



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2022, AT 5:00 PM  
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,  
126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

**The meeting convened at 05:07 pm.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice Chair Kyla Topham, Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, Adam Hyatt, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Principal Planner Niall Connolly, and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. See attached sheet for attendees.

**Approval of the Agenda:**

**Noel Benson moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.**

**Vote on the motion:**

**Campbell: Aye**

**Inghram: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Benson: Aye**

**Topham: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**General Announcements:** Director of Community Development, Thomas Dansie, reported that a Streetscape Plan was underway. It came out of previous Planning Commission work. A Consultant was hired to prepare a plan for the streetscape with a public event to be held on September 1, 2022. During the event, the Consultant would share an overview of the plan. There would also be an opportunity to walk up and down the street with the Streetscape Consultant. Members of the community would also be able to share input and feedback. He explained that additional details and the time of the event would be shared in the future.

Mr. Dansie reported that the Town was given copies of the book, *Ground Rules: Your Handbook to Utah Land Use Regulation*. It was published earlier in the year and was an update to a popular book that has been around for a long time. The Utah Land Use Institute gave copies of the book to each Planning Commission Member. It was to be a great guide and reference for the Commission.

**A. Action Item**

- 1. Erosion Hazard Permit - David Baird Requests an Erosion Hazard Permit for Development in an Erosion Hazard Zone at 483 Watchman Drive, Lot 2, in the Larry West Subdivision. The Erosion Hazard Permit is Preparatory for the Construction of a Single-Family Residence on the Property.**

Principal Planner, Niall Connolly, reported that the Erosion Hazard Permit Application was for property located at 483 Watchman Drive, Lot 2, in the Larry West Subdivision. The Town adopted an Erosion Hazard Zone that identified areas that were at risk of erosion damage from flooding of the Virgin River. Most of the subject property fell within the Moderate Risk Erosion Hazard Zone ("MREHZ"). Anyone who wants to carry

out a land disturbance in an Erosion Hazard Zone needs to have a valid Erosion Hazard Permit. A land disturbance was defined in the Ordinance and included most development activities other than activities such as gardening or constructing a small shed.

The applicant, David Baird, was applying for an Erosion Hazard Permit to install erosion protection on the property. The property was currently undeveloped. Mr. Connolly reported that the erosion protection installation would allow Mr. Baird to construct a single-family home on the property in the future. He clarified that the design of the home was not part of the permit application. The proposed erosion protection consisted of a 10-foot deep and 13-foot-wide trench filled with rock rip-rap. The drawings showed that the rip-rap would be buried in the ground. Rosenberg Associates prepared a Supporting Engineering Report. The report demonstrated that the proposal would mitigate erosion damage to the property and would not increase the risk of erosion or flooding on other properties.

Mr. Connolly reported that Rosenberg Associates presented two different design options for erosion protection. Both options were reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer. No disturbance was proposed to vegetation within the riparian zone or regulatory floodplain. However, if the Planning Commission decided to approve the application, a condition could be added to require that any disturbed riparian vegetation be replaced with appropriate native planting.

A question was raised as to why there were two different design options. Jared Bates, from Rosenberg Associates, explained that the initial design was created but then the property owner had ideas about different mitigation options. The first option was strictly rock rip-rap erosion protection and the second would extend the footings down five feet below the finished grade in lieu of erosion protection on the northeast corner of the lot. Mr. Bates stated that the intention was to prevent the rip-rap along the river from being flanked. Either one of the two options would work and a rip-rap would be installed regardless of the option selected. Mr. Bates shared the initial plan with the Commission.

The initial plan would include erosion protection along the southeast and northeast boundaries. Mr. Bates reported that the water came from the northeast and around the southwest. The erosion protection identified would ensure that any future home would be protected. Mr. Bates shared the second option plan with the Commission. He explained that the protection along the southeast boundary would be maintained. Along the house, the footings would extend down five feet below the finished grade. The second option could potentially be more expensive depending on the cost of concrete. The access was along the southwest corner of the lot and not along the northeast corner. The second plan was the one that worked best with the proposed layout from the applicant, but both were acceptable.

