



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, MARCH 1, 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 electronic login information below****

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Review of proposed clarifications to the development standards in the Agricultural zone
2. Review of housing committee recommendations for a workforce housing overlay zone
3. Review of proposed ordinance changes regarding development on split-zoned parcels

B. Adjourn

APPROVED 

DATE 03/01/2023

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately 10:30 am on 02/24/2023 by AREN EMERSON.

****To access the electronic webinar, please click the Zoom link below:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84058309956>

Meeting ID: 840 5830 9956

One tap mobile
US: +12532050468,,84058309956#

Dial by your location
US: +1 256 205 0468

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Darci Carlson 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, MARCH 1, 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, Pam Inghram, 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.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: The Town's birthday celebration would be held on March 11, 2023. This was an opportunity for the community to get to know the members who serve them and offer suggestions and insight on how to serve the community better.

A. Non-Action Items

1. Review of proposed clarifications to the development standards in the Agricultural zone

The Town Council instructed staff to draft potential revisions to sections of the Town code related to the Agricultural (AG) Zone. Springdale contained one agriculturally zoned parcel (S-132-D). The parcel measured approximately 19.7 acres. Section 10-10 of the Town code outlined the purpose and objectives of the AG zone. The intent for the revisions was to clarify areas of the code to achieve those purposes and objectives more fully. The proposed amendments would clarify that any accessory structures would need to be essential to the agricultural use of the property. The minimum front setback was currently 30 feet. The proposal was to increase that setback to 100 feet for structures larger than 3,000 square feet or greater than 26 feet in height. Another amendment would encourage the clustering of buildings and introduce an overall cap of 40,000 square feet of building floor area. The final revision would clarify the permitted restaurant use in the AG zone to allow one restaurant in the Town's AG zone. This revision also presented a requirement that any restaurant must incorporate food grown into its menu. The Commission's objective was to discuss the proposed revisions and determine if they were agreeable.

During the discussion, Ms. Inghram proposed implementing a minimum acreage for future AG-zoned parcels to limit potential subdivisions. However, Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission that in addition to the proposed 40,000 square foot regulation, there was an existing requirement on the amount of landscape needed to be provided in the AG zone. He suggested that the Commission could use the open space or landscape requirement to maintain the agricultural open space feel. Furthermore, he expressed his concern that adding a 15-acre minimum area requirement for the AG zone might not allow any new areas in the Town to be designated as agricultural, given that there were few candidates in the Town with properties of 15 acres that could be zoned as AG. He urged the Commission to be mindful of which areas could potentially be zoned AG

in the future.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on the term 'dwelling group.'

- Dwelling group referred to a structure in conjunction with the agricultural use on the property. An example would be a single-family dwelling where the ranch manager would reside

Mr. Kruschke asked how the Town would identify the principal and accessory structures on a property. It was explained that the principal structure would be in conjunction with the property's primary use, while the accessory structure would support the use of a property. Additionally, he asked if the revisions would have a maximum number of buildings on a property in the AG zone, and it was clarified that there was not a cap on the number of buildings, and setbacks and landscape requirements could be tools to help govern that.

When asked about the goals of the AG zone revisions, Mr. Dansie stated that the Planning Commission identified technical changes to the AG zone in a previous discussion that the Council felt were important to address.

Mr. Kenaston suggested encouraging restaurants to incorporate locally grown products rather than mandating it.

Ms. Topham suggested prohibiting future restaurants in the agricultural zone.

- Mr. Benson wondered why the Town would not encourage more restaurants if they were not negatively affecting the neighbors.
- Ms. Inghram stated that restaurants must be in commercially zoned areas and taxed accordingly.

Mr. Dansie highlighted that in recent communication with the property owner Ryan Lee, he had expressed a willingness to meet the community's request by adding a restaurant on his property.

