



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, JULY 5, 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 the stream information below\*\***

**Approval of the agenda**  
**General announcements**

**A. Discussion / Non-Action Items**

1. Discussion of potential revisions to Chapter 10-13F of the Town Code, the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone
2. Update and status discussion regarding the following planning initiatives: open space preservation, water conservation planning, protection of natural washes, accessory dwelling unit regulations

**B. Adjourn**

**\*To access the live stream for this public meeting,  
please visit or click the link below:**

**<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>**

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

07/06/2023

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately 4:15 am/pm on 06/29/23  
by Aron Emmerson.

**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 REGULAR MEETING ON  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 5, 2023, AT 5:00 PM  
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,  
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

**The meeting convened at 05:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Kyla Topham, Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Noel Benson, Pam Inghram, Adam Hyatt, Terry Kruschke, Pat Campbell, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park  
**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development, Tom Dansie; Principal Planner, Niall Connolly; and Town 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:**

Ms. Topham reported that this would be the last Planning Commission for Susan McPartland From Zion National Park. She announced that Jonathan Shafer would join future meetings as the Ex-Officio Member. Ms. Topham thanked Ms. McPartland for her contributions. Ms. McPartland thanked the Commission and noted that Mr. Shafer was the Public Information Officer. He had a broad understanding of the area and would serve the Planning Commission well moving forward.

**A. Non-Action Items**

**1. Discussion of Potential Revisions to Chapter 10-13F of the Town Code, the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone.**

Mr. Dansie reported that the item related to potential revisions to Chapter 10-13F of the Town Code, the Transient Lodging Overlay (TLO) Zone. The Town adopted the current version of the TLO Zone approximately one year ago. The purpose of the TLO Zone was to ensure that the Town had a handle on where, when, and how transient lodging was developed. Prior to the TLO Zone being adopted, transient lodging was allowed in the Central Commercial Zone as a permitted use. This meant that anyone in the Central Commercial Zone could develop transient lodging on their property. In the Village Commercial Zone, transient lodging was a conditional use. Mr. Dansie clarified that conditional uses in the State of Utah were uses that must be allowed on a property if the proposal met all the standards. Even though there was a Conditional Use Permit process, the Town was obligated to approve a conditional use if the proposal was compliant with all the Code standards.

As more properties in the two zones were converted from their traditional non-lodging uses to lodging, there were increasing impacts on the community. That was the reason that the Town adopted the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone. It meant that transient lodging was no longer a permitted or conditional use. To develop transient lodging on a property, the property owner needed to seek out a zone change process. Unlike the permitted or

conditional use processes, which were administrative in nature, the overlay zone was legislative. The Town had more discretion to approve or deny transient lodging applications.

After the Town adopted the TLO Zone, five applications were received. The TLO Zone put a cap on the number of applications per year, which was five. In reviewing those five applications, the Planning Commission and Town Council identified some aspects of the current TLO Zone standards that could be improved. Based on the first round of applications received, it appeared that the quality of applications was not what was anticipated. There were no added benefits of mixed-use or other community amenities. Near the end of last year, the Town Council revised the TLO Zone. It stated that the Town would no longer accept five applications per year but every other year. As a result, no TLO Zone applications would be accepted this year. That allowed time to look at the standards in the TLO Zone without pending applications.

During the hiatus in accepting new applications, the Planning Commission and Town Council directed Staff to investigate revisions to the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone. The Town formed a committee to research potential revisions and updates. The Committee included two Planning Commissioners, two Town Council Members, and Staff. The Committee had been meeting for the last five months and was now ready to present recommendations to the Planning Commission for consideration. The recommendations were as follows:

- Eliminate the distinction between Type 1 and Type 2 lodging:
  - Currently, hotels and motels were classified as Type 1 lodging, while short-term rentals, B&Bs, hostels, and similar lodging were classified as Type 2 lodging. There were separate requirements for each type of lodging. The committee recommended treating all types the same.
- Specify more clearly what type of mixed-use was required with lodging:
  - The current Transient Lodging Overlay Zone required all lodging to include another use on the property to ensure a balance between lodging uses, other commercial uses, and residential uses. Based on the first round of applications for the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone in 2022, the mixed-use requirement did not produce the kind of diversity envisioned. The proposed revisions required all new lodging to include new long-term residential units (one long-term residential unit for every eight lodging units), and lodging establishments with more than ten lodging units would be required to include a restaurant on the site. Long-term residential units and restaurants would be the only approved mixed-uses associated with new lodging.
- Change the application process for TLO Zone applications:
  - The Town currently accepted five applications for the TLO Zone in even-numbered years. Applications were accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. This limited the number of applications but did little to encourage quality applications. The proposed revisions created a new application process, which was described as follows:

The Town would accept an unlimited number of applications for TLO Zone changes between January 1 and January 31 of each even-numbered year. All applications received would be considered. The Planning Commission and Town Council would review the applications during a single meeting and may approve up to three Transient Lodging Overlay Zone applications each year. Prior to applying, an applicant would be required to meet with all owners of property within 300 feet of the subject property, explain the proposed lodging, and request feedback. The proposed application submittal requirements for the TLO Zone applications were more detailed and would require more information than the current application. If a TLO Zone application were to be approved, the applicant would be under a timeline to complete the projects. There would be one year from the approval date to commence construction on the project.

Mr. Dansie noted that the ordinance would include more clear evaluation criteria. Currently, there were general zone change criteria that talk about how well the application promoted the goals and objectives of the General Plan. The proposed change would implement clear evaluation criteria for a transient lodging application to be seriously considered. However, the Town would not be obligated to grant approval. Mr. Dansie talked about mixed-use requirements. There was a desire to preserve a mix between lodging uses and residential uses. He noted that certain aspects of the ordinance would remain the same, such as the requirement for there to be an

on-site manager who could respond within 30 minutes to address issues or emergencies. There was also a requirement to have good neighbor policies and guest education policies so appropriate behavior is made clear. In addition, there was a requirement for a Restrictive Covenant to be recorded against the property. It would memorialize the requirements of the zone. For transient lodging facilities with more than ten units, there was a requirement to have a front desk or concierge service.

The committee asked that the Planning Commission share feedback on the proposed language. If the Planning Commission was supportive of the language, as proposed, there would be a public hearing scheduled. If the Planning Commission wanted to spend more time reviewing the language, it could come back at the next meeting for additional review and discussion. Mr. Dansie recommended that the Commission act on the item sooner rather than later because applications would be accepted in January 2024. If there was a desire to make changes before that, it was important to act in a timely manner. In addition, it made sense to give applicants as much notice as possible about the new requirements before the application period opened.

Mr. Benson asked about the standards for long-term housing compared to transient lodging.

- Mr. Dansie noted that section numbers were not added to the proposed language yet, but he referenced F: All Transient Lodging Facilities Shall Include Long-Term Residential Units. There were requirements listed underneath for clarification.

Ms. Inghram pointed out that there was one inconsistency between the summary and the actual proposed language. In the summary, it stated that applications would be taken each year.

- Mr. Dansie clarified the proposal was to have applications accepted during each even-numbered year.

Mr. Campbell noted that in the original ordinance, there was Section 10.13 F(4)(B). It listed specific requirements related to fencing, but he did not see that in the newly proposed language. He wondered if that was intentionally left out.

- This was confirmed. Mr. Dansie explained that there were specific standards for fencing and screening. Many of the applications that came to the Planning Commission met those standards. However, those applications were not necessarily what the Town was looking for. Rather than including prescriptive requirements for fencing and screening, the idea was to be clear about what the Town wanted to accomplish with the TLO Zone. The Town was looking for transient lodging facilities that would protect the village atmosphere, add to the community character, and enhance the quality of life for residents. There was more of an emphasis on the quality of the application rather than screening and fencing.

Mr. Benson asked about the restaurant requirement.

- Mr. Dansie explained that the Committee discussed mixed uses and what would enhance the quality of life for residents. Ultimately, the Committee thought that adding more long-term residential housing and restaurants would most benefit the community.

Mr. Campbell wondered whether the Town Council would see all the applications.

- This was confirmed.

Mr. Campbell was familiar with the previous document and the decisions that had been made at that time. He thought the proposed language was well thought out. There could be some minor changes made, but he was supportive of the proposal overall. Mr. Kruschke liked the direction because there were clearer definitions. He was supportive of removing Type 1 and Type 2 lodging. Ms. Inghram was happy with the proposal in general but wanted the Town Council to have the option to cap transient lodging units. Though up to three applications could be approved, it might make sense to place an annual cap on the number of rooms that could be approved.