Ms. Inghram wondered why the rip-rap did not extend to the corner of the lot. Mr. Bates explained that it went a minimum of 10 feet past the house. The intention was to protect the structure and not necessarily the lot. Often, it is better to stay away from the lot line to avoid encroachment on neighboring properties. Ms. Inghram referenced the speed of the river during full flood stages. She asked if it would percolate down through the rock. When the speeds are high, it seemed like the water would remain on the surface and not soak down. Mr. Bates stated that the rip-rap would prevent the bank of the river from moving up toward the house. The river had a harder time moving the rock compared to sand. That was the idea behind the inclusion of the rip-rap.

Mr. Campbell noted that Page 50 showed a depth of the rip-rap at 10 feet and Page 51 showed a model with eight feet. He asked for clarification of those numbers. Mr. Bates explained that there was a bigger section along the main channel of the river. The one below would be on the upstream side. Mr. Bates overviewed the design with the Commission. There was enough rock in the corner so that if there was a flood, the dirt would be washed out and all of the rock would fall into the scour depth. Mr. Campbell stated that Page 27 addressed the liquefaction. He read the following language: "According to the Utah Geological Survey, the soils in the project area are mapped as being within a high liquefaction-susceptibility zone."

Mr. Bates reported that this was based on high-level information and the property was automatically put into that category. The data mentioned in the later paragraphs of the report represented what was encountered on-site.

Mr. Kenaston noted that there were two different proposals. One involved the southeast extension and one with the southwest extension. He wondered if one was preferred over the other. Mr. Bates clarified that either one was appropriate but the second proposal worked best with the Site Plan. Due to the size of the desired home compared to the width of the lot, there was not a lot of room for rip-rap. As a result, the second proposal made the most sense. He reiterated that either would be suitable for the property. Mr. Baird asked the Commission to consider the second option, which was his preference.

Vice Chair Topham believed that all of the bases had been covered as there were two different possibilities for the project. The other Commissioners agreed. They felt that the proposals were solid.

**Motion made by Tom Kenaston that the Planning Commission approve the Proposed Erosion Hazard Zone Permit for 483 Watchman Drive, as discussed during the Planning Commission Meeting on August 03, 2022. This motion was based on the following findings:**

- 1) **The applicant complies with all grading and materials requirements.**
- 2) **The Planning Commission finds that the applicant has complied with the requirements of (10-13E), the Erosion Hazard Zone Ordinance and that the proposed land disturbance minimizes the risk of flood and erosion damage to adjacent properties in the Virgin River Watercourse.**
- 3) **The application for an Erosion Hazard Zone Permit includes the appropriate engineering analysis that meets the requirements of subsection C of this zone.**

**The motion was subject to the following conditions:**

- 1) **If any vegetation in the riparian zone is disturbed during these works, appropriate revegetation must be completed, using plants native to Zion Canyon.**

**The motion was seconded by Pam Inghram.**

**Vote on the motion:**

**Campbell: Aye**

**Inghram: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Benson: Aye**

**Topham: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**B. Discussion/Non-Action Items**

**1. Continued Discussion on a Proposed Workforce Housing Overlay Zone.**

Mr. Dansie reported that the Planning Commission previously discussed workforce housing strategies. At a recent Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission considered a proposal prepared by the Housing Committee for a Workforce Housing Overlay Zone. The Commission had several questions and concerns about the proposal and asked the Committee to address them. The Housing Committee had met once since then and would meet again soon. At the current time, the Housing Committee had not prepared an updated or revised proposal to bring back to the Planning Commission for consideration. However, a number of the issues and concerns raised during the last Planning Commission Meeting had been discussed. The Housing Committee discussion and findings were summarized in the Staff Report.

Both the Planning Commission and the Housing Committee identified several data points that would need to be gathered before moving forward with a revised proposal. For instance:

- Who was the target audience for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone?
- How many workforce housing units were appropriate in Springdale?
- How many workforce housing units were needed in Springdale?
- How many workforce housing units would be used in Springdale?