Most of the Commissioners supported the ordinance revision with the clarifications identified, and they requested that staff investigate several issues, including the impact of implementing a minimum lot size, conducting a more thorough analysis of the maximum building size of 40,000 square feet, and clarifying the distinction between primary and accessory buildings. Additionally, the Commission suggested encouraging on-site food production to promote the use of locally sourced food products.

2. Review of housing committee recommendations for a workforce housing overlay zone

Last year, the Planning Commission reviewed a proposal from the housing committee for a workforce housing overlay zone. That overlay zone would allow more housing options for employees of Springdale businesses or employees from Zion National Park. This was based on the housing study completed in 2020 and the direction in the General Plan about providing more attainable housing options for employees of local businesses. At that time, the Commission directed the housing committee to review the overlay zone. The housing committee spent the last six months researching and revising the workforce housing overlay zone. At that time, they worked with a survey consultant to conduct a Town-wide survey regarding community attitudes toward housing, specifically about different housing types. In addition, the housing committee researched the housing strategies of other resort communities. They had discussions with employers in the Town to see their housing needs. They also worked with outside experts to get feedback on housing issues in general. Based on their research, the housing committee revised the workforce housing overlay zone and sought the Commission's feedback on the draft outline. They will take the feedback to formulate a formal ordinance recommendation in a future meeting.

Ms. Inghram requested data regarding how many rentals were in Springdale.

- Mr. Dansie indicated that they were working with Utah Tech University through their city alliance program to hopefully conduct an inventory of the housing options in the Town.

Mr. Kruschke stated there were currently no limitations to which zones this could be applied to and wondered if the Commission should identify specific zones for the overlay zone.

- The Commercial zones currently allowed residential uses and allowed more density than the overlay zone would.

Ms. Inghram asked the reasoning for increasing units per acre from 12 to 16 in the proposal.

- The reasoning for the increase was based on the Town's survey results and in speaking with affordable housing providers.

Ms. Inghram asked how the Town defined a unit related to the proposal.

- A dwelling unit was defined as a kitchen, bathroom, and any number of sleeping areas.
- She was concerned about the required parking spaces, now understanding the number of bedrooms allowed in a unit.

Mr. Benson asked if the workforce units would be predetermined.

- Yes, they would be deed-restricted for the Town to have enforcement capabilities.
- The proposal stated that the workforce units needed to be comparable in size and finish to the market rate units.

Ms. Inghram wondered why ownership units were being reintroduced.

- In speaking with affordable housing providers, they encouraged a mix of rental and ownership units because of the mix of needs and jobs in Town.
- Currently, the Town was involved in finding a potential buyer for the home in Redhawk for sale. The Town received 21 applications from people who lived and worked in the canyon who wanted to purchase that home, supporting the demand for ownership and rental units.

During the meeting, Ms. Inghram presented a chart (Attachment #1) that highlighted important factors to consider when buying a home, including mortgage interest, cost per square foot, and gross annual income. She explained that the prices of building materials, land, and mortgage interest rates have recently gone up. To illustrate this point, she gave examples of the income needed to cover various expenses such as taxes, mortgage insurance, and land costs for each housing option. She expressed concern that it would not create family housing.

Ms. McPartland stated that she knew a few people who worked in the park that would qualify for ownership units and was actively searching for homes to buy.

Mr. Kruschke emphasized that the property was initially designed as workforce housing. He pointed out that altering it to accommodate families exclusively would deviate from its intended purpose and require significant changes to the existing layout. Mr. Kenaston agreed and stated that while individual workers might struggle to afford the units on their own, the opportunity to share the space could benefit multiple employees in Town.

Mr. Campbell wondered how the proposal would work mechanically for retirees. He suggested adding language regarding a maximum time limit for retirees to ensure the workforce of Springdale would occupy the workforce housing units.

- The idea was not to kick out retirees but to ensure that the workforce housing was not occupied by retired people. Language could be added to address that concern.

Mr. Kruschke suggested a mandatory review of the overlay zone after a period of time to consider revisions.