Mr. Kenaston liked the new language and the fact that there would be more of a competitive process in place. Instead of applicants trying to meet a deadline and working quickly to make sure their application was considered, it would now be possible for the applications to be more robust. Mr. Hyatt thought the proposed changes were positive and moved things in the right direction. It would clean things up and make it more straightforward and thoughtful.

Mr. Benson thanked everyone on the Committee who had worked on the language. A lot of complex information had been made easier to understand. He thought the changes were positive but had concerns about the restaurant requirement. He understood that there was a desire to move forward with applications that would benefit the community, but public restrooms, shaded areas, or other amenities might be worth considering. There were a lot of options that could benefit the community outside of a restaurant. Mr. Benson noted that there were over 300 approved transient lodging units that were not developed yet and could not be stopped. He referenced a map of the Town (attachment #1).

Mr. Dansie stated that the Potential Lodging map (attachment #1) was a map of Springdale. It showed the Village Commercial Zone in shades of red and the Central Commercial Zone in shades of yellow. The darker yellow and darker red were properties that did not have any transient lodging developed on them at the time that the map was created. The lighter shades of yellow and red were properties that had already been developed with transient lodging. The numbers shown were the size of the lot divided by the number of transient lodging units allowed in the zone. In the Village Commercial Zone, one unit was allowed per 4,000 square feet of lot area.

Mr. Benson pointed out that there were rights for transient lodging units that were not being used. It was important to consider that. Mr. Dansie explained that it was based on what could theoretically be developed, property size, and what had been developed already.

Mr. Campbell wondered if it would be possible to explore who might be willing to sell granted transient lodging units.

Mr. Benson believed the onus would be on the applicant to determine that. He felt it made sense for the Town to update the maps and provide as much information to the potential applicants as possible. It was noted that there could be a public list made of the 300 transient lodging units that had not been developed yet.

Ms. Topham asked if people were allowed to sell their Development Agreements.

- Mr. Dansie did not believe there was anything in the State Law that specifically addressed that. It would be like a transfer of development rights. He imagined that there was a legal pathway to move that forward, but those details would need to be verified with the Town Attorney.

Mr. Benson wanted to see the latest restrictions apply to a property if the development rights were transferred at some point. There were a lot of hurdles associated with the undeveloped transient lodging units. Ms. Inghram thought this was an innovative way of looking at transient lodging and thought it made sense for the Town to continue to pursue the different possibilities.

Mr. Benson explained that it was possible for those owners to have a Development Agreement approved and propose that to the Town. A Development Agreement would have to be approved in order to sell the transient lodging units to someone else. As a result, it would need to come to the Town for consideration.

It was determined that the Planning Commission would review the proposed revisions to the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone language section by section. The first section was Purpose, but there were no suggestions made for that particular section. The next section was Applicability, which discussed the properties that were eligible for the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone. Ms. Topham noted that during the last committee meeting, there were discussions about the word "concurrently." Mr. Dansie explained that another sentence had been added for clarity, which was: "The Town will not accept an application for the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone on a property unless that property is zoned either CC or VC at the time the application for the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone is submitted." He felt that added appropriate clarity but offered to change the word "concurrently" within the paragraph if that was desired. Ms. Inghram pointed out that "a person" did not account for corporations. She suggested that it state "applications may not be made..." instead of referencing a person. A similar issue was found in the next section as well. There was support for the changes proposed.

The Commission discussed the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone Required for Transient Lodging section. Ms. Inghram referenced item C, which stated that: "The Planning Commission will not accept applications for Design/Development Review for new transient lodging facilities unless the property where the proposed transient

lodging facility is located is in the Transient Lodging Overlay Zone.” Ms. Inghram believed there should be an addition to the language to state that this was true unless the application was subject to a prior agreement. She wanted to make sure the language, as proposed, would not be applicable to projects with Settlement Agreements. Mr. Dansie clarified that a Settlement Agreement superseded the zoning. He was hesitant to reference a Settlement Agreement within the code language itself. However, the Town Attorney could look at the language further to make sure that everything was clear. Ms. Inghram had a similar question about item D. She wanted to make sure that the language clearly accounted for applicants with Settlement Agreements.