The Housing Committee did not have answers to those questions at the current time. Mr. Dansie reported that the Housing Committee would prepare a community-wide survey that would be distributed to Springdale residents. The Committee would also continue to reach out to community housing development groups. Mr. Dansie understood that there was a housing group associated with the park that the Housing Committee wanted to coordinate with. He noted that the Housing Committee was continuing to work on the issues raised by the Commission. Once the data was received, the Committee would prepare a revised proposal for consideration. In the meantime, any feedback from the Planning Commission could be shared.

Ms. McPartland referenced the Developer Feasibility section of the Staff Report. It mentioned that there had been discussions with community housing organizations. She asked for additional information about that. Mr. Dansie reported that the Town Council hired a Housing Consultant. The Consultant had several connections with community housing development organizations. He had reached out to a few organizations to float the idea of projects in Springdale. Based on the initial discussions, there was a lot of interest from those organizations in a project in Springdale. However, there were two obstacles. The first was finding a piece of property for this type of project. The second was implementing an appropriate zoning mechanism. The Moderate-Income Housing Development Overlay Zone could work, but that came with a lot of bureaucracy and income qualification requirements. If there were a different zone in place, the housing projects would be much more feasible for the housing development organizations.

Mr. Dansie explained that the housing consultant and the Housing Committee continued to speak to housing development organizations. Several months earlier there was a meeting with Committee Members and representatives from those groups. That meeting pertained to possible ideas and projects. No specifics were discussed in terms of zoning at that time. Vice Chair Topham felt it would be beneficial to hear more from the housing development organizations about what was needed and what would work best. Mr. Dansie liked the suggestion and stated that they could reach out to obtain some more specific feedback. He reported that the community housing development organizations were non-profit organizations that took advantage of available housing programs, such as the Olene Walker Housing Fund, to develop projects.

The Commission further discussed the Housing Committee survey. Mr. Dansie explained that the surveys could be written and distributed in a few different ways. The easiest and most economical way to move forward was to develop a survey with the existing resources. For instance, utilizing the Housing Committee, Staff, and Planning Commission to write the questions. The survey could then be distributed through a free survey service. That was typically what had been done in the past because it was the simplest. Survey experts could be engaged if desired. He recently met with a survey professional and had discussed potentially engaging in those services. Mr. Dansie informed the Commission that using a survey professional would be a lot more expensive. The quote for a targeted survey on housing was approximately \$4,000.

Ms. Inghram asked about the Community Benefits section of the Staff Report. It indicated that it would be possible for people to live in Springdale at a reduced rent. Based on the last Planning Commission discussion, she believed the units would all be at market rates unless the owner chose to offer lower rental rates. Mr. Dansie stated that the idea was that everything would be at market rent, however, if 75% of the units need to be rented to households that are actively employed in the community, which was a much different market than the general rental market in Springdale. Therefore, the rents that those units could demand in the free market would be reflective of the active employment market rather than the broader rental market in general.

Ms. Inghram also wanted to understand whether there was any data to support the statement that renters were more engaged in civic and community volunteer opportunities. She wanted to understand the actual data behind

that assumption. Mr. Dansie clarified that there was not any quantifiable data along those lines but additional information could be gathered from the survey. He noted that it was not that renters were more likely to be involved in civic activities, but people living in Springdale were more likely to be engaged in Springdale civic activities. An employee living in Springdale was therefore more likely to be involved in the community. Ms. Inghram felt the language implied that employees of local businesses were more likely to be involved in civic and community volunteer opportunities than non-employees who lived in Springdale. Mr. Dansie apologized if the report gave off a different impression than intended. People who live in Springdale, regardless of whether they work or not, are more likely to be involved in Springdale civic activities. If an employee lived in Springdale versus living elsewhere, that employee was more likely to be involved.

