



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2023, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 05:03 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Kyla Topham, Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Noel Benson, Pam Inghram, Pat Campbell, Adam Hyatt, and Terry Kruschke

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Principal Planner Niall Connolly, Zoning Administrator Shelly Heaton, and Town Clerk Darci Carlson. See attached sheet for attendees.

EXCUSED: Susan McPartland from Zion National Park

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Noel Benson to approve the Agenda. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements:

Betina Lindsey announced that Earth Day was important to Zion National Park and the Town of Springdale. She outlined the rights of nature and reminded everyone of the 2023 National Earth Day celebration.

Ms. Topham announced that Mr. Kenaston would be acting as the chair for item five on the agenda.

A. Action Items

- 1. Wireless Communication Facility Permit: Nate Wells requests approval for a concealed attached wireless communication facility on the roof of Happy Camper Market at 95 Zion Park Blvd, located in the VC zone**

Nate Wells applied for a wireless communication facility to be placed on the roof of the Happy Camper Market. The facility would be operated by New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T). Section 10-27 of the Town code outlined the regulations for wireless facilities. The ordinance included a preferential hierarchy of facility types in zones, which meant applicants had to justify why higher-preference facilities were not feasible before lower-preference options could be approved. The proposed facility would be concealed in a roof-mounted structure designed to match the appearance of the existing HVAC enclosure. The proposed structure would increase the building's height by ten feet. Because the proposed facility technology type and location were not the most preferred options, the applicant provided justification as required by the ordinance. It was reviewed in detail by the Town's expert, CityScape Consultants. They determined that the proposed facility met the Town code requirements and was an appropriate design to provide the best level of cell service for the project with minimal visual impact. Ms. McPartland submitted a comment letter sharing their experience in the park with a recently installed wireless facility.

The expert reviewer suggested two additional conditions for the Commission to consider if they were inclined to approve. These conditions included conducting a structural drawings analysis and reviewing RF exposures.

Meredith Hewett of J5 Infrastructure Partners represented the applicant.

Ms. Inghram wondered if this was initiated by the applicant or AT&T and asked what could be provided to enhance the cellular coverage at the south end of Town.

- Mayor, Barbara Bruno, considered improving cell coverage in the Town a priority, and the Town was in the process of developing a wireless communications master plan. This plan aimed to identify areas with inadequate coverage and propose solutions. Meredith Hewett confirmed that AT&T had initially approached the Town during their assessment of existing services, and she was willing to relay any concerns back to AT&T for further exploration.

Ms. Topham asked if Ms. McPartland's apprehension about the generators was something the Commission should be concerned about for the current application.

- Meredith Hewett acknowledged that her team carefully examined previous messages and recognized the gravity of the concerns raised. She clarified that the proposed installation did not involve fans or generators that would generate significant noise or vibrations.

Mr. Benson wondered if other members of the Town Council had worked on the communications plan.

- A working group was established to assist in creating the wireless communications master plan. Lisa Zumpft and Jack Burns from the Town Council were part of the working group.

Mr. Benson stated that because pertinent information was distributed the day of the meeting, he was unable to review it and, as a result, was uninformed. It was inappropriate to post applicable information so close to the meeting.

Ms. Topham emphasized the significant need for cellular coverage in the Town, drawing from her experience. Mr. Kenaston confirmed that the facility was discreetly concealed and posed no visual obstructions. Mr. Campbell expressed that the provided diagram in the staff report indicated an apparent necessity for the facility.

Motion made by Pat Campbell that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Wireless Communications Facility Permit for the facility at Happy Camper Market 95 Zion Park Boulevard. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **Reliable cell service is increasingly viewed as an essential element of our infrastructure and necessary for public safety as landline use declines.**
2. **The New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T") installation of a new wireless facility will serve those cell service users in Springdale, both residents, and businesses, who currently experience poor service on certain networks, particularly at peak times.**
3. **The proposed facility intends to improve reliability and coverage for AT&T customers.**
4. **As evidenced by the Coverage Justification Map included with this application, there is not good outdoor coverage without a facility at the Zion Visitors Center complex. This facility will provide improved service and coverage for the area's full-time residents, business owners/operators, and millions of annual visitors to the park facilities.**
5. **Although a lower priority, facility technology, type, and location are proposed. The design does balance the need for wireless infrastructure and the protection of our essential view shed.**
6. **Additionally, the roof-mounted facility is concealed to match existing building finishes used on an existing HVAC concealment, which is also on the roof.**
7. **Per Section 10-27-7.B.2: An attached facility must not extend more than ten feet (10') above the roofline of the structure, as seen in the elevation drawings submitted with this**

application, the proposed facility extends no more than 10' above the highest point of the roof.

