



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2023, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 05:01 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Kyla Topham, Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, Adam Hyatt, Terry Kruschke, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Principal Planner Niall Connolly, and Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson recording. See attached sheet for attendees.

EXCUSED: Commissioner Pam Inghram

Ms. Topham stated that Mr. Hyatt would be a voting member in Ms. Inghram's absence.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Tom Kenaston to approve the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Campbell: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Hyatt: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: There were no general announcements.

A. Non-Action Items

1. Continued discussion on open space planning strategies

The Commission had dedicated several months to working on open space planning strategies. During the previous meeting, the Commission reviewed a draft of the open space plan and provided feedback. Taking their input into account, staff updated the draft accordingly, and the revised version was presented. The Commission needed to provide any additional feedback and revisions necessary for the plan. The changes included a revision of the introductory language, refining the criteria for open space priorities based on feedback, adding a section about acquiring open space through fee-simple purchase or donation, including language outlining partnerships with conservation organizations, and providing a general overview of what could be included in a hillside protection zone. Also, the intention was to remove the TDR process from the open space planning strategies. The Commission needed to review and provide any additional feedback to staff. This would be presented in a future meeting, and the Commission will provide a recommendation to the Town Council.

Mr. Campbell asked if it was appropriate to suggest the conservation agencies in the plan.

- Including specific organizations would be a good idea.

Mr. Benson suggested moving pastures down the list because of the amount of water used.

Ms. McPartland wondered if the Commission could clarify that the preservation of current orchards or pastures was not required to be a continuation of that same use to preserve water.

Mr. Benson wondered about selling the recently acquired property adjacent to River Park. He suggested investigating properties with no open space value to sell and acquire more visible lots along SR-9 with open space.

Mr. Campbell suggested defining the characteristics of different types of open spaces.

- There were some defining characteristics, but they could be more specific.

Mr. Hyatt suggested using similar language to the high visual impact lots to determine hillsides.

Mr. Kruschke understood this was more of a guideline and was not designed to define each specific property. He suggested broadening the definitions to allow for various open spaces.

Ms. McPartland suggested cross-referencing definitions in the code and goals in the General Plan.

Mr. Benson asked about the process for working with landowners on development rights.

- The plan aimed to help the Commission determine if it was worth the Town's time and resources to engage in that discussion. If the property met one of the priority areas identified by the Planning Commission and Town Council, the Town could discuss moving forward with the property owner.

Mr. Benson suggested having a process for the evaluation of candidate properties. He wondered if an open space planning committee should be formed to define the process.

Mr. Dansie noted that the Town Council was allowed to go into a closed meeting to negotiate and acquire property.

The Commission decided to prioritize open space on the valley floor visible from SR-9. They directed staff to draft language consistent with the revisions discussed. They also suggested clarifying some of the definitions to help people understand some of the commonly used development language.

2. Discussion on possible land use regulations and strategies to promote water conservation and more efficient use of water resources

In April, an initial information session about the Town's water system was held at the Commission meeting. Town Manager Rick Wixom also gave an overview of how water was distributed, where it came from, and a basic introduction to the Town's water conservation management plan and goals. One of the key findings from that session was that most of the water use was used in outdoor irrigation. As the Commission looked at conservation, some of the most effective ways of conserving water would have to do with outdoor irrigation. Based on the conversation in April, the Commission recommended that staff look at section 10-1-8, the Water Rights Dedication ordinance, to facilitate acquiring more water rights and shares in the irrigation company. Another area identified was potential revisions to the Landscape Ordinance to promote water conservation. The final item the Commission directed staff to investigate was the building requirements to potentially require or incentivize more water-wise fixtures. The staff report included other water conservation programs as additional strategies to encourage water conservation.

Mr. Dansie explained equivalent residential units (ERU) and stated that it equated to one-quarter acre-feet of water for each ERU. For example, one house was equal to one ERU, and two transient lodging units equated to one ERU. Section 10-1-8 of the Town code required a developer to give the Town one quarter acre foot of water right for each ERU being developed. An in-lieu fee of \$950 could be paid if a developer could not obtain the water to give to the Town. The fee would be utilized to purchase water rights. Since it was cumbersome for a developer to dedicate water rights to the Town because the irrigation company calculated shares differently than the Town, the fee was the most chosen avenue. This made it hard for the Town to acquire water rights.

Mr. Dansie clarified that the Town only had the first right of refusal on water share sales between an irrigation company holder to a non-irrigation company holder. He added that the total water right in the Town between the Town's water right and the irrigation company's water right was sufficient for the Town's anticipated build-out. The ordinance was trying to effectuate the conversion of irrigation water rights to municipal water rights, which could be used for culinary and irrigation water purposes.

Ms. McPartland suggested updating the in-lieu fee to be concurrent with the prices of water shares.

The Commission could designate two Commissioners to participate in a working group to investigate section 10-1-8 of the Town code to potentially bring a recommendation back to the Planning Commission at a future meeting.

The Commission also wanted to look at potential changes to the landscape ordinance to promote water conservation. This was specifically looking at ornamental landscape at houses and businesses to see what could be done to promote more water conservation. The Commission previously reviewed a model ordinance the Washington County Water Conservancy District produced. The Town adopted several strategies they recommended. One of the things recommended that the Town did not have was a limit on the total amount of turf grass that could be used on any property. They recommended a limit of 8% of a property by area be allowed to be turf grass with a cap. Most of the new residential development had no turf grass. Some of the older residential development did have turf grass. There was a significant amount of turf grass being planted on most of the new commercial development. If a maximum limit were to be adopted, it would not apply to existing development. However, they could be eligible for a cash rebate through the Water Conservancy District if they removed their turf grass. The Commission may want to consider a limitation on outdoor water features. Although there were not a lot of outdoor water features, some property owners had installed outdoor water features. The model ordinance recommended limiting them by gallon capacity. The model ordinance also recommended limiting the size of pools or requiring automatic pool covers to reduce evaporation.

