



118 Lion Blvd • PO Box 187 • Springdale, UT 84767 • (435) 772-3434

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2024, 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**
- Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

A. Action items

- 1. Public Hearing - Zone Change:** Request to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to parcel S-161-8 (located behind the Bit and Spur restaurant), which is currently in the VR zone. The requested zone change would allow the development of four workforce housing units on the property. Applicant: Andrew Green. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie
- 2. Time extension for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plats:** Pearl Johnson requests a time extension of 12 months to implement the improvements associated with her preliminary and final subdivision plat at 1365 Zion Park Boulevard, which was approved on July 12th, 2023. Staff contact: Niall Connolly
- 3. Erosion Hazard Permit:** The Town of Springdale requests an erosion hazard permit to install erosion protection on the west bank of the North Fork of the Virgin River. The protection will extend northwards from the northern pedestrian bridge at the George A Barker River Park for 564 ft to the rear of 1599 Zion Park Blvd. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

B. Consent Agenda

- 1. Approval of Minutes from April 17th, and May 1st, 2024.**

C. Adjourn

***To access the live stream for this public meeting,
please visit or click the link below:
<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>**

APPROVED Tom Kenner DATE 6/19/24

This agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at 12:00 am/pm by F. B. [Signature] on 06/14/24

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Aren Emerson (435.772.3434) at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/agendacenter/planning-commission-7>



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2024, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 05:00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Terry Kruschke, Paul Zimmerman, Noel Benson, Rich Swanson, Jennifer McCulloch, and Erin Dempsey from Zion National Park

MEMBERS EXCUSED: None

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Zoning Administrator Kyndal Sagers, and Deputy Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording. See the attached sheet for attendees.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: No announcements

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest:

Mr. Kenaston disclosed that he was a member of the Springdale Housing Committee and had worked on developing the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone.

A. Action items

1. **Public Hearing – Zone Change:** Request to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to parcel S-161-8 (located behind the Bit and Spur restaurant), which is currently in the VR zone. The requested zone change would allow the development of four workforce housing units on the property. Applicant: Andrew Green. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Dansie said the parcel was located behind the Bit and Spur restaurant and was 1.26 acres. It contained a fair amount of steep slopes, and when the 30% and greater slopes were excluded from the property, it had approximately .96 acres of developable area.

He outlined that the request was the first the town had received to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to a piece of property. The town approved that zone in 2023 and had not received any requests until now. The purpose of the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone was to allow increased residential densities for

the purpose of developing workforce housing. In general, the workforce housing overlay zone required that 75% of the units constructed on the property be dedicated to workforce housing. The other 25% of the units could be market-rate units.

The restricted units were governed by a number of standards in the ordinance. The occupants had to demonstrate that they were actively employed in the Town of Springdale. There were annual reporting requirements to verify that the occupants met the active employment criteria. A restrictive covenant was placed on the property to ensure that all of the standards of the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone had been met.

The Workforce Housing Overlay Zone allowed up to sixteen housing units per developable acre of property. The current application requested an allowance of up to four units, and 100% of the units were intended to be used as workforce housing.

The property was changed from the Foothill Residential zone to the Valley Residential zone in September 2022. At that time, the applicant intended to develop workforce housing on the property. The town required that a restrictive covenant be recorded against the property as a condition of the zone change approval. The existing restrictive covenant made the property subject to most Workforce Housing Overlay Zone requirements. In essence, the end result of the applicant's request was to increase the number of workforce housing units from two to a potential of four.

Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the Town Council where they would decide whether or not to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone. If the Council elected to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone, a subsequent step was to enter into a development agreement with the property owner and record a deed-restricted covenant against the property.

He explained that if the Commission decided to recommend approval and wanted to ensure that certain aspects or elements of the development were included in a development agreement, it would be appropriate to include those in their recommendation to the Town Council.

