



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 16, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 05:02 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Ric Rioux, Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Kyla Topham, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

ABSENT: Commissioner Adam Hyatt

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Planning Technician Shelly Heaton, Town Clerk Darci Carlson, and Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the meeting.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the agenda. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Oath of Office:

Ms. Carlson led Mr. Benson in the Oath of Office.

Commission discussion and announcements:

Mr. Dansie commended the Commissioners for their hard work in initiating and moving their projects along. He announced that he had reserved Wednesday mornings for Commissioner meetings to serve them better.

Ms. Carlson reminded the Commissioners of the Public Officials Training scheduled on February 18th at 9:00 AM.

A. Action Items

- 1. Public Hearing – Zone Change:** Changing the zone on parcel S-150-D from Valley Residential (VR) to Public Use (PU) for the purposes of expanding the Town of Springdale River Park.

The Town code stated three circumstances in which a zone change could be granted. 1. The zone change would promote the goals and objectives of the General Plan and or the Land Use Ordinance. 2. The zone change would correct a manifest error. 3. The zone change accommodated some substantial changes in conditions. The Town recently acquired parcel S-150-D, adjacent to the developed portion of the George A. Barker River Park. The Town intended to incorporate that parcel into the River Park and make it part of the developed portion of the park. Changing the zone from VR to PU better reflected the future intended use for that property.

Commission Questions to Staff:

Mr. Benson asked if the current park was in a public use zone.

- There were two parts to the River Park; the developed part was zoned PU. Across the river was still located in the FR zone.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

The Commission discussed that since the park was adjacent to the current park and aligned with the goals in the General Plan, they should recommend approval.

Motion made by Kyla Topham that the Commission recommends a zone change from VR to PU on parcel S-150-D. This motion is based on the following findings. 1. Changing the zone promotes the General Plan by ensuring that the property will have public use, such as a park or open space. 2. Placing the property in the PU zone will make the zoning designation on the property more consistent with the intended future use, therefore, avoiding any future manifest errors. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Exterior building material review: Canyon Springs Lot 21.

The Town received a request to review the proposed metal siding material in place of the original approved material over a portion of the garage on Lot 21 in the Canyon Springs subdivision. The Town code prohibits aluminum siding but does allow wood siding and any synthetic material that the Planning Commission determined resembled an approved material and was also complementary to the building surroundings and natural features. The Commission needed to decide whether the material was sufficiently similar to wood siding.

The Commission discussed the negative impact of the proposed siding on the adjacent neighbors from the material's reflectivity. They were concerned with potential future applications utilizing the material over larger spaces if the Commission approved the proposed metal siding.

Motion made by Pam Inghram that the Planning Commission denies the proposed alternative material. After examining the material, the Commission determined that although it was a wood grain appearance it had reflective qualities that were not similar to the materials on the approved list and would negatively impact the adjacent residents. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

3. Annexation Policy Plan: Adoption of an annexation policy plan establishing the annexation boundaries for the Town of Springdale.

The Commission previously held a public hearing on the current item. They made recommendations to the Annexation Consultant which included minor revisions to the annexation policy plan map and updated language from the National Park Service. The Consultant had prepared altered language concerning sensitive lands. The revised language did not preclude the Town from taking advantage of resources offered through land management agencies.

Mr. Benson asked if Mr. Dansie could clarify why the justifications for exclusions were needed.

- The state code required the Town to have justifications for why they chose not to annex an area.

Ms. Topham asked what the benefits of being an annexed property were.

- In general, the benefits for the property owner would be to take advantage of the municipal services offered by those cities.

Mr. Campbell asked if a property were to be annexed, what would the Town have to provide.

- The state code required the annexation policy plan to have a physical analysis of the impact of providing services to the annexed area on both the existing residents of Springdale and the residents of the annexation area. Because the Town would not provide the services, the physical analysis was not included in the plan.

Motion made by Pam Inghram that the Commission recommends approval of the proposed annexation policy plan including the updated language of “Prior to annexation the Town should survey the area to ensure that sensitive areas including areas contiguous to other publicly owned sensitive lands are inventoried and protected by the annexation agreement“ related to sensitive lands adjacent to public lands for the Town of Springdale, as presented in the Commission’s meeting of February 16, 2022. This motion is based on the following findings: The Town of Springdale does not currently have an annexation policy plan. Per section 10-2-401.5 of the Utah Code, the Town must have adopted such a plan prior to consideration of any annexation requests. Adopting the proposed annexation policy plan will prepare the Town to respond to future annexation requests. The annexation criteria in the proposed annexation policy plan will emphasize the need to develop the annexation area in a manner consistent with the General Plan, emphasizing the preservation of open space and sensitive lands. These criteria will help preserve the Town’s village character and promote the goals of the General Plan in the event the annexation area is incorporated into the Town boundaries. The proposed annexation policy plan meets the requirements for annexation policy plans established in section 10-2-401.5 of the Utah Code. The proposed plan: 1. Avoids possible gaps between or overlaps with the expansion areas of other municipalities; 2. Considers population growth projections for the municipality and adjoining areas for the next 20 years; 3. Limits projected costs of infrastructure, urban services, and public facilities necessary; 4. Considers in conjunction with the municipality’s General Plan, the need over the next 20 years for additional land suitable for residential, commercial, and industrial development; 5. Considers the reasons for including agricultural lands, forests.

recreational areas, and wildlife management areas in the municipality: 6. It is guided by the principles outlined in Utah Code Subsection 10-2-403(5). Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

Motion by Tom Kenaston to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 05:45 pm made by Noel Benson Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Aren Emerson, Deputy 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 for more information.