Ms. McPartland wondered if native plants or grasses could replace the turf grass to help the wildlife as promoted in the General Plan.

Ms. Topham was hesitant to rule out grass completely. She stated that in certain instances, native grass helped with erosion control and deterred non-native species. It also assisted in keeping the temperatures down. She wondered if educating people would be more beneficial in the long run. Mr. Kruschke thought it would be valuable to provide education on revegetation.

Mr. Benson thought that cutting turf grass down to 8% would be reasonable, as other vegetation options may assist with erosion control.

Mr. Dansie clarified that the Water Conservancy District required a revegetation plan and assisted in educating on the revegetation plan.

The Commission directed staff to assist in creating a committee to investigate the turf grass limitation of 8%. They also discussed exploring the restriction of water features to 200 gallons. Staff was also directed to investigate the possibility of requiring pool covers.

The Water Conservancy District also recommended that the Town require water-receiving features for new construction. This would include requiring all new residential development to have a recirculating hot water pump and requiring all new residential development to use water sense fixtures. This would be an added cost to new development.

Mr. Kruschke recommended investigating different avenues that may be more cost-effective in recirculating hot water.

Mr. Benson and Mr. Campbell were apprehensive about requiring water-saving facilities for residential properties and wanted more information on how much water these fixtures would save.

The Commission was in favor of instant hot water but not necessarily requiring a recirculating pump. They wanted to allow flexibility for different technology as long as it accomplished the goal. It was suggested to consider requiring water-saving fixtures on commercial properties since that would have a more significant impact.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Pat Campbell to Adjourn at 06:57 p.m. The motion was seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Campbell: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Hvatt: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Aren Emerson

Aren Emerson, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: _____

Kepu Topham

DATE: _____

07/19/23

A recording of the public meeting is available by clicking the link or visiting: <https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>
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

ATTENDANCE RECORD Please print your name below

Meeting PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING Date 6/7/2023

IN PERSON ATTENDEES:

**REMOTE ATTENDEES:
(Clerk will complete)**

Jeff Carlson

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Paul Zimmerman

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Bethan Lindsey

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)



FW: THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION Work meeting June 7

Rick Wixom <rwixom@springdale.utah.gov>
To: Darci Carlson <dcarlson@springdale.utah.gov>

Mon, Jun 5, 2023 at 2:40 PM

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 12:47 PM
To: rwixom@springdale.utah.gov
Subject: FW: THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION Work meeting June 7

Rick,

My apologies, I inadvertently left you off this email.

Best Regards,
Paul Zimmerman

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 11:28 AM
To: ktopham@springdale.utah.gov; tkenaston@springdale.utah.gov; nbenson@springdale.utah.gov; pinghram@springdale.utah.gov; pcampbell@springdale.utah.gov; ahyatt@springdale.utah.gov; susan_mcpartland@nps.gov; tkruschke@springdale.utah.gov; tdansie@springdale.utah.gov
Subject: THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION Work meeting June 7

Springdale Planning Commission members,

I am a Springdale resident and the President of the Kinesava Homeowners Association a 27-member development in the heart of our beautiful community.

In support of your meeting this week I have attached a quick briefing detailing an inconsistency between the Town's developing Open Space strategy and its Irrigation Water policies.

Late in the last century the Kinesava Homeowners Association (KHAI) independently purchased and has since been maintaining a 5.5 acre pasture at the corner of SR-9 and Serendipity Lane in the Town of Springdale. KHAI members acquired this land to preserve community viewshed, protect wildlife habitat, preserve a link to the Town's agricultural heritage, and to protect and enhance the community character and rural village feel of the Town of Springdale.

Recently, the Town of Springdale has announced they are interested in the same goals KHAI adopted many years ago. KHAI's pasture is consistent with Town's stated Priority Area Interests as it is maintained as pasture for grazing cattle, adjacent to and in prominent view of State Route 9, and devoid of buildings and structures.

However, KHAI has had to face the reality that maintaining this pasture is now close to unaffordable due to recent changes in the Town's irrigation water rates. Changes that appear in direct opposition to the stated goals of promoting and preserving open spaces within the community. While most irrigation water customers saw a 50% increase over their last year's rates KHAI was singled out (as the Town's only 4" valve user) and hit with a 225% increase in our base rate. As you might understand our 27-member community strongly believes that this is unfair and unjust treatment, especially as we have been good stewards of the community and pioneers of open space preservation.

I appreciate you spending a few minutes of your time in reviewing the attached briefing so that its merits can be considered in the open space strategy discussion. Failure to address this dichotomy and inequity will likely result in greatly diminished interest in open space preservation and ultimately yield to conversion of these diminishing spaces to commercial development.

Looking forward to working with you in the future,

Paul

Paul T. Zimmerman

President, Kinesava Homeowners Association



For your convenience the attachment is provided as either a Powerpoint show or a PDF file.

2 attachments

 **KHAI Open Space and Water.pdf**
233K

 **KHAI Open Space and Water.ppsx**
104K