Seven public comment letters, all generally supportive of the proposed zone change, were received and forwarded to the Commission.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Dansie clarified that the potential development area referred to an area that the applicants provided that met the setbacks and avoided the 30% slopes on the property.

Mr. Benson inquired about the improvements on the property.

- Mr. Dansie said the property was vacant.

Mr. Dansie said the duplex could be developed to 5,000 square feet in response to Mr. Benson's question.

Mr. Benson asked if any accessory buildings could be developed on the property.

- Under the current Valley Residential zone, a duplex and accessory building could also be developed on the property.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Green, representing The Bit and Spur, stated they were approved in September 2022 to build workforce housing as a duplex with an accessory building or a single-family residence with a guest house and an accessory building.

The Workforce Housing Overlay Zone gave them the opportunity to build up to 3,000 square feet of a house and 1,500 square feet of a guest house. The idea was for employee housing. The Workforce Housing Overlay zone gave the applicants the opportunity to develop individual spaces for people.

Mr. Green stated that they spoke with residents of Gifford Park to mitigate any potential negative impacts on the residents. Depending on the soil reports and engineering recommendations, they wanted to maintain the topography and as much natural vegetation as possible.

Mr. Green explained that they would be paving Sage Lane in anticipation of this project.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Benson asked what the timeframe looked like if approval was granted.

- Mr. Green explained that it would depend on the Planning Commission and Town Council process. They currently had a six-month extension, so Mr. Green explained that time was of the essence.

Mr. Benson asked how many feet the property line was from the adjacent Gifford Park residence.

- Mr. Green stated that from the actual structure, it was likely around 200 feet from the adjacent residence.

Mr. Dansie explained the next few steps for the Workforce Housing Overlay zone if the Town Council granted approval.

Mr. Benson asked Mr. Green if he would be comfortable with the Commission requiring the project to be completed within three years.

- Mr. Green was comfortable with that as a condition.

Mr. Benson suggested changing the regularly scheduled work meeting to a special meeting.

Questions from the Public: There were no questions from the public.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Ron Reber, a resident of Gifford Park and owner of the property directly adjacent to the subject property, expressed his support for the proposed development. Mr. Green approached him a few weeks ago to discuss the proposal. He was pleased with the design of the proposal and appreciated their neighbors for being concerned about potential impacts on the adjacent residents.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Kenaston highlighted the Land Use and Town Appearance goals from the General Plan that the proposed development would promote. He explained that adding housing for the workforce was a goal the Town had been working towards for some time. He appreciated the applicant for doing a lot of work to mitigate the negative impacts on the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Kruschke read section 10-13G-11(E) of the Town Code and believed it would not apply due to the distance between SR-9 and the parking lot between the proposal and SR-9.

Mr. Benson suggested adding conditions to mitigate any potential negative impacts on adjacent residents.

Ms. Inghram agreed and suggested a condition requiring the roadway and parking area to be paved to mitigate noise pollution in the area, which should be added to the recommendation. She suggested requiring all units to be used for workforce housing since that was in the application.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the determination of units in the proposal.

- Mr. Dansie explained that a unit was determined by the number of living areas inside the development. Regardless of the number of bedrooms and bathrooms inside a residence, the occupants should live as one household per unit.

Mr. Green then explained that with the new information, they would be requesting five units based on the orientation of living spaces among the units.

The Planning Commission determined to recommend approval for up to five workforce housing units instead of the original request for up to four units.