There was discussion regarding the survey. Some of the Commissioners felt it was important for the Planning Commission to have some input on the questions. The questions in the survey needed to focus on the number of employees that live in town, the hours worked, whether those employees had second jobs, and so on. It was also important that the questions not be slanted toward any one outcome. Vice Chair Topham believed that might be the benefit of hiring someone neutral to write the questions. She suggested that the broad research questions be outlined. This would help determine what type of information the Commission hoped to learn from the survey. Those broad questions could then be taken to a professional and the detailed questions could be crafted. Ms. Inghram stated that employees, businesses, and residents would need to be surveyed.

Ms. McPartland stated that from the park side, the survey was something that could be brought to the Housing Committee. It was necessary to understand what the unmet demand for housing was within the park. Depending on the methodology for the survey, it may be possible to reach both park employees and local town employees. She would speak to the Zion National Park leadership team about this.

Ms. Inghram wanted the Housing Committee to consider limiting the number of units that could be constructed per year. She noted that this could be similar to what the Town Council did to address transient lodging. It would ensure there is enough time for the community to assess the response to the additions. The other Commissioners felt that suggestion was reasonable. It was important not to build a dense cluster of workforce housing that would impact the surrounding neighborhoods. Certain parcels of land would lend themselves more naturally to this type of development. Ms. Inghram reiterated that the development of the units should be slow. It was difficult to know if an overlay zone would produce the expected results. She wanted to hear a recommendation from the Housing Committee about a reasonable first-year cap.

Vice Chair Topham wanted to discuss the mitigation strategies listed in the Staff Report. This was included in the Impact on Adjacent Residential Uses section. It mentioned increased setbacks, prohibition on pools, and regulations for parking lots. She wondered if the Commission had additional suggestions or feedback. Mr. Benson wanted all of them. He believed a large piece of property would be the best way to make something like this work. Concerns were expressed about the feasibility. It was necessary to determine whether there was an appetite for increased density through the survey questions. Mr. Benson did not want to create added density if that was not something desired by residents. Unless something was constructed very thoughtfully, it might be difficult to implement. As a result, he felt the survey questions should be specific. For instance, "What kind of setback would you be comfortable with if there were twelve units next door to you?"

Ms. McPartland pointed out that the Staff Report stated that the Town's 2020 Housing Study included a community survey that asked about housing preferences. Over 51% of respondents indicated that employee housing was an important need and nearly 60% indicated that a lack of affordable housing was a significant concern. The second survey should look at more specific details to solve the issues and address those concerns. Mr. Benson noted that the vast majority of people that worked in town fit the bill for moderate income. He wanted to make sure there was a market for workforce housing and that the rents would still be feasible for a developer. Vice Chair Topham reported that there were organizations that focused on this issue. She felt there were options to move forward with. The Commission further discussed workforce housing. Mr. Campbell wanted to clarify whether Springdale wants or needs employee housing. He believed this could be clarified through the survey. Vice Chair Topham stated that some business owners had made their own employee housing. That seemed to answer the question of whether employee housing was needed in the Town.

Ms. Inghram felt the perfect lot for this type of development was one that would not impact views. There were some parcels like that, but she was not sure who owned them. Many residents want to preserve the views, so the Commission needs to consider where workforce housing was and was not appropriate. Vice Chair Topham stated that a Workforce Housing Overlay Zone would allow the Planning Commission and Town Council to determine what projects were appropriate within the zone. Ms. Inghram thought that with the overlay zones, the items went straight to Town Council. Mr. Dansie explained that an overlay zone change was just like any other zone change. It required the Planning Commission to make a recommendation.

It was suggested that the Moderate-Income Housing Development Overlay be revamped rather than pursue the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone. Mr. Benson did not see how a project would be feasible for developers and still be affordable enough for the people who worked in Springdale. Vice Chair Topham wondered if there was a lot of debate when the Red Hawk Apartments were proposed. Mr. Dansie confirmed this. It was a multi-year process. The Planning Commission denied the application, but it was eventually approved by the Town Council. It took a lot of time to move through the process.