The application process section was reviewed. Mr. Kruschke referenced item B, which had to do with contacting property owners within 300 feet of the proposed transient lodging facility. He noted that it was not required for the property owners within 300 feet to reply to the notice or agree to meet the applicant. If an applicant tried to contact other property owners but no one met with them, that needed to be considered. Ms. Inghram noted that later on in the document, it stated that the applicant must report back. In that scenario, the applicant could report to the Town that they tried to reach out to property owners but there was no response. Mr. Kruschke believed the language could be clearer. Mr. Kenaston suggested that there be certified letters sent out to the other property owners. Ms. Topham worried that certified letters would be onerous. The intention was for the applicant to start the conversation with those most impacted. Mr. Dansie explained that the point of the language was to make sure that there was not a room full of neighbors who had not heard about the potential transient lodging. It was suggested that the attempt to contact and discuss the matter with neighbors be documented. That way, it would be clear to the Planning Commission which property owners had not responded.

Mr. Kruschke shared comments about item F. He pointed out that sometimes construction work took longer than anticipated. If there were timelines in place (one-year to start and two years to complete the project), it might be difficult to meet those deadlines. He was not comfortable with the language, as stated. There should be some mechanism for applicants to explain that work was underway. If an applicant was close to completion or had been diligent, there should be some options available for an extension. Otherwise, it could result in vacant lodging facilities that were almost complete due to a missed deadline. Mr. Campbell suggested that there be penalties if completion did not occur within the specified timeline.

Ms. Topham explained that the timeline and penalties had been discussed at a committee level. It was difficult to determine an appropriate financial penalty for those instances. During the Committee Meetings, she had pushed for a longer timeline because a larger project would take more time to complete. Mr. Campbell suggested that the timelines be project specific. Mr. Kruschke thought the two-year limit was reasonable but noted that unexpected things happened, and it was important to leave room to account for unexpected situations. Mr. Kenaston thought it made sense to allow the Town to grant an extension in certain scenarios. There might need to be some sort of requirements in place. For instance, proving that the work was close to being completed or that something occurred that was beyond the control of the applicant. It was suggested that the Town Council determine whether it was appropriate to allow an extension to be granted.

The Application Review Criteria section was discussed along with item A. Ms. Topham noted that the applicants would need to present during the public hearing. There was a specific question included about whether the proposed development would take away from residential properties. Item B related to a point-based ranking system. Ms. McPartland understood the idea of the ranking system, as it would create more transparency, but she wanted to make sure there was a clear plan moving forward. Mr. Dansie explained that the idea came from the Committee. It was based on the Town’s experience reviewing various requests for proposals (RFP). When those were received, there was a scoring process in place, which made it possible to look at the application more critically and objectively. The different criteria listed in item A would be used as part of the scoring. There could be a point value assigned to each question. This would allow each proposal to be reviewed according to the exact same criteria.

The Application Standards section was reviewed. Item A (4) referenced all existing development on the property. Mr. Dansie acknowledged that if there was anything other than a transient lodging development, that was not clearly stated, which it should be. The language could reference all proposed development. Item H had to do with contacting property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. It was reiterated that there should be some sort of spreadsheet or documentation to show that property owners had been contacted in some way. Ms. Topham referenced item J, which stated: “Any other information the applicant wishes to include that

demonstrates how the proposed development will enhance the Town's community character, as outlined in the General Plan." She explained that this had to do with the applicant narrative that would be submitted.

Commissioners discussed the Standards for Transient Lodging section. Ms. Inghram discussed item A. Previously, the ordinance required a dedicated road, but this language allowed for a private street that was built up to the standards of a public road. She thought it needed to be clear that the entire road needed to be brought to that standard and not just the part in front of the property. The language also called for improvements but did not address the issue of other property owners on the street and how maintenance costs would be allocated between other owners. She wanted additional clarity so it would clearly state the distance that the improvements needed to be made and how the maintenance costs would be distributed between property owners.

Item C related to good neighbor policies. Mr. Dansie explained that there were good neighbor policies adopted previously, but there was proposed language that talked about educating visitors to the Town. It was important to encourage visitors to respect the Town's community and character and be respectful regarding noise. Item E related to a restaurant use if there were ten or more transient lodging units. Ms. Inghram had a question about the hours mentioned in E (4). She thought the language was vague. Something being open for breakfast, lunch, and dinner would be onerous, so she wondered how long the restaurants were expected to be open per day. She wanted to understand the amount of flexibility there would be. Mr. Dansie stated that the idea was not to have the restaurant open for a few days and then closed for months on end. There needed to be language to ensure the restaurant would be available, but not be specific enough to state that it needed to be open for breakfast, lunch, and dinner or that it needed to be open for specific hours.

