspecified Respondents:

- To stay as it is—minimize development
- Growth- be very restrictive
- Growth
- Withstanding commercial development pressure and maintaining rural character- maintain and improve the strength of the Land Use Code
- Growth- grow some and make it easier for people to get things

QUESTION 48: ARE THERE QUESTIONS YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SEEN ON THIS SURVEY THAT WE FAILED TO ASK? DO YOU HAVE COMMENTS ABOUT THIS SURVEY OR OTHER TOWN ISSUES?

Resident Property Owners:

- It is okay
- This survey is unnecessary. The questions are slanted toward pro-growth and development. The town has spoken repeatedly to reject growth and this survey represents a failure of certain politicians to accept those past findings. Get rid of pro-growth mayor and council.
- Town clerk is very difficult for public to deal with. Since this has been the case for a long time, perhaps a change should be considered or division of duties on a part time basis with a different person to interact with the public. Also, one person's control of all town records is never advisable
- It is important to have these surveys regularly
- Noise ordinances—deal with loud speakers, barking dogs, loud parties, etc.
- Ask us whether we want to keep the big flag display on holidays. No, I find it ostentatious
- Not everyone in town is retired or are able to take time off when

they want. Some people have health issues and/or work odd hours and days. Please don't try to make them feel badly of not being more involved.

- I'm not sure why "renters" are allowed to respond to this survey as they do not pay the taxes. Also, renters are allowed to respond to the survey and then the owners of that same property also respond to the survey. It seems one survey should have been mailed out to each property owner period.
- Questions 4-9 are all answered with the reality of the water situation in mind. As there is already a shortage of water for the existing population we don't need to put more stress on the existing situation.
- I am a strong proponent of the development of a trail system Rockville to Springdale
- Control of building design, prohibit huge homes, prohibit use of culinary water for landscape purposes, complete prohibition of ALL commercial signage (no B & B signs) and complete prohibition of lighting on any signs

- More specific. regarding park or bridge maintenance/improvement
- Do we need to fund cops? Can we have a pro-bicycle stance? Ban recreational ATV use in town. Eliminate "The Bridge."
- Thanks for your concern for our town and taking the time to put together this survey.
- I think all rentals should have a safety inspection. We have rentals that were built as storage or workshop areas and now have people living in them. They may need to be brought up to code.
- Energy conservation, sound and light ordinances enforced, agricultural land preservation, old bridge should have its foundation and supports in ground checked and repaired, build a Grafton pedestrian bridge on Highway 9, relieve stress on bridge at Bridge Road, don't rely on realtors on info at river and rocks
- Should there be limits in the City Government prohibiting spouses from serving on Commissions or Council at the same time? Should there be a limit of terms on the Planning Commission?
- In a world near out of control on so many fronts, stability is a precious commodity. That is what Rockville represents. It's a nostalgic trip down Memory Lane to a simpler time, a simpler life. It's what makes living in Rockville so appealing.
- Why does Elaine Harris use the city tractor on her yard? Why is the water usage allocated unfairly?
- More and more properties are owned by non-residents. We think there should be requirements that they maintain or hire maintenance on these properties. Rockville needs ALL owners to take pride in this community.
- Some questions were vague and difficult to understand what it wanted (Example # 21 & 39)
- Would you please get the town office out of the Harris residence? It's unprofessional and very uncomfortable to sit in their living room and do business. This should be neutral territory. I hate to see paying rent on the "hotdog Stand" when we have the community center.
- Concerning multiple unit dwellings, unless our culinary water supply miraculously increases we need to continue to allow only one culinary share per one dwelling. As for my volunteering, up until recently I was able. Now because of advanced age and decreased mental and physical ability, everything is difficult or impossible.
- We need new people on the Council and Planning and Zoning Commission are to be answered back to the County. They should live and let live. We need a change.
- Water for current residents
- I believe in limiting home based business or only allowing B & B or agriculture business but I think the Council should be able to make an occasional exception like for the Bridge and the Winery that wanted to come in. Both of these would fit nicely with the tone of Rockville and be an asset.
- Question #36 (participate) and #38 (volunteer): of course we all probably think participation and volunteering is great—but on a survey- - Why? People all have lives to live (which can include a job or jobs, children- or none, status of health and family relationships, new marriage, divorce, retirement, emotional state- - all things which can affect participation in community. Time to be grateful and thank those who are presently involved and stop criticizing—both in print and in public (as in meetings and hearings). If Town officials really want people to come out, then stop scolding and reprimanding other adults (even if their views differ) is

certainly not the way to get positive results and is a poor example of community spirit.

- I plan to attend the town meeting when this survey and the town planning is being changed or updated
- You guys have done a great job. Keep in mind our kids will take over someday. Nothing is perfect. Rockville needs small growth with preservation of its image that you folks have created over the years.

Non-Resident Property Owners:

- As a non-resident it is difficult to make reliable suggestions
- The poor and unusable roads up on the south bench may give access into more usable water aquifers and existing water sources, if one could explore the potential more easily
- None
- Some improvement to the secondary water source is needed—too many days of diminished or lessened availability
- I think this is a wonderful process and I appreciate those who have made it happen. Without strong, well planned land use rules, the character of this wonderful town could be lost. I think that people managing the town are doing and have done an excellent job. More residents and property owners should volunteer to do whatever the town needs.
- Again, without culinary water there can be no additional growth in Rockville. The Council uses lack of water to prevent any new growth. Failure of Rockville to tie into Lake Powell water will eventually be disastrous. It must be remembered current residents die and children of current residents might/will want to live in Rockville. As things now stand this will be impossible. There are far too many regulations which give the Council dictatorial power.
- I very much like the existing town management. Congratulations to Mayor McGuire, Meagan and others
- I don't understand how they can build duplexes or townhouses with no water. I have land in Rockville and wanted to build on it, but we can't because we have no water and are told we won't get any. It was a complete loss for us.
- I pay taxes on a property with no water. I can't build with no water. It won't make the community too large- - 60 lots
- Questions 25 and 26 are poorly worded which may result in inverted responses
- We bought our property years ago for an investment if and when I decide to sell it or leave it to my children this would be important information to know.
- Thank you for asking and for protecting Rockville for future generations
- Regulations and enforcement should be equal. It seems there is a set of rules for the "in" group, and another set for others. Property rights should be respected.
- Pressure irrigation system ought to be implemented for residential use
- I am opposed to bringing water in from the Colorado River/Lake Powell area
- Keep up the good work!
- Thank you so much for taking the time to conduct this survey! I hope my responses will be taken into account even though they were late. Thanks again.

Tenants and Renters:

- The survey is well written and clear. There are not a lot of townfolk and those that are involved are probably getting burnt out. Younger people need to get involved and that will require one on one contact (not being chided in newsletters).
- Hire a new town clerk or make communication course available to current one. Who has water shares? How and when were they acquired and is it "Democratic?" Why is the ranch at the west end of town allowed to leave on such bright lights? They ought to be on a sensor. Since many driving tourists are looking at the scenery, they

might miss a bicyclist. A sign alerting them would be helpful and also, a reminder for people to drive slow on dirt roads.

- Appreciate these thoughtful considerations towards our future at large

Unspecified Respondents:

- Additional questions: Do you want flags to line Main Street? Do you support limiting building permits to existing water shares? Why do you live in Rockville? Why did you move to Rockville?