## **2. Continued Discussion on Proposed Revisions to Requirements for the Distance Between Buildings and Development on Ridgelines in the CC and VC Zones.**

Mr. Dansie reported that the Planning Commission discussed two related Ordinance revisions during previous Work Meetings. One was the distance between buildings and the other related to development on ridgelines. The Staff Report included proposed Ordinance language based on those previous discussions. The first related to the distance between buildings and was as follows:

- In the Village Commercial Zone, the distance between buildings will be regulated by the height of the taller of the two buildings being compared.

If there is a 26-foot building next to a 15-foot building, the required separation between the two buildings would be 26 feet. Mr. Dansie overviewed the second proposed revision. It would regulate development on ridgelines or hilltops. During the last Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission requested that the existing language from the Foothill Residential Zone be applied to all zones in the Town. The language that was currently in the Foothill Residential Zone classified a high visual impact lot as one that would either break the skyline when viewed from the valley floor or be located on a ridgeline, hilltop, or the edge of a mesa. Mr. Dansie suggested that the Commission concentrate on the second of those two criteria when extending this to other zones. For example, development would be classified as having a high visual impact if it was located on a ridgeline, hilltop, or the edge of a mesa. The reason for this was that there was a potential problem using language that mentioned breaking the skyline when viewed from the valley floor. Mr. Dansie explained that for zones on the valley floor, a structure would break the skyline from many points. This would make almost every lot in the Town a high visual impact lot. As a result, his suggestion was not to use that criterion, but instead to focus on the location on a ridgeline, hilltop, or edge of a mesa.

Mr. Benson felt that the proposed revisions for the distance between buildings seemed unnecessary. He was not sure what problem that language was intended to solve. Vice Chair Topham clarified that the distance between buildings was intended to address the feeling of density. Spreading the buildings out in the Village Commercial Zone would address existing density concerns. Vice Chair Topham believed the distance requirements would accomplish something that the Planning Commission had been concerned about for quite a while. However, if desired, the Commission could reconsider a previous suggestion from Mr. Campbell, which was to use the average height of the two buildings.

It was confirmed that the side, front, and rear setbacks would not be impacted by the proposed revisions. Ms. Inghram noted that this would not be a significant increase. The intention was to maintain a buffer zone with increased distance between the buildings within the Village Commercial Zone. Mr. Kenaston stated that a year or two ago, a lot of time had been spent discussing the purpose of the Village Commercial Zone. It had been established to provide areas where low-impact commercial service uses may be harmoniously

integrated with low to medium-density residential uses to preserve the village scale. That was the reason the Commission was trying to decrease the density or even the visual density of the Village Commercial Zone. This would allow commercial use to integrate more harmoniously with residential uses.

Mr. Benson was concerned that this would lead to larger buildings and less character in the area. Mr. Inghram reminded him that there were still height limits within the Village Commercial Zone. Mr. Dansie stated that the limitations were 5,000 square feet in the Village Commercial Zone. However, it could be increased to 8,000 square feet if the building was 100 feet away from SR-9 and a residential zone. Vice Chair Topham believed there was majority support for the proposed revisions.

Discussions were had about whether there could be different requirements for lodging. Ms. McPartland noted that people would likely want rules that were applied equally, regardless of the use. Mr. Benson believed the use would dictate what was logical. Ms. Inghram felt it was irrelevant what was in the building. A building was a building and if it was 26 feet high and 15 feet from the next 26-foot-high building, which was too dense for the area. Ms. Inghram explained that the proposal would address visual density and maintain a transition zone between residential. The Village Commercial Zone was both residential and commercial and that was the reason it was a transition zone. Mr. Benson reiterated his opposition.

The Commission discussed the suggestion from Mr. Dansie to remove language regarding the skyline when viewed from the valley floor. Vice Chair Topham felt it was logical to remove that if it would become an issue. She was supportive of the change. Mr. Hyatt supported the change as well. Mr. Dansie believed that based on the Planning Commission discussions, the Commission was in support of the ridgeline language, as drafted. There was some disagreement about the language related to the distance between buildings, but it seemed like the majority of the Commissioners felt comfortable forwarding the proposed revisions. Mr. Kenaston wanted to take steps to reduce the visual density in the Village Commercial Zone. He felt that increasing the distance between buildings would help accomplish that.

