



118 Lion Blvd • PO Box 187 • Springdale, UT 84767 • (435) 772-3434

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2023, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD – SPRINGDALE, UT 84767

A live broadcast of this meeting will be available to the public for viewing/listening only.

****Please see the stream information below****

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Discussion regarding regulations for open air displays related to outdoor bike displays, as well as additional regulations for e-bike rental businesses.
2. Discussion of potential revisions to the Town's regulations of Accessory Dwelling Units.
3. Review of Draft Open Space Plan for the Town of Springdale.

B. Adjourn

***To access the live stream for this public meeting,
please visit or click the link below:**

<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>

APPROVED

Tom Kenealy

DATE

9/6/2023

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately 11:46 am on 8/31/2023
by *Aren Emerson*

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Aren Emerson at 435.772.3434 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/agendacenter>



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2023, 2023, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 05:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Tom Kenaston, Commissioners Noel Benson, Adam Hyatt, Pam Inghram, and Jonathan Shafer from Zion National Park

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chair Kyla Topham and Commissioners Terry Kruschke and Pat Campbell.

Ms. Emerson announced that Mr. Kenaston would be acting as chair, and Mr. Hyatt was a voting member for the meeting.

Approval of the Agenda:

Adam Hyatt made a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Noel Benson.

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Hyatt: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: No general announcements

A. Non-Action Items

- 1. Discussion regarding regulations for open air displays related to outdoor bike displays, as well as additional regulations for e-bike rental businesses.**

Mr. Dansie stated this was an item the Commission had discussed on several occasions in the past. The intent of the revision was to get more control over open air displays that contained bicycles or e-bikes. The concern was that they tended to draw large crowds and caused conflict with pedestrians and vehicles when close to the sidewalk and right of way. The changes also allowed for more certainty on where the open air display boundaries were. He updated the document to reflect those comments made during the last review.

Mr. Kruschke and Mr. Campbell submitted public comments in their absence.

Ms. Inghram asked Mr. Dansie about 10-7A-4C(1). She requested that the section be re-worded for clarity. In addition, she requested signage be removed from 10-7A-4G. The Commission agreed that the more signage there was, the less likely they were to be read.

The Planning Commission discussed the use of physical barriers. Mr. Dansie was instructed to update language in 10-22-7, requiring a physical barrier to prevent the transfer of bikes from the open air display to the sidewalk. The Commission also discussed removing section 7B related to signage.

Mr. Benson had spoken with some bike shop owners regarding the area to train and orient riders. He said several felt it was a good idea. It was not intended to act as an obstacle course.

The Planning Commission moved the item forward for a public hearing.

2. Discussion of potential revisions to the Town's regulations of Accessory Dwelling Units.

Mr. Dansie outlined the Planning Commission's previously discussed changes to the Town's Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) regulations. The Commission specifically discussed 1) allowing external ADUs in the Foothill Residential (FR) zone, 2) allowing more than one ADU on a property, and 3) allowing caregivers to live in a dwelling unit on the property without going through the ADU process.

The Commission gave general direction to staff on potential changes in these areas. However, the Commission did not previously reach a consensus on these topics. The staff updated the proposed ADU revisions intended to assist with the Commission's discussion. The staff included a notice about ADUs in the September Town newsletter and requested feedback from the community. Town staff would forward any comments from the community to the Commission.

Mr. Dansie reviewed the General Plan goals related to ADUs. He surmised that the General Plan gave a consistent and clear message that expanded uses of ADUs were appropriate if the character of existing residential neighborhoods could be protected and retained.

Mr. Kruschke and Mr. Campbell submitted public comments in their absence.

Ms. Topham noted a typo in 10-22-9(D)(6) and clarified that it should read "which may either be internal or external."

Mr. Hyatt expressed concern about increased density. Ms. Inghram asked Mr. Hyatt to clarify density and if it was based on people vs. structure. Mr. Hyatt felt the two went hand in hand, and Ms. Inghram countered that density would be based on the number of structures, not people, because some families may be larger in numbers than others.

Mr. Hyatt expressed hesitancy with changes to zoning as it would instantly give higher value to those properties affected.

