



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 1, 2021 AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 5:00 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Barbara Bruno, Commissioners Ric Rioux, Jack Burns, Tom Kenaston, Kyla Topham, Noel Benson, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.
ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Town Clerk Darci Carlson, Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson, and Katy Brown recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the electronic meeting.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Ric Rioux to approve the agenda. Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Mr. Dansie announced that Dawn McComb had tendered her resignation as Commissioner. She had provided great service and the Commission was grateful for her time. There would be a recommendation at the next Town Council meeting for Kyla Topham to become a full voting member and for Pamela Inghram to be appointed as an alternate.

Ms. Carlson had received a few requests for printed packet material. The Clerk's office was happy to provide printed materials for any Commission members upon request.

A. Non-Action Items

1. Discussion of the General Plan Final Draft Document: Due to some unforeseen delays, it had been a few months since the Planning Commission had reviewed the General Plan draft. The purpose of the General Plan was to capture the collective will of the community and what they wanted Springdale to be in the next 20 years. The Commission had pushed out a few online surveys, conducted stakeholder interviews and input sessions, conducted one-on-one neighbor interviews, and consulted many subject matter experts. After the initial public input had been gathered, the Commission began drafting the aspirational vision statement that would become the guide to direct the content of the General Plan. The content was organized into eight main elements (chapters). Within each element, general goals were then identified. Once general goals were established, they were augmented further by subgoals and strategies that would serve as stepping stones to achieve the goals and help promote the vision in the General Plan.

This was the first time the Commission was seeing all the content packaged together into one document. Staff had also included background and existing conditions language which the Commission had previously not reviewed. They would need to offer feedback on the newly added language.

The Commission also needed to determine what they wanted to do with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The FLUM was a visual representation of the desired future uses of different areas in Town. It did not forecast zone changes and it did not encourage or discourage future development. It simply

visualized how areas in Town may be used in the future. The FLUM had been included in the General Plan since 2010. The Commission was welcome to make revisions to the map, create a new one altogether, or leave it out of the General Plan.

In addition to the Commission's feedback on the compiled final draft, staff recommended additional public feedback sessions in the coming weeks to present the final General Plan back to the public for review. Staff sought direction on how the Commission would like to execute the final stages of public outreach.

Ms. Topham asked if the FLUM could be used in litigation as a finding.

- As a preemptive strategy to address the concern Ms. Topham addressed, the current General Plan had always contained language that stated the FLUM was a guide only, and the Town was free to make decisions on development regardless of what the FLUM said. An example would be a decision that the Council had utmost judicial discretion on, such as zone changes.

Ms. Bruno didn't see that much that needed to be revised on the FLUM. She asked if the area identified as 'mixed use' was still appropriate considering the LaFave suites that had since been erected in the area.

- The LaFave suites were technically still within the parameters of what the General Plan envisioned for mixed-use areas.

Mr. Rioux felt that the FLUM was generally hard to read without any street names or notable landmarks. He also felt it would be more readable to visually see which portions of Town were already developed and which parcels were still undeveloped.

The Commission agreed that the FLUM should be included to support the General Plan. They ultimately felt it was still accurate but wanted to add overlays to make it more understandable in terms of differentiating between residential and commercial uses.

Ms. Bruno asked for the definition of 'mixed use.'

- Mr. Dansie read the definition of 'mixed use' from the General Plan: *"These are areas of mixed residential and commercial uses. The mixing of uses should help promote the Town's atmosphere and small-town feel. Higher-density residential uses, including multi-family uses, are appropriate in this area as well as small scale commercial development. Both residential and commercial uses may be accompanied by limited and incidental agricultural uses. The combination of residential and commercial uses in a single building or development is particularly encouraged. Moderate-income and employee housing is encouraged. While allowing higher-density residential and commercial uses, this area should still seek to preserve open spaces where appropriate. Doing so will help promote the small town feel and rural village atmosphere."*

Mr. Burns wondered if Lodging uses should be included in mixed use area. He was concerned that 'mixed use' had become a gateway for transient lodging, which tended to take the shape of high-density proposals.

