



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

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A SPECIAL MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021 AT 5:00 PM

This Commission meeting will not have an anchor location and will be conducted entirely via electronic means. Commission members will connect remotely. The meeting will be available to the public for live viewing/listening. If you do not have access to the internet, you can join the audio via telephone.

****Please see electronic login information below.**

Attending Clerk: Katy Brown

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

1. Geologic Hazards Ordinance Update
2. SR9 Corridor Design Standards Ordinance Update
3. Commissioner Reports on General Plan Progress

B. Adjourn

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88313518336?pwd=UjFpSjRpdjAkdjdpUkZlMzZkdjZ0Q0TjZkdz09>

Meeting ID: 883 1351 8336

Passcode: 8eR6k9

One tap mobile

+16699009128 88313518336# *204790W US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 883 1351 8336

Passcode: 234790

APPROVED Barbara Bruno DATE 2-3-21

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately 4:00 am/pm by [Signature]

This notice is provided as a courtesy to the community and is not the official notice for this meeting/hearing. This notice is not required by town ordinance or policy. Failure of the Town to provide this notice or failure of a property owner, resident, or other interested party to receive this notice does not constitute a violation of the Town's noticing requirements or policies. If you have questions regarding any of the agenda items or other community development comments, please contact Community Development staff at 435-772-3434 or tdansre@springdale.utah.gov.

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Dera Carlson at 435-772-3434 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Agenda materials for agenda items can be found on the town website at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/AgendaCenter/Planning-Commission/2>



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

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.

Meeting convened at 5:00 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Barbara Bruno, Commissioners Ric Rioux, Jack Burns, Ric Rioux, Dawn McComb, Tom Kenaston, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie and Deputy Clerk Katy Brown recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the electronic meeting.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Ric Rioux to approve the agenda. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

McComb: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Bruno established the voting order to be alphabetical by first name. She also asked that all Commission members enable their webcams so everyone would be visible and to raise a hand to signal the desire to make comment.

Mr. Dansie announced that Kyla Topham was on the upcoming Town Council agenda to be appointed as an alternate Commission member. The mayor was still searching for another individual to fill the remaining alternate position.

A. Discussion/Non-Action Items

1. Geologic Hazards Ordinance Update: (20 mins) The Geologic Hazards ordinance had been reviewed by industry experts who felt that it was lacking specific, objective standards to evaluate development on geologically hazardous property. They recommended an established measurement called 'Factor of Safety,' criteria that would help evaluate the level of risk for stability and landslide issues. They also recommended requiring a more robust variety of pre-development studies. They suggested incorporating some of the provisions from the Draper City geologic hazards ordinance and consulting the Utah Geological Survey (UGS) ordinance as a potential model. There was also potential for Steve Bowman from the UGS to hold a community engagement presentation to help educate the public about geologic hazard regulation.

Ms. Bruno liked the criteria but felt the sample ordinance was technical/overwhelming and may not be well received.

Mr. Rioux felt that having a technical and science driven ordinance was appropriate considering the subject matter.

Mr. Kenaston felt that the ordinance presented was fully vetted by specialists in the field. He suggested making a summary version available to help with public outreach.

Mr. Burns said the more details, the better. Geologic hazard by nature was a complex issue and the current regulations were not adequate. He would be interested in how other communities sought public support for the ordinances. He also suggested adding an appendix.

Ms. McComb liked the 'Factor of Safety' concept and felt the Commission should consider ways to craft the language in such a way that would be easy to read by the layperson.

Staff noted that the Town had included the subject in a few newsletters and sent a town wide email and no public comment had been submitted yet.

The Commission was interested in having Dr. Bowman present for the public on February 24th and directed staff to schedule a community engagement event with him. Staff would also forward a copy of the Draper ordinance for the Commission to review before their next discussion.

2. SR9 Corridor Design Standards Ordinance Update: Staff had engaged a professional architect, Burke Cartwright, to offer feedback on the drafted design standards for the corridor. One of the concepts that came out of the meeting was to create a Design Review Board. A reviewing board would add a step in the development process and focus purely on design, architecture, and appearance of designs prior to being presented to the Planning Commission. In considering the Design Review Board concept, the Commission was tasked with discussing scope and member composition. It was imperative to strive for balance between achieving the best results for the Town in terms of design while ensuring an effective and efficient process to administer for staff, commission, and applicants. A Design Review Board would present an additional burden for the applicant and additional resources from town administration, which was acceptable if a Design Review Board ultimately served it's intended purpose.

Ms. Bruno felt the review board needed to be a mix of residents and design professionals and not necessarily a public body.

Mr. Burns liked the concept but worried that the current Town ordinances failed to provide clear design guidelines for the board to use as criteria. It wouldn't make sense to task a review board with the same conundrums that the Planning Commission had been struggling with. As far as adding a step in the design process, Springdale was well worth the investment to ensure design compatibility throughout Town. He also cautioned against developing restrictions that only a select few could afford.