8. in all other respects, the proposed design aligns with the Code requirements of the Village Commercial Zone.

Conditions for approval include that:

1. The Applicant shall submit for review a structural analysis and construction drawings, both signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer licensed for the State of Utah at the time of request for a building permit.
2. The Permittee shall provide for review documents with respect to RF exposure as per FCC rules and ensure that only authorized individuals have access to the roof.

Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Discussion of the motion: Mr. Benson abstained from the vote because he did not have reasonable time to review pertinent data.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Public Hearing - Design/ Development Review: Nate Wells requests DDR approval for a concealed attached wireless communication facility on the roof of Happy Camper Market at 95 Zion Park Blvd, located in the VC zone**

Staff Presentation:

The proposal was for the installation of a roof-mounted wireless facility at the Happy Camper Market. The facility would be discreetly housed within a structure designed to match the existing HVAC enclosure on the roof. Furthermore, a fenced compound would be established at ground level behind the building to accommodate the necessary equipment. The facility did not entail any new parking or access requirements. In reviewing the proposal, the Commission would need to assess its compliance with the zoning and design standards applicable to the Village Commercial (VC) zone.

Applicant Presentation:

Meredith Hewett attended virtually to represent Nate Wells. She added that they worked closely with the property owner to satisfy the Town's expectations and the applicants. She thanked the Commission for their time and looked forward to working with the Town.

Questions from the Commission: None were asked.

Questions from the Public: None were asked.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Tom Kenaston. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

The Commission did not have further comments.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Design Development Review for a Wireless Communication Facility Permit at the Happy Camper Market at 95 Zion Park Boulevard, as discussed in the April 19, 2023, Commission meeting.

This motion is based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed development meets all the Village Commercial (VC) zone requirements.**
- 2. The maximum building height in the VC zone is 26 feet. In this case, the Happy Camper Market is 25 feet in height. Ordinance 10-27 allows exceptions to height in certain circumstances pertaining to Wireless Facilities.**
- 3. The Town consultant verified that, in her opinion, a ten-foot exception could be applied to the facility to grant a maximum height of 35 feet.**

Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Discussion of the motion: There was no discussion.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. Public Hearing - Revised DDR: Andy Green requests a revision to a previously approved Design/Development Review for six housing units on parcel S-BIT-3-B in the VC zone.**

Staff Presentation:

Andy Green, representing Bean, Cotting, and Munson LLC, submitted an application for a revised Design Development Review (DDR) concerning six employee housing units at 1212 Zion Park Boulevard. The initial DDR was approved in late 2021. The proposed revisions primarily focused on modifying the building's elevations and footprint, while the number of units, floor area, building height, and materials remained unchanged. The proposed development was on the same property as the Bit and Spur restaurant, where a single-family residence stood. The proposed project aimed to demolish and replace the existing building with a six-plex structure to accommodate employee housing units. To ensure compliance with the standards outlined in the Village Commercial (VC) zone, the Commission should refer to section 10-11B of the Town code.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Green mentioned that their initial DDR was approved the previous year. However, they were dissatisfied with the design after reviewing the proposal more recently. Considering feedback from future

occupants of the units, they decided to submit a revised design for approval. While the floor plan underwent slight modifications, the overall square footage would remain unchanged.

Questions from the Commission:

Ms. Inghram asked if the loft area was intended to be the sleeping area.

- Yes, the idea was that the loft would be the sleeping area.

Ms. Inghram wondered if the bathrooms in the facilities would be ADA-accessible.

- Mr. Dansie clarified that the building inspector would analyze the plans to ensure all ADA requirements were met.