- Ms. Bruno suggested that 'mixed use' could be redefined as residential and retail, and transient lodging could be taken out. The Commission could make the change and it would be included in any public hearings.

Ms. Topham asked if it was possible to make the FLUM interactive so a user could click on different layers and see them overlaid.

- Ms. McPartland thought that would be a great tool for public input.
- Mr. Kenaston added that it would also be a great tool for the Commission.

The Commission would discuss the FLUM further in their next work meeting. They continued their review of the General Plan language by discussing each element individually:

1. LAND USE & TOWN APPEARANCE

Mr. Burns liked how the existing conditions were captured.

Mr. Rioux was unsure of how 'key members' was defined and wondered who was being prioritized by the Town, and why only certain groups were being targeted as a priority.

- The Commission opted to strike the work 'key' so it would just read 'members of the community'

2. TRANSPORTATION

The Commission was pleased with the language as-is.

3. HOUSING

Mr. Kenaston suggested mapping fiber installation progress as a way for the Town to be held accountable to what had been identified as a goal.

- Ms. Bruno was in support of assigning Commissioners and community members to the General Plan Elements to track the progress and add in accountability factors.
- The Town was in the process of creating a more detailed housing plan and an-depth study was in the works currently.

Ms. Bruno and Mr. Burns touched on comments submitted by resident Jeff Carlson regarding accountability and tracking progress with the creation of workplans with distinct timelines. (Attachment #1). There was language in the General Plan implementation section that discussed identifying timelines and tracking progress. The Commission agreed to prioritize accountability in their approach.

- Mr. Rioux suggested a quarterly review of General Plan goals and progress.

4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Burns shared his thoughts about the 'impacts of commercial activities' portion of this section. He felt that the more Springdale encouraged commercial development, the more it impacted the housing issue. He asked if the Commission could assert that any commercial development proposals must contain a housing proposal to offset the impacts of the lack of housing.

- The town code currently had language about requiring employee housing, but the threshold was set at 25 full-time employees which was much more than most of the businesses in Town employed. The Commission could look at adjusting the threshold in future conversations about how to address attainable housing.

5. MUNICIPAL AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Mr. Burns mentioned the phrase "continue to provide culinary water," and felt it was important to keep an eye on long term projections of water availability, especially if Springdale sees more large-scale development.

6. PARKS RECREATION & THE ARTS

Ms. Bruno suggested striking language about the softball field. Because of the recent flood destruction, the Council had given staff direction to restore the ball field as open space rather than a dedicated ball field.

7. PUBLIC HEALTH

No suggestions or revisions were made.

8. NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

No suggestions or revisions were made.

The Commission decided that the General Plan would be housed on the Town website as a static document and called for an updated, more accessible FLUM to be included with it.

- Mr. Dansie suggested labeling streets and subdivisions on the FLUM to make the map more visually accessible.

Ms. Bruno asked how the Commission wanted to handle additional public feedback.

- Mr. Rioux felt that a charrette format would be ideal, where each Commissioner could be posted at a station to answer specific questions.
- Ms. Topham felt that any in-person efforts should be offset with an online survey, given the varying comfort levels with the status of the pandemic. She also suggested scheduling the CCC gallery area for people to interact with informational displays at their leisure.

The Commission agreed to hold an asynchronous charrette in the CCC gallery so the public could interact and offer feedback in their own timeframe. A public hearing would be scheduled when the additional comments from the community had been incorporated into the General Plan update.

Mr. Burns felt that the final format should be something that the public would want to read, and felt an Executive Summary version of the General Plan would be easy to digest.

The Commission wanted to seek a publishing professional's assistance to help determine the best font to use for GP content.

Ms. Carlson announced that this was Katy Brown's last meeting and thanked her for her service to the Town for the last few years. The Commission expressed their gratitude for her assistance.

B. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 6:42 pm made by Kyla Topham Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.



Katy Brown
Katy Brown, Attending Clerk

APPROVAL: Barbara Bruno DATE: 9-15-21

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



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Date 9/1/21

IN PERSON ATTENDEES:

REMOTE ATTENDEES:
(Clerk will complete)

Mark Chambers
Name (please print)

PAM CARLTON
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

ERIN TYLER
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)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)