Mr. Kenaston was hesitant about creating a Design Review Board and didn't want to create an overly onerous development process. He was in favor of spending more time crafting clearer ordinance language.

The Commission wanted to prioritize refining design standards language and seek another architect's opinion on the draft. In the meantime, potential members of the board could be considered. The Commission preferred that the review board be comprised of one design professional, two residents, and one Planning Commission member. They directed staff to gauge the Council's interest in the Design Review Board concept.

3. Commissioner Reports on General Plan Progress: Each Commissioner had been assigned General Plan topics to perform a more in-depth analysis of current conditions and future needs. The Commissioners reported their progress and impressions so far.

Jack Burns – Land Use and Town Appearance: Mr. Burns began by documenting existing conditions. He also crafted some desired conditions to address what was currently lacking. He had spent more time working on the Town Appearance topic than on Land Use and needed to gain more familiarity in that realm. His overarching question was how to balance residential needs with new development.

Dawn McComb – Transportation: Ms. McComb had spoken to some stakeholders about current conditions and future desires. Respondents reported a desire for sustainable transportation and focusing on enhancing existing resources. Two distinct viewpoints emerged after her initial interviews. One group favored more parking in front of businesses in the commercial center of Town. The other group wanted to promote a pedestrian/bike-only commercial district and redirect vehicle traffic so that it wasn't a factor in the commercial portion of Town.

- Mr. Burns urged Ms. McComb to think about where technology might be headed in the future. It would be helpful to consider what infrastructure might be required to accommodate more electric vehicles and the possibility of autonomous vehicles.
- Ms. McPartland suggested considering longevity in the event that big tour bus trends change. The commercial tour bus industry was already showing signs of changes.

Dawn McComb - Parks & Recreation and the Arts: Any art initiatives in Springdale should be community-centered. She had reached out to members of The Mesa art community to see how the Town could support the arts and how arts could support the Town. The common desire was to use art and recreation resources as a means to convey that Springdale is a community of kindness, acceptance, and diversity.

Tom Kenaston – Housing: In identifying current conditions surrounding housing, Mr. Kenaston saw an overabundance of high-end options and a lack of 'life-cycle' housing for entry level house-holders. He had spoken with Benj Becker who had conducted an extensive housing analysis in 2020. He touched on the current constraints certain income demographics face when building a home in Springdale. Development costs in Springdale were typically 20-30% higher than other areas in Southern Utah largely because of transportation and per diem required to pay workers. Mr. Kenaston was in favor of seeking public monies/grants or tax credits to infuse more diversity into the housing stock. He referred to a 'self-help model' that would prioritize housing for first responders and teachers. He had continuing support from community housing stakeholders such as Tracy Duston, Lisa Zumpft, Barbara Bruno, Ric Rioux, and Benj Becker, who were all anxious to serve in advisory positions with future committees.

Barbara Bruno – Economic development: Ms. Bruno reported that she and Mr. Dansie had met with Supt. Jeff Bradybaugh to discuss how Springdale could best support Zion National Park. In assessing the current conditions there was a clear need for more public restrooms, overflow parking from Zion, and more shuttle stops. She scheduled a meeting with Kevin Lewis of Greater Zion and stakeholder Nate Wells to broaden the scope to include the greater Zion area. SR9 design ordinance could deter big box stores, leaving more room for local businesses.

Susan McPartland – Municipal Services: Ms. McPartland had discussed the topic with the Park sustainability coordinator and she wanted to see if those concepts would translate into Springdale. She planned to focus more time on assessing the current conditions.

Barbara Bruno– Public Health: Ms. Bruno and Mr. Dansie had a good conversation with Mike and Helen McMahan who provided historical context of the Zion Medical Clinic which used to be affiliated with Intermountain Health care. Current patient intake was limited to a degree based on insurance networks. Ms. Bruno wanted to look more into wellness programs as a way to promote preventative healthcare within the community.

Ric Rioux – Cultural and Natural resources: Mr. Rioux listed the abundant resources present in Springdale: Clean air/water supply, river corridor, low noise impacts, wildlife, night skies, and view corridor. He felt that the vehicle for protection of resources was primarily ordinance crafting and refining. He was passionate about securing Dark Sky certification and wanted to move forward with it.

Mr. Dansie would provide feedback in the google docs that each Commissioner had been working on for their chosen topics. The Commission had originally set a deadline of March 2021 to have an outline of the goals and strategies for the General Plan.

B. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 6:54 pm made by Dawn McComb. Seconded by Jack Burns.

Bruno: Aye


Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

McComb: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Attending Clerk: 



APPROVAL: Barbara Bruno DATE: 2-17-21

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 Work Meeting 2/3/2021

Kyla Topham