



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 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: Town Manager Rick Wixom, Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, and Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson recording. See attached sheet for attendees.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Tom Kenaston to approve the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: There were no general announcements.

A. Non-Action Items

1. Update on Transient Lodging Working Group and Housing Committee efforts

Transient Lodging Working Group Updates:

The Town had previously adopted a Transient Lodging Overlay (TLO) zone, which allowed the Town to accept five applications for transient lodging every even-numbered year. The TLO zone contained two categories of transient lodging. Type one, which was traditional hotel or motel style. Type two was short-term rentals, vacation rentals, bed and breakfasts, and hostels. After reviewing the first five applications, the Commission expressed concern with the results of the TLO zone. As a result, the Town Council established a working group to investigate potential revisions to mitigate some of the concerns and impacts on the Town.

The potential revisions included removing type one transient lodging from the TLO zone. They would be permitted in the Village Commercial (VC) and Central Commercial (CC) zones. However, there would be enhanced standards for a property owner to meet to develop a type one facility. Specifically, they would need to provide a restaurant that increased in size with the number of hotel rooms. In addition to those revisions, type one facilities would be required to provide new long-term residential units to help preserve the balance between long-term uses and lodging uses. The number of those units would depend on the number of units in the facility. The front desk requirement would remain, and there was an addition to require a lobby with restrooms. The idea was to leverage the benefits that type one facilities could provide to the community while trying to prevent negative impacts.

Regarding type two facilities, the working group was investigating a possible cap of allowed units. Whether that was a cap with each application period or a total cap of units, type two facilities would still be required to undergo the TLO zone process, but the Town could limit the acceptance time frame. The Town would then have the option to accept any applications they felt promoted the goals of the General Plan. Another suggestion regarding type two

facilities discussed by the working group was a distinction between the VC and CC zones. Meaning that since the CC zone was a denser area, it was ideal for type two to be in that zone.

The working group was still working through the details of each potential revision but searching for feedback from the Commissioners regarding their general direction with revisions.

Mr. Kruschke asked if there were location requirements for the new long-term housing.

- As written, the long-term housing could be located on any property. However, it would be deed restricted to remain long-term housing.

Ms. Inghram asked if the long-term housing units would be required to be in the same zone as the transient lodging.

- No, those were intended to be seen as true residential units.

Ms. Inghram asked for clarification on which zoning standards the residential units would be subject to.

- They would adhere to the zoning standards that apply to the area where the residential units were situated.

Mr. Hyatt wondered if the working group was looking into refining the mixed-use list for type two transient lodging.

- Yes, they planned to refine the mixed-use list for type two.

Housing Committee Updates:

The Commission reviewed a draft of the Workforce Housing Overlay (WHO) zone in their previous meeting. Based on the feedback received, the Housing Committee put together a refined draft of the WHO zone for the Commission to review in a public hearing scheduled for April 19th. Mr. Dansie clarified that the detailed staff report would be distributed to the Commissioners on Friday, April 14th, and encouraged the Commissioners to reach out to staff with any questions.

Ms. Inghram was concerned that the public hearing was happening too quickly and that there would not be enough time to prepare for it properly.

- Mr. Dansie clarified that the Commission reviewed the draft on three separate occasions and gave great feedback to the committee. The committee requested to take the draft to the Commission in a public hearing.

Mr. Dansie also clarified that the Commission did not have to make a final decision on April 19th if they needed time to gather more information.

Mr. Benson expressed concern that more public input was not gathered before the public hearing would be held. He stated that the housing survey was not able to gauge the acceptance level of the Town.

2. Continued discussion on open space planning strategies

The Commission had discussed open space planning for the last couple of months. In those discussions, the Commission identified hillsides, riparian areas, agricultural areas, wildlife corridors, and parklike landscaped areas as open spaces that should be preserved. The staff report contained a rough draft framework for what could be included in an open space plan. Staff wanted the Commission's feedback about the plan's general direction to create a more defined plan. Based on the previous meetings, the draft identified the priority areas the Town wanted to pursue for open space protection. It outlined the important characteristics of properties that should be considered for open space. It also outlined three different strategies for open space preservation. Although the donation of land to the Town happened in the past, the Town should not rely on that for its open space plan. Instead, the Town should be prepared to incentivize the donation of land. The staff report outlined three potential scenarios for donating land. The first would be to purchase open space either the property itself or through a conservation easement. The second scenario would be alterations to the Foothill Residential (FR) zone, possibly creating a new zone to decrease the density in certain areas of the FR zone. Another strategy would be a transfer of development rights (TDR) program, which would require the Town to identify sending and receiving zones. Staff would like feedback from the Commissioners on the draft provided.

During the meeting, Mr. Campbell expressed concern about identifying the receiving zones for TDRs, which was shared by Mr. Benson, who emphasized the need to establish both sending and receiving zones beforehand.

- Mr. Dansie suggested researching potential legislative mechanisms similar to a TDR program since the traditional program typically established sending and receiving zones up front and would be an administrative action. Furthermore, Mr. Dansie clarified that the Town could limit the density allowed in the determined receiving areas.