Mr. Campbell preferred his previous suggestion, which was to use the average building height. He believed this was a better way to address the distance between buildings. However, he would still support the language as it was drafted. Ms. Inghram noted that there would likely be additional ideas expressed during the public hearing process as well. She wondered if the distance between buildings and development on ridgelines would be separate hearing items. Mr. Dansie explained that they could be separate or voted on together. Ms. Inghram asked that there be two separate hearings.

Mr. Dansie informed the Commission that the meeting agendas were already full through October. Unless the Commission wanted to add additional items to the agendas for each meeting, this particular item would not be heard until October 2022. There had been a discussion with the Chair last week about the number of applications that the Town received and the current schedule. There was a plan in place to move through all of the current applications. To do this, there would be one or two public hearings on the Work Meeting agendas as well. There would also be three public hearings on each Regular Meeting agenda. The bylaws stated that there could not be more than three public hearings per meeting. If more public hearings were placed on the Work Meeting agendas, this would decrease the amount of time the Commission had to discuss other items. Vice Chair Topham felt it was important that the Commission be focused to balance all of the discussions and the public hearings that needed to be held.

Mr. Benson asked that the two proposed revisions be separated out on a future agenda because he was in support of one and against another. Ms. Inghram also believed they should be separated so there could be individual discussions on each of the items. Mr. Dansie suggested that there be another scheduling conference so an appropriate time for the public hearing and discussion could be determined.

There was further discussion regarding the distance between buildings. Vice Chair Topham would support any distance between buildings that created an increase. If the suggestion from Mr. Campbell was

supported by the other Commissioners, she would be willing to support that. Ms. Inghram stated that she supported the larger distance. Anything was better than nothing, but she would prefer the larger distance. She was interested in hearing feedback from the public about the concept. Mr. Dansie explained that the purpose of a public hearing was to hear from the community. That feedback could influence the decision of the Commission one way or another. It was possible to make changes or revisions to the proposal based on the input heard during the public hearing process. Vice Chair Topham reported that there was majority support for the drafted language. She asked that the Staff Report mention the averaging suggestion as well so the public would be aware of that option and potentially share feedback.

Ms. Inghram noted that the remaining 30 minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting could not be used because there was not a standing agenda item to discuss miscellaneous work. She pointed out that the Town Council had a standing item. If the Planning Commission has something similar, like Continued Discussion on Work Items, this would allow the Commission to use all of the time effectively. Vice Chair Topham was not sure how that would work, since Staff would not be prepared with the necessary information. Ms. Dansie noted that there was an item for Council Discussion at the end of each Town Council Meeting. That allowed the Council to discuss any issues that had arisen. It was a forum where Council Members could introduce a topic or share information that they had received. This was not necessarily intended for in-depth deliberations. Something along those lines could be added to the Planning Commission Meeting agendas if that was desired by the Commission.

Ms. Inghram suggested that there could be a standing item that was limited to discussions on recent items. She did not want to lose the time that the Planning Commission had especially when there was such a backlog of items to discuss. Mr. Dansie explained that certain items could be discussed, however, if there was to be an in-depth conversation, notice would need to be provided to the community. The item would need to be more informative in nature. For example, if a Commissioner wanted to generally introduce a topic to the Commission, a quick introduction or status update would be appropriate. Town Clerk, Darci Carlson reported that in some Town Council Meetings, whenever there was a deeper conversation about a topic that a Council Member brought up, Staff was required to cut off the discussion. This was because in-depth conversations need to be noticed and added to an agenda with reasonable specificity.

**C. Adjourn**

**Motion made by Noel Benson to adjourn at 06:45 p.m. The motion was seconded by Tom Kenaston.**

**Vote on the motion:**

**Campbell: Aye**

**Inghram: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Benson: Aye**

**Topham: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

---

Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

**APPROVAL:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk's Office. Please call 435-772-3434 or via email at [springdale@springdale.utah.gov](mailto:springdale@springdale.utah.gov) for more information.