Ms. Topham asked if the parking spot encroaching into the setback was intended to be an ADA-accessible parking space.

- It was intended to be van accessible in the event of a ramp needed.

Mr. Benson asked how far the parking spaces could encroach into the setback.

- The Commission could authorize up to half of the setback for parking. On one side, the setback was ten feet, whereas on the opposite side, the setback was 20 feet.

Questions from the Public: None were asked.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Pat Campbell.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Tom Kenaston. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Response: No applicant response.

Commission Deliberation:

Since the same people owned the adjacent lot, the Commission did not see an issue allowing for a reduction of half of the side setbacks to be used for a parking space. Otherwise, the application seemed straightforward.

Motion made by Pat Campbell that the Planning Commission approves the modified Design Development Review for the footprint and exterior elevation changes to the previously approved six housing units located at 1212 Zion Park Boulevard as presented in the DDR application reviewed in the April 19, 2023. Commission meeting.

This motion is based on the following finding:

1. **The proposed development meets all the Town code standards and design elements**

The motion has the following conditions:

1. **All areas disturbed during construction but not built upon must be revegetation with native grasses and shrubs chosen from the Town's plant list before the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the project.**
2. **The applicant must provide a common parking agreement with the adjacent property before the building permit is issued.**

The Commission grants a reduction of the side setbacks by half the distance to allow the two parking spaces on the plan. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Discussion of the motion: There was no discussion.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Public Hearing – Ordinance Revision: Addition of Chapter 10-13G to the Town Code, adopting a workforce housing overlay zone which would allow increased density (units per acre) for residential developments targeted to employees of local businesses**

Staff Presentation:

In 2020, a housing study conducted by Zion's Bank Public Finance highlighted the need for additional workforce housing options in the Town. The study revealed that over 1,000 employees of businesses in Springdale and Zion National Park commuted to work daily, with many desiring to live within the community. However, limited housing options were available to these employees, as indicated by the study and anecdotal evidence. In response, the updated General Plan dedicated a chapter to housing and instructed the Town to explore opportunities for providing more housing options for local business employees.

The Planning Commission recognized housing as a top priority in the past two years and formed a housing committee to engage housing and other relevant experts. Drawing inspiration from Moab, Utah's housing ordinance, the committee developed a Workforce Housing Overlay Zone (WFOZ) proposal. This proposal incorporated the goals outlined in the General Plan, input from the Planning Commission, feedback from housing experts, community survey results, and interviews with Springdale employers. Multiple drafts were reviewed and refined based on feedback before arriving at the final version.

The proposed WFOZ aimed to increase residential density for Springdale and Zion National Park employees. It allowed for eight units per acre for single-family and duplex development and 16 units per acre for multi-family development. To qualify for the WFOZ, at least 75% of the housing units must be occupied by households with at least one member actively employed in Springdale. The proposal also included criteria for evaluating requests for the WFOZ and mandated deed restrictions to ensure the preservation of workforce housing in the long term. Additionally, it specified development standards such as building sizes, heights, and setbacks for the overlay zone.

As the overlay zone falls under the legislative domain, the Town would have discretion in determining the location and timing of development applications. The Planning Commission was tasked with reviewing the Housing Committee's proposal for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone. They needed to assess whether the proposed overlay zone aligned with the goals and objectives of the General Plan, addressed the Town's housing needs, and subsequently make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Mr. Dansie also clarified the difference between the current Moderate Income Housing Overlay zone and the proposed Workforce Housing Overlay zone. The main difference was that the Moderate-Income Housing Overlay zone was based on income rather than the workforce of local businesses.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Benson asked how much workforce housing was currently in Springdale.

- In the proposal, the housing would be deed restricted to ensure that employees of local businesses were occupying the units. Under that same definition, there were four units on West Temple Drive, pursuant to a Development Agreement, that were deed restricted in the Town.

Mr. Benson asked how the Town quantified employer-built housing for their employees.

- There were approximately 36 housing units on properties with an otherwise primary commercial use. There were other units owned by Springdale employers in residential zones that were used to house their employees, but there was no regulation to ensure those units remained employee housing in perpetuity.