Mr. Kruschke suggested that the Commission include a visibility component when prioritizing hillsides.

Ms. Topham asked for clarification about ecologically sensitive areas in the staff report.

- In the previous meeting, the Commission discussed preserving the dry wash areas or areas with ecological benefits.
- Mr. Benson suggested combining wildlife habitat and corridor areas with ecologically sensitive areas to create a single category.

Mr. Kruschke wondered if those areas could be protected with other mechanisms.

- Mr. Dansie stated that Ms. Inghram asked staff to prepare amendments to the grading standards to help maintain ecologically sensitive areas, and the Commission would likely review those amendments in a future meeting.

The Commission discussed hillsides being the top priority, followed by riparian areas. Ms. Topham highlighted the importance of natural resources when thinking about preserving open space. They moved pastures down the list to promote water conservation. The Commission determined the following list in order of priority.

1. Hillsides
2. Riparian areas
3. Pastures, orchards, and agricultural use areas
4. Wildlife habitat and corridor areas and other ecologically sensitive areas
5. Park-like landscaped areas (on private or public property)

Mr. Kruschke expressed concern about reducing density in certain zones and said he did not view developed land as open space.

- Mr. Dansie clarified that changing to a ten-acre zone would not change the current development potential of any existing parcel because they would become non-conforming. However, it would stop subdividing those areas into more developable areas.

The Commission discussed purchasing development rights as a primary tool to preserve open space. They also expressed interest in having staff gather more information about the potential changes in Foothill areas.

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

The Planning Commission identified promoting water conservation as a top priority for 2023. This was becoming an increasingly pressing issue in Washington County. The staff report outlined an overview of the existing water system, a review of the General Plan discussion, and some strategies other communities have adopted. In addition, Town Manager Rick Wixom was present to give an overview of how the existing water system worked as background for the Commission.

Mr. Wixom stated that there were three primary water sources: the Virgin River, a well on Hummingbird Lane, and the pump station at Big Springs. The primary source of water came from the Virgin River. The system was comingled with the irrigation company so that all the water entered the irrigation system first. All the diverted water was pumped into the pressurized irrigation system, which overflowed at the pond on Lion Boulevard. In addition to a two-step pond, a round tank collectively held about three million gallons of water, which was the inflow to the treatment plant. Those ponds were initially designed to provide head pressure to the irrigation system but no longer do that. Once water gets up there, it only flows to the Water Treatment Plant. The main pump house was located at Zion Canyon Village. The two pumps there pressurized the water from the river. The irrigation company and the Town both owned water rights on the river. The irrigation company owned roughly two-thirds of the water shares, and the Town owned about a third. So, the Town was a shareholder in the company, but other shareholders get

water directly through the water right owned by the irrigation company. There were about a hundred connections from Town customers that would buy water directly from the Town.

All water sources coming out of the pumps, flowing in and out of the treatment plant, sold at individual properties, and the Town properties and customers were metered. In addition, the irrigation company received a grant from the state of Utah to install meters on their shareholder connections. The installation was planned to take place in the winter of 2023. After metering all shareholders, the irrigation company would be able to identify where the most water was being used.

Ms. McPartland wondered if the Town had issues finding water rights to purchase.

- Locating water shares to buy was a problem.

Mr. Wixom also explained the Engineer's analysis. The calculations assumed that all water was municipal water and would be put into culinary water. The Town would further research how water use in hotel rooms compared to residential uses. Scenario one in the analysis would consist of all available water, including the irrigation company's water right. Scenario two would only account for the Town source. Scenario three would be fully utilizing the used sources, which were the Virgin River, Hummingbird well, and pump at Big Springs. Scenario four mirrored scenario one but with achieving conservation goals.

The Town had a well right by the cemetery that was not currently being used and would not be used in the future due to dissolved minerals being too high. The Town would be moving that water right to Rockville at the sewer lagoons to put it to use. There were also water rights in the park that the Town needed to utilize fully.

Ms. McPartland wondered what would happen to the Town's water relative to other rights in the basin if there were a prolonged drought or a call on water.

- If your water rights were the oldest, they were a higher priority. The Zion National Park, the Town of Springdale, and the Town of Rockville had the highest priority rights on the Virgin River. There had been priority calls in the river before, particularly near Washington. Because of the age of our water rights, we were fairly protected from drought conditions.

The Town was required to have a water management conservation plan. The first goal in the plan was to reduce the Town's per capita water consumption by 14% by 2030, equating to about 126,000 gallons of water conservation per day. Land use decisions would be a very impactful way to reach the goals outlined in the water conservation plan.

The Commission discussed researching strategies from other communities similar to Springdale in a future meeting and investigating land use regulations to encourage water conservation.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Noel Benson to Adjourn at 07:25 p.m. The motion was seconded by Tom Kenaston.
Campbell: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Benson: Aye
Topham: Aye
The 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.