Ms. Inghram was concerned about the vague language related to the restaurant use. Mr. Dansie clarified that the committee was open to suggestions in that section. Ms. Inghram suggested that the restaurant must serve at least two meals per day. That would still provide some flexibility. Mr. Kenaston pointed out that some restaurants were only open for five days a week and just did dinner. It was important to encourage the restaurants to be open but not make things too onerous for the owners. One suggestion was to state that it needed to be open for 40 hours per week. Concerns were expressed about the current wording, but there was support to require a restaurant to be open for a minimum number of hours per week or month. There was a desire to provide flexibility for the restaurant so it could be successful.

Ms. Topham pointed out that if ten transient lodging units were desired, then there needed to be some consideration about hosting those visitors. That was the reason that a restaurant made sense. Mr. Kenaston pointed out that it would be possible for someone to run the transient lodging units and then lease the restaurant to someone else. There was a six-week transition period referenced to account for that. Ms. McPartland wondered whether there was a desire to have all sit-down restaurants or if there could be some variety. Mr. Benson agreed that if there was some flexibility, the applicants could be more creative. The language could state that a restaurant was strongly encouraged, but the Town was open to hearing other suggestions that might benefit the community. Alternative proposals could be considered.

The Commission discussed the long-term housing requirements. The proposed language stated that one long-term residential unit would be required for every eight lodging units. Ms. Inghram explained that if there was a desire for that to be linked by ownership, that would need to be clearly stated within the proposed language. Mr. Benson wanted to see language that stated the development would be under the current ordinances.

Mr. Dansie asked whether the Commission wanted the long-term housing units to be rentals or for purchase. Some believed those should be rentals, while others felt ownership was preferable. Ultimately, the goal was to produce long-term housing in some way. Ms. Inghram believed the language related to long-term housing requirements needed additional discussion. Mr. Dansie clarified that the long-term housing units were not required to be on the transient lodging property. Mr. Dansie wondered whether there was a desire to discuss that section of the proposed language at a future Planning Commission Meeting. This was confirmed.

Mr. Kruschke referenced item F (2). It stated that: "The long-term residential units used to meet this requirement must be newly developed units. A property owner may not use long-term residential units which exist at the time the application for transient lodging is approved to satisfy the long-term residential requirement for the development." He wondered whether "exist at the time of the application" meant that a development review had

been approved, but no construction had started. Mr. Dansie explained that the idea was to preserve the mix of transient lodging and residential units. Bringing in transient lodging and pointing to already approved residential units would not accomplish the goals of the language. Transient lodging would need to create new lodging.

Mr. Kruschke asked about item F (3), which stated: "Each long-term residential unit used to fulfill this requirement must measure a minimum of 600 square feet in area." Mr. Dansie reported that the 600 square feet came from a discussion about livable long-term housing units. Mr. Kruschke wanted to know if a residential unit required a kitchen. Mr. Dansie referenced the housing standards, which included a kitchen and bathroom. Ms. Inghram hoped that revised definitions would be brought forward as well because the proposed language would likely impact the definition section of the code. For example, references to Type 1, Type 2, as well as short-term rentals.

Item F (11) was discussed. It had to do with the Restrictive Covenant. Mr. Kruschke pointed out that there was not a lot of specificity there. He was not sure whether it was appropriate to include a lot of details in the ordinance, but he wanted a better understanding of what the Restrictive Covenant would say. Mr. Dansie noted that the section could include more details. Essentially, the Restrictive Covenant was attached to the property and stated that the property satisfied the transient lodging requirements for a specific transient lodging facility. As a result, it must continue to be a long-term residence for 50 years from the date of the covenant. Mr. Kruschke wondered whether the language would state that the residence needed to be occupied for a certain number of months per year. Mr. Dansie thought that was a good catch and agreed that all that information should be made clear. Mr. Kruschke asked to see a template of what the Restrictive Covenant would look like at the next meeting. The Commission discussed what could happen to long-term residents in the future. It was noted that the language was not restrictive, and it would be possible to rebuild the home as long as the requirements were met.