Mr. Benson asked if the Town had required employers to provide employee housing as part of the approval for Development Agreements.

- As previously mentioned, there were four units on West Temple Drive. The Town initially allowed ten units, but currently, four had been developed. Besides those, Mr. Dansie was unaware of any required employee housing through Development Agreements.

Mr. Benson asked if there was a deadline for the owner of those properties to construct all the housing units. He also wondered if the Town had approached the owner to incentivize the construction of the remaining units.

- The Town had set a deadline for the construction of the first four units as a condition for granting the property owner specific incentives. However, there was no requirement to ensure the development of the remaining six units.
- Throughout the process, the Town maintained regular communication with the property owner, who had obtained the necessary approvals and building permits to construct the remaining six units. However, the Town had not initiated any discussions or incentives to encourage the owner to proceed with the development of these units.

Ms. Topham asked why the language in the occupancy limit was revised.

- The housing expert cautioned attempting to determine family members and recommended using an occupancy limit for enforcement.

Mr. Campbell asked if the legal review had been conducted.

- Mr. Dansie stated that the legal team had not seen any Constitutional issues or legal risks with the ordinance as drafted.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification about the 25-year deed restriction.

- The deed restriction was in perpetuity. However, after 25 years, the Town had an opportunity to initiate a modification to that deed restriction if, after going through a housing analysis, they identified a better way to fulfill the Town's housing needs.

Mr. Benson asked if there was a way for the Town Council to change the deed restriction before the 25-year mark.

- Mr. Dansie stated that, to his knowledge, changes would not be allowed before 25 years.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on the requirements of owned and rented units.

- Rented units required annual documentation to show that qualified households occupied the units.
- Once a person qualified and purchased a home, they did not have to provide annual documentation because if they left their job, the Town could not take it. They would only be subject to the deed restriction requirements.

Ms. Inghram asked why the setbacks were significantly less than those for Foothill Residential (FR).

- In discussion with the housing experts and affordable housing developers, they recommended less of a setback because it was too restrictive.
- Since a zone change was Legislative, the Town could suggest a more restrictive condition than what was in the code.

Mr. Benson asked what the reasoning was behind lower density for duplexes and higher density for apartment buildings.

- The two main reasons were feasibility and market preference issues. Duplexes typically were larger, and the market demand would be for larger square footage than a multi-family unit.

Mr. Benson asked if the Town had considered community land trusts.

- Yes, the Town had considered them. However, it had not been further explored because of the limited space, and the ordinance had no mechanism to facilitate development.

Questions from the Public:

Elizabeth Cutler asked if there were any restrictions on what a developer could charge for the units.

- There was no restriction on the amount they could charge.

Betina Lindsey asked if the Town had conducted studies through businesses and Zion National Park to identify what percentage of housing was in shortage. She suggested conducting more studies to identify the potential occupants of these types of units.

- The study conducted in 2020 had a survey that was sent out to business owners and employees in the Town of Springdale to identify the number of people who would live in these potential units. The Town followed up with a similar survey last fall and received similar results. The housing committee also had conversations with business owners, and that information was used to create the proposal.

Motion made by Noel Benson to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Mark Stevens stated that his family bought 6 acres 17 years ago, which was developed into their home shortly after. The property around was zoned for low density and agriculture. He expressed discomfort with several overlay zones and their negative impacts on surrounding properties. He outlined that the updated General Plan highlighted the need to protect existing residential neighborhoods. He believed the best way to strengthen the community would be to honor the zoning standards in place when an owner invests in a property.

Elizabeth Cutler expressed confusion. She opposed the overlay zone because it did not honor the long-time residents. She did not appreciate the language of the most recent survey. After researching the associations provided by staff, the impression was that they were trying to avoid having the state mandate such things. She was not persuaded by the comment letters and felt the negative effects of the proposal were clear. She was not against progress and having more people living in Springdale. She was against the proposed overlay zone.