Mr. Benson asked Mr. Dansie about the recent state mandate on internal ADUs and properties that had a Homeowner Association (HOA). Mr. Dansie said the Town did not regulate what HOAs or Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) did, and the state law did not mandate HOAs through their CC&Rs to allow internal ADUs.

The Commissioners discussed parking issues and concerns.

Ms. Inghram requested the definition of the caregiver not be limited to providing care to an occupant and be expanded to include a person who cared for the property.

Mr. Hyatt suggested allowing a full-time caregiver to be the occupant of the residence or the occupant of the ADU.

The Commissioners felt that changing the name from Accessory Dwelling Unit to Guest House could make it easier to understand. Mr. Dansie agreed it could eliminate some confusion.

Mr. Dansie provided public feedback options, which included an online survey, a public workshop, or a public hearing.

Most of the Commission expressed interest in conducting a survey. Mr. Dansie would draft survey questions for the Commissioners to review.

Mr. Dansie would refine the ordinance language and provide a draft to the Commissioners.

3. Review of Draft Open Space Plan for the Town of Springdale.

Mr. Dansie presented the Town of Springdale Open Space Plan and requested feedback from the Commissioners for content and format. He suggested discussing a potential strategy to help encourage the preservation of pasture areas through a partnership with the Town.

Ms. Inghram asked Mr. Dansie if additional pastures in town were irrigated with Town-supplied water, aside from the pasture in Kinesava, which members of that subdivision had voiced concerns about the rates. Mr. Dansie indicated some smaller pasture areas were Town customers.

It was noted the Virgin River Land Trust needed to be changed to the Virgin River Land Preservation Association, and the Natural and Cultural Resources Sub Goal G needed to be modified.

There was a discussion regarding water rights and land preservation strategies. More data was needed for further conversation on the matter.

Mr. Kenaston suggested language in the purchase of development rights that stated the Town of Springdale could purchase some or all of the development rights to a property.

Mr. Campbell submitted public comments regarding the Hillside Protection Zone (HPZ), indicating it needed additional work.

Mr. Benson suggested the HPZ had an increased minimum lot size.

Mr. Dansie said the HPZ was added as an item the Commission may want to consider including in the Open Space Plan and would not be an ordinance.

Ms. Inghram proposed including mesa properties in the HPZ.

Mr. Shafer asked the Commission if they had considered a land swap.

- Mr. Benson said a land swap was something that had been discussed.
- Mr. Dansie pointed out that language in the draft referred to a land swap, but it could be revised to be more specific.

Mr. Dansie asked the Commission if they wanted to include a section that detailed partnerships with pasture owners on water conservation.

Mr. Zimmerman, a member of the community, approached the podium and said he had floated the idea of a partnership some time ago. The thought process behind it was that the plan currently had three options. One, the Town buys the land; two, convince a property owner to donate it; or three, buy the future development rights. Buying it and buying future development rights would be very expensive. The partnership would be very inexpensive for the Town if done right and achieved the same result. In his view, it was probably the most likely to achieve a result for the Town in terms of preserving open space property. He thought there was a benefit and offered it for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Benson shared concern that a temporary preservation scenario seemed a bit counterintuitive.

Mr. Dansie would take the Commission's feedback and revise the draft for review at an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Inghram had an unrelated question for Mr. Dansie, She asked if he was aware of any current or upcoming applications for workforce housing.

- Mr. Dansie stated he was not, but that was privileged information until someone made a formal application.

Mr. Kenaston inquired about a database project that could query parcel information.

- Mr. Dansie shared that the Town had partnered with Utah Tech University through their City Alliance Program, where they would bring the resources of the University to the Town and help with projects the Town did not have the ability to accomplish on its own. The database project was identified as one that the Town wanted them to assist with. The Town would work with them to review each parcel and identify characteristics that the Planning Commission had asked for in the past. The database project was still in the development phase.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Ms. Inghram to Adjourn at 6:46 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Benson.

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Hyatt: Aye


Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.





Robin Romero, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: 

DATE: 10/18/23

Recording of the public meeting is available by accessing the Town's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Work Meeting Date 09/06/2023

ATTENDEES:

PAUL ZIMMERMAN

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)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)