The Commission discussed the annual review of the TLO Zone Compliance section of the document. Item A (2) referenced "documentation that the required restaurant is in operation and open for business." Commissioners confirmed that a Business License would be needed for the restaurant use. A Business License would not be issued unless certain requirements were met. The final section in the proposed language was Notice and Restrictive Covenant Required. Mr. Dansie noted that there were two Restrictive Covenants referenced in the ordinance: the one attached to the houses and one recorded against the property where the transient lodging facility itself was located. The language in that section was related to the latter.

Commissioners were supportive of a lot of the language that had been proposed. There were some changes that would need to be made, as well as some additions, but Commissioners believed this was a good start.

**2. Update and Status Discussion Regarding the Following Planning Initiatives: Open Space Preservation, Water Conservation Planning, Protection of Natural Washes, and Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations.**

Mr. Dansie reported that during the Planning Commission Meeting in June, some feedback was given on the Open Space Plan. Staff was in the process of incorporating that feedback and formatting the document. Once that was done, a finished version would be brought back to the Commission for consideration. From there, a recommendation would be made to the Town Council. That would take place during the August meeting.

As for water conservation strategies, there was a kickoff meeting where there were discussions about Section 10-1-8, which was the Water Rights Dedication portion of the ordinance. There were some conversations about what could be done to strengthen that requirement, so the Town would receive water rights instead of in-lieu fee payments. A lot of ideas had been shared, and those were now being researched with the Town Attorney. It was anticipated that the legal review of those questions would be received later in the month. That Committee would then regroup and move forward with different ideas based on what was shared by the Town Attorney.

Mr. Benson asked Mr. Dansie to explain the need for water shares and how that would assist with development in the future. Mr. Dansie reported that most of the water in the Town was used for outside water irrigation. Indoor water was a small fraction of that. There were two main water rights in the canyon. The Town's water right was mainly used for indoor water and for culinary water as well as a much larger right that was held by the Springdale Consolidated Irrigation Company. The latter was used exclusively for outdoor watering by the 400 shareholders



in the company. The Town was one of the larger shareholders in that company but still had a minority of the shares. As properties that had historically been irrigated with water using Springdale Consolidated Irrigation Company water were no longer irrigated (either through development or because there was no longer a desire to use those properties for irrigation), those shares were not being used. The future water planning for the Town anticipated a conversion of those shares from irrigation outdoor water use to indoor culinary water use. Mr. Benson noted that it was important to have the shares. Otherwise, it could drastically restrict any development moving forward. He explained that the Town having the shares was critical.

Mr. Dansie shared information about the protection of natural washes. He explained this had to do with ensuring that washes would remain natural as properties were developed. This would prevent people from channeling them, piping them, or doing things that would alter the natural flow. He noted that this was better for flood management and better for native flora and fauna species as well. There were a lot of benefits. Mr. Dansie stated that the main issue that came up the first time the matter was discussed was trying to determine what a wash was. Right now, Staff was researching resources that could make that identification. There had been discussions about the fact that Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was updating the flood map that was used to determine where flood insurance was required. That resource, as well as other resources, made it possible to identify what kind of washes were of concern. Once that information was considered, it would be possible to determine a strategy, which would then be brought to the Planning Commission.

Both the Town Council and the Planning Commission recently directed Staff to look at revising the standards for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), specifically looking at the possibility of extending the allowance for external accessory dwelling units (E-ADU) to the Foothill Residential Zone. Those were currently only allowed in the Valley Residential Zone. It was also possible that the number of ADUs allowed on a property could be increased. Mr. Dansie reported that only one ADU was currently allowed per property. The Town could consider potentially allowing more than one ADU per property. He noted that there had been discussions about those concepts with the Housing Committee. The Housing Committee was now doing some research into the Town's previous discussions and deliberations on ADUs as well as best practices from other communities. The Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) may be contacted as well, so it was possible to better understand what might happen with State Legislation. Mr. Dansie explained that the Housing Committee would suggest policies and recommendations to share with the Commission.

**B. Adjourn**

**Motion made by Noel Benson to Adjourn at 7:30 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  
Aren Emerson, Town Clerk

Tom Kenaston

DATE: 8/16/23

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk's Office. Please call 435-772-3434 or via email at or more information.





PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING Date 07/05/2023

### ATTENDEES:

LAURA DOTY  
Laura Doty

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Betha Lindsey

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Samantha

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Kimberly Clark

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)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)