Kael Weston commended the staff for the work on the proposal. He strongly supported the proposal, as Springdale was one of the fastest-growing Towns. He stated that the 1,000 employees commuting to serve the community were not being well served if they did not have those options. He felt that the Town Council should review the proposal with all the questions and suggestions provided by the Commission. He believed this was about families and strengthening the community and workforce in the Town. He thanked the Commission for their hard work. He hoped the discussion did not end tonight and that Springdale could become a model for finding true ground.

Betina Lindsey expressed discomfort about the lack of discussion about water and sewer. She was very concerned about the increasing development in Springdale and all of Utah. She explained that she had been commuting to Saint George for 15 years.

Andy Green moved here 37 years ago. He stated that with the amount of change and additional people coming through Springdale, it was hard to maintain the village character of the Town. He was concerned about the lack of inclusion and stated it was unfair to the community's workforce. He expressed gratitude and appreciation to the Commission for their hard work.

Mary Stults supported the overlay zone and hoped that it would be affordable. The Town should take advantage of the time before there was no more room. The Town should allow the workers to live here.

Bob Carlton appreciated the comments expressed by Mark Stevens and agreed. This was a problem nationwide. There were many components that the Town could not control, especially with inflation, which made it hard to make a project feasible. He urged the Commission to look at other options. They rented their accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to Zion National Park employees because they support the park and support the workforce in Springdale. A suggestion would be to allow more ADUs to be rented at a lower rate and investigate the properties given to the Town.

Suzette Benson stated that Springdale was a small Town. The average commute in the state of Utah was 25 minutes. Spending most of her life living in Los Angeles and North Carolina, she was used to a 45-minute commute. She moved to Springdale 28 years ago and loved the Town. She understood that growth was inevitable but disagreed with allowing a property owner to place a 16-unit condo next door.

Motion made by Noel Benson to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Pat Campbell.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

During the discussion, Ms. Inghram provided revisions to address language clarity, including the requirement that units must be owned and occupied by qualified households at the time of application. She also raised the question of whether the 75% requirement for rented units applied to owned units. She highlighted the need for clear guidelines regarding property owners' obligations regarding private lanes and public streets. Additionally, she recommended revising the parking standards to address concerns about parking availability.

Mr. Kruschke suggested clarifying if the enforcement section would apply to the ownership and rental units. He also expressed concern with the time limit an owner had to sell their property because of the

unpredictability of the housing market. Mr. Benson concurred with his statement and felt it was not enforceable.

Mr. Kenaston agreed that language could be added to clarify. Many people were commuting to work in Springdale who would live in Town given the opportunity. Mr. Kenaston stated that in working with housing experts, the Town could identify places in Town where additional density would not impact the residents. He used the Juniper Apartments, the Moenave subdivision, and Stone Mountain Condominiums as an example of added density that did not affect the residents. The WFOZ was a way to provide workforce housing and allow the Town to retain the Legislative power to ensure the density did not impact the residents. This was a tool that the Town should have for the option to develop workforce housing.

Ms. Topham concurred with Mr. Kenaston's statement. There was a reason this decision would be Legislative, and that was to ensure that negative impacts on the residents were mitigated. This was a step in the right direction and would be part of the solution to the workforce housing shortage in Town.

Mr. Campbell was concerned about the lack of data and sought concrete evidence regarding the utilization of the overlay zone. He suggested identifying how many workforce housing units the Town wanted. He stated that some goals outlined in the updated General Plan directly conflicted. He wondered if developing workforce housing in the Redhawk lot that the Town owned would be an excellent place to start. He also expressed concern about using the 2020 survey results, as there were only about 140 respondents. He felt the 2022 survey was more representative. He wondered if the earlier comment about renting ADUs would help provide additional workforce housing.

Mr. Benson could not support adding a large amount of density to established neighborhoods. It was important to be able to differentiate between commercial and residential properties. He was uncomfortable putting commercial buildings in residential zones and reducing the setbacks. He did not see an appetite for that. He felt the surveys were unable to gauge the acceptance level of the residents in Town based on the way it was framed and the people who took the survey.