Ms. Topham suggested including short and long-term disability, illness, and birth in the life-changing events list.

During the discussion, Mr. Kruschke proposed a clarification to the original proposal. He suggested that individuals participating in the zone should not be allowed to own any additional property in Washington County. Mr. Benson proposed an alternative approach prohibiting participants from owning property in any county. Mr. Kruschke expressed his concern that such a restriction could hinder participation in the program, particularly for workers who had already invested in other properties, and wondered if a radius method would be a more useful tool. He argued that this could ultimately undermine the goal of providing housing for the workforce. Mr. Kruschke also identified a drafting error in using the term 'active employed households,' which he recommended be replaced with 'qualified households' for the housing committee to review.

Mr. Benson concluded that the housing survey was not presented in a way that asked if multi-family housing was supported in Town. He expressed concern that residents may have with the increased density being placed close to their homes. He recommended conducting an additional survey to see what the appetite in Town would be.

3. Review of proposed ordinance changes regarding development on split-zoned parcels

Recently, the Commission heard several different development proposals with split-zoned properties. Split-zoned parcels were challenging to administer and complicated the planning and development review. Currently, there was nothing in the Town code that prohibited a split-zoned parcel. Commissioners Benson and Inghram suggested revisions to section 10-20 of the code that would prevent the creation of new split-zoned properties. The proposed

revisions would also clarify that further development on existing split-zoned properties would be required to comply with all the requirements of the zone where development was located based on the area of the property contained within that zone. The staff report included a model showing potential development on a hypothetical one-acre Village Commercial/Valley Residential (VR/VC) split-zoned parcel.

Mr. Kruschke suggested the Commission consider providing a mechanism to encourage owners of split-zoned parcels to request a single zone over their property.

Mr. Benson stated that they wanted to keep the regulation consistent with other development, not on split-zoned properties.

Mr. Kruschke was concerned about adding the setback restrictions to the center of the property. He suggested adding an option that if an owner of a split-zoned property developed to the most restrictive zoning requirements, they might essentially treat the entire property as if it were in that zone.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Pam Inghram to Adjourn at 07:10 p.m. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Campbell: Aye


Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.



Aren Emerson, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: _____



DATE: _____

4/19/23

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

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING Date 03/01/2023

IN-PERSON ATTENDEES:

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)

REMOTE ATTENDEES:

LAURA DOTY

Name (please print)

KELLY MCKEAN

Name (please print)

PILEY

Name (please print)

TOM DANSE

Name (please print)

RYAN LEE

Name (please print)

DARCI CARLSON

Name (please print)

PASSEK

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

| Cost per Sq Foot (not including land) | Square Footage of Duplex | 30yr Conventional mortgage P & I only at 6.7% | Gross income per month at Mortgage Debt ratio of 28% | Gross income per month at Mortgage Debt ratio of 36% | Gross Annual Income | Gross Annual Income |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| \$ 200.00 | 1500 | \$ 1,936.00 | \$ 6,915.00 | \$ 5,378.00 | \$ 82,980.00 | \$ 64,536.00 |
| \$ 250.00 | 1500 | \$ 2,420.00 | \$ 8,643.00 | \$ 6,722.00 | \$ 39.89 | \$ 31.03 |
| \$ 300.00 | 1500 | \$ 2,904.00 | \$ 10,371.00 | \$ 8,067.00 | \$ 103,716.00 | \$ 80,664.00 |
| | | | | | \$ 49.86 | \$ 38.78 |
| | | | | | \$ 124,452.00 | \$ 96,804.00 |
| | | | | | \$ 59.83 | \$ 46.54 |

Why these assumptions are understated:

1. Does not include cost of land
2. Mortgage payment does not include Taxes, Insurance, or Mortgage Insurance
3. Assumes borrower has excellent credit or no other debt
4. Assumes 40 hour work week, 52 weeks/year