



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION ELECTRONIC WORK
MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY MARCH 3, 2021 AT 5:00PM**

This Planning Commission meeting did not have an anchor location and was conducted entirely via electronic means. Commission members connected remotely. The meeting was available to the public for live viewing/listening. If a member of the public did not have access to the internet, they could join the meeting audio via telephone.

Meeting convened at 5:04 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Barbara Bruno, Commissioners Jack Burns, Ric Rioux, Dawn McComb, Tom Kenaston, and Kyla Topham

EXCUSED: Susan McPartland from Zion National Park

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the electronic meeting.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Jack Burns to approve the agenda. Seconded by Ric Rioux.

McComb: Aye

Burns:

Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

General announcements: There were no announcements.

A. Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

1. Geologic Hazard Ordinance: Recently Commissioners and community members attended a presentation with experts from the Utah Geologic Survey (UGS) to learn more about geologic hazards and a geologic hazard ordinance. Mr. Dansie indicated the current ordinance draft combined previous work from the Planning Commission and language from a model ordinance prepared by the UGS. In order to streamline the ordinance and make the information more accessible to a reader, technical details regarding standards for each type of hazard would be moved into a manual the Town Council would adopt by resolution.

Mr. Dansie noted the Utah Legislature was currently reviewing a bill (HB 98) that could affect when a geotechnical report was required. If this bill passed, the Town may have to consider alterations to the geotechnical report requirement even though preparation of this report was in accordance with current policy.

The Commission reviewed the draft ordinance language and discussed refinements and clarifications.

- A number of elements from the USG model ordinance were removed because the hazards were not applicable to Springdale; however, the section about radon gas was retained.

Mr. Burns asked how often the Town required a third-party review.

- This was only required for areas where the Town needed assistance in determining whether a development would place people at unreasonable risk of harm from natural hazard. This was by far the exception and currently the Town absorbed costs for this review. The geologic hazard ordinance made it clear these costs were now the responsibility of the applicant.
- For the geologic hazard investigation, Mr. Dansie indicated there were a number of items without standards. This process would add all the additional study requirements into the ordinance not currently there.

Mr. Rioux felt the USG presentation was informative and their model ordinance very helpful. Referencing page 4 of the draft ordinance, Mr. Rioux suggested the 500 square foot minimum, which triggered a geotechnical review, be lowered.

- To address concerns, Ms. Bruno recommended language be added that tied human occupancy in a structure to the geotechnical report trigger. Mr. Burns and Ms. Topham agreed.

Mr. Burns asked about the requirement occupants be notified in the case of transient lodging use.

- Mr. Dansie said the ordinance did require recordation that a geologic hazard investigation had been done on the property. This would alert future owners. It did not however include notice to prospective renters.

Ms. McComb asked about drainage study and flood mitigation requirements.

- Mr. Dansie said there were standards for development in mapped flood hazard areas, but not for potential flooding. The UGS model ordinance contained language about geologic flood hazards that could be modified for Springdale.
- Ms. Topham agreed this was a good point. She had experience with flooding and water runoff affecting her residential property which was attributed to recent development in the area.

The Planning Commission discussed drainage issues and concern how properties influenced each other. Another consideration was the impact of landscape and the introduction of irrigation water to an area. Commissioners agreed a drainage study should be required of every residential development and not just tied to the geologic hazard ordinance.

Mr. Dansie would incorporate Commissioner comments and edits into the draft. In an effort to engage and notify the community about this ordinance, staff had published two newsletter articles, sent an email, and organized the UGS information event. The Planning Commission agreed to hold a public hearing on the ordinance in their March 17th regular meeting.

2. General Plan Update: Review Goals and Objectives for each Element: Commissioners reviewed and discussed the General Plan elements in sequential order.

Element One – Land Use and Town Appearance.

In the current General Plan, Ms. Topham appreciated language which placed specific attention on avoidance of rezoning to commercial near residential properties. Following that vein, she suggested language be added to section C1 of this element to achieve that goal.

Except under certain instances, Mr. Burns suggested zone changes should not be considered outside a General Plan update. Mr. Burns was specifically concerned with the loss of agricultural property in Town which was character defining in maintaining a small, rural atmosphere.

- Mr. Kenaston said one exception to restricting a zone change might be if it addressed creative housing solutions.

Element Two – Transportation.

Commissioners discussed a vehicle-free concept where visitors parked outside Town, and participating in regional transportation efforts that created park & ride locations along the SR-9 corridor. It was agreed communication should be pushed out to visitors before they got here, specifically real-time information.

Element Three – Housing.

Mr. Kenaston integrated suggestions from the Town’s housing study into this section. The language used was intended to quantify the need for employee housing.

Ms. Topham knew first hand that many families were priced out of Springdale. She also commented that some architectural design standards were pricey which made affordability more difficult.

Commissioners discussed one of the biggest threats to affordability was the trend to turn properties into short-term rentals.

- Mr. Burns said it was a complicated issue. Private developers were not motivated to build multi-family structures then charge low rent. He felt there should be Town or state-controlled housing in order to regulate affordability.

The Planning Commission considered housing options and opportunities. They agreed it was important to preserve the character of the community. More commercial development created a greater need for more employee housing.

- Mr. Kenaston suggested deed restrictions in order to ensure housing uses were protected into the future.
- Ms. Topham said it was a cyclical issue wherein better housing enticed better employees who stayed longer.

Element Four – Economic Development.

Commissioners considered a number of issues from this element including: how to par leigh tourism revenue to develop amenities and infrastructure that would benefit residents; how to spread visitors around the region to alleviate impact; education and messaging that enticed quality instead of quantity.

- Mr. Kenaston suggested adding language that emphasized a balance between commercial expansion and the residential community.

Element Five – Municipal and Public Services.

A strong water conservation message was needed. A build-out study was done last year looking at water consumption but it did not specifically consider the prolonged effects of drought.

- Mr. Rioux noted build-out projections were based on current zoning. If zones changed, usage numbers could be affected.

The remaining General Plan elements would be discussed at the next Planning Commission work meeting.

B. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 7:01pm made by Dawn McComb. Seconded by Barbara Bruno.

McComb: Aye

Burns: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.



APPROVAL: Barbara Bruno

DATE: 3-17-21

Darci Carlson
Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

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 for more information.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

REMOTE MEETING ATTENDANCE RECORD

Meeting: Planning Commission Meeting 3/3/2021

Passek

Erin Tyler