Motion made by Noel Benson that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the applicant's request to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to parcel S-161-8 as presented in the Planning Commission meeting on June 19, 2024. The motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The application meets the general criteria set forth in section 10-13G-9 of the overlay ordinance.**
2. **The application meets the Land Use and Town Appearance Sub-Goal C and C2 as outlined in the staff report.**
3. **The application meets the Housing General Goal and the Housing Sub-Goal B as outlined in the staff report.**
4. **The application meets those due to the density is low and the setbacks to residential areas are high.**

This motion has the following conditions:

1. **The development must be within the developable area shown on the map provided by the applicant.**
2. **All units must be workforce housing.**
3. **The buildings must be seventeen feet in height or less.**
4. **The total build must not exceed 5,000 square feet.**
5. **The parking and drive aisles and driveways must all be paved.**
6. **The entire project must be finished within two years, with a possible extension to three years.**

Seconded by Terry Kruschke

Discussion of the motion:

Mr. Kruschke proposed amending the motion to include up to five units.

Mr. Benson accepted the proposed amendment.

Mr. Kruschke proposed amending the motion to include a condition that all development on the property is single-story and in similar design and appearance to the Canyon Casita buildings.

Mr. Benson accepted the proposed amendment.

Vote on the Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Time extension for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plats: Pearl Johnson requests a time extension of 12 months to implement the improvements associated with her preliminary and final subdivision plat at 1365 Zion Park Boulevard, which was approved on July 12th, 2023. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Last year, the Commission approved a two-lot subdivision on Pearl Johnson's property. Currently, the lot was developed with a single-family house, and the subdivision would split the lot into two to allow for an additional single-family residence to be developed. The subdivision was approved by the Commission and Town Council with a condition that a water line be installed to ensure the rear lot had fire protection. Because there was a fire hydrant on the line, the line then became a public line. The Town Code required all public lines to be installed concurrently with the approval of the final plat. The applicants had been working toward completing the water line installation but had not yet finished it. Because of that, they were requesting a time extension of 12 months to complete the improvements associated with her preliminary and final subdivision plat. The staff report highlighted all of the criteria that needed to be met in order to receive a deadline extension for the project. The Planning Commission needed to determine if all of those criteria had been met.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there was a legal connection between Ms. Johnson and Mr. Tebbs, who was in attendance representing the application.

- There was a familial connection that allowed Mr. Tebbs to represent the application.

Applicant Presentation:

Aaron Tebbs, representing the applicant, explained the reasoning for the extension request and made himself available for additional questions from the Commission.

Commission Deliberation:

The Commission determined that the criteria set out in the Town Code had been met.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke that the Planning Commission approves the request for a time extension for the period of 12 months to install the culinary water line to lot two on the Johnson Family subdivision as described in the Planning Commission meeting on June 19, 2024. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The time extension request was received within 12 months of the date of the preliminary plat approval.**
2. **There are no changes to the plat, and no subdivision improvements have taken place.**
3. **No new zoning changes have been applied to the subdivision since the original plat approval.**

Second by Noel Benson.

Discussion of the motion: No further discussion.

Vote on the motion:

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Erosion Hazard Permit: The Town of Springdale requests an erosion hazard permit to install erosion protection on the west bank of the North Fork of the Virgin River. The protection will extend northwards from the northern pedestrian bridge at the George A Barker River Park for 564 ft to the rear of 1599 Zion Park Blvd. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

When the Town prepared the Virgin River Management Plan several years ago, one of the strategies that came from that was the direction to complete a Virgin River erosion hazard analysis, which was completed by Rosenberg Associates. When the analysis was conducted, Rosenberg identified an area of the river that was concerning due to a height erosion risk that could damage the infrastructure and negatively impact the Town and Zion National Park.

Based on that analysis, the Town identified funding to conduct a streambank protection project to mitigate the erosion hazard on that particular bend of the river. The Town applied for and was granted federal funding to construct streambank protection in that location. Because it was in the Erosion Hazard Overlay zone, an erosion hazard permit was required. The staff report contained an analysis of the Erosion Hazard Permit requirements. One of the main issues was related to the proposed streambank armory. The proposed material was hardened riprap, whereas the erosion hazard ordinance and Virgin River Management Plan both had a preference for soft armory.

Questions from the Commission:

Ms. Inghram asked if the study identified any private properties with potential erosion hazards besides the