Ms. Inghram stated that it was essential to differentiate between what the Town wanted and needed. Since the Town was landlocked, there were limited opportunities for building if they wanted to maintain the character of the Town and honor the goals in the General Plan. The General Plan gave direction to encourage development that was light on the land. It also stated that zone changes should only be considered if it led to attainable housing. The General Plan also outlined that the Town would retain existing residential zoning. The primary function of the overlay zone was to directly benefit businesses in Town. She suggested exploring other options fully and understanding the projected growth of the Town before entertaining the overlay zone. She also suggested revising the standards for ADUs to allow more workforce housing without creating additional density. Instead of placing more significant amounts of density in residential zones, the Town should investigate placing workforce housing in commercial zones.

Motion made by Noel Benson that the Planning Commission recommends denial of the proposed Workforce Housing Overlay zone as presented in the April 19, 2023, meeting. This recommendation is based on the following findings:

- 1. The Town housing committee made it evident that increasing setbacks and /or lowering density would make the proposal financially ineffective and would not meet the goals of the General Plan. Specifically, the general goal asking the Town to manage the size, scale, and intensity of new development and reduce impacts on existing residents.**
- 2. Subgoal A asks the Town to maintain its identity as a unique village**
- 3. Subgoal C asks the Town to ensure the style, pace, and intensity of new development does not detract from the Town's small-town character.**
- 4. Subgoal F asks the Town to protect residential neighborhoods from the impacts of commercial development.**

Each of the mentioned subgoals were not of a specific category but subgoals of the General Plan itself. Each subgoal mentioned in the staff summary was specifically from the General Plan housing section.

- 5. Housing subgoal A asks the Town to maintain Springdale's character as a rural residential community.**
- 6. This proposal did not meet the circumstances to make land use regulation changes as outlined in section 10-3-2A of the Town code.**

Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Discussion of the motion:

Mr. Campbell stated that before the meeting, he supported the overlay zone but was persuaded by the information and insight provided by Mr. Benson at the meeting. There were other avenues the Town should explore to provide workforce housing.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: No

Benson: Aye

Topham: No

The motion passed 3:2.

5. Grading Permit: The Town of Springdale requests a grading and excavation permit for improvements to Balanced Rock Road, including a 10-foot tall retaining wall

The Town of Springdale applied for an excavation permit to construct roadway improvements to Balanced Rock Road and Hummingbird Lane. The project on Balanced Rock Road included a roadway reconstruction of approximately 11,500 square feet with curb and gutter, a new six-inch water line, and improvements to the existing storm drain system at the intersection of Balanced Rock Road and SR-9. The project would also include a retaining wall. The project on Hummingbird Lane included a roadway reconstruction of approximately 13,000 square feet with curb and gutter on both sides of the road and improvements to the existing storm drain system. Blaine Worrell of Sunrise Engineer was available to answer the Commission's questions. The Commission needed to determine if the Town code requirements had been met.

Ms. Topham disclosed that she lived on Hummingbird Lane.

Ms. Inghram asked if this was a result of flood damage.

- This was partially a result of the flood damage and bringing streets to the construction standards. The Public Works Department had a list of streets that needed improvement and were working through all the Town-owned streets to bring them up to current construction standards.

Mr. Kenaston asked if this was the access to the Stone Mountain Condominiums.

- This was the only legal access to the Stone Mountain Condominiums.

Mr. Kenaston asked what the six-inch water line was for.

- It was to create infrastructure to assist with getting culinary water from the springs in the National Park.

Ms. Topham asked what material would be used for the retaining wall.

- It would be the type of material that was on the retaining wall across from the post office.

Motion made by Kyla Topham that the Planning Commission approves the grading permit for the reconstruction project on Balanced Rock Road and Hummingbird Lane, as discussed in the Commission meeting on April 19, 2023.

This motion is based on the following finding:

- 1. The application appeared to meet the standards of section 10-15B of the Town code.**

This motion has the following condition:

- 1. The construction shall not disturb Natural slopes of 30% or greater.**
- 2. The contractor must fence off any such slopes for the duration of the construction project.**

Seconded by Noel Benson.

Discussion of the motion: There was no discussion.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Benson: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

Mr. Benson abstained from voting since he did not read the minutes.

Motion made by Kyla Topham to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Campbell: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjourn

Motion made by Pam Inghram to Adjourn at 07:50 p.m. Seconded by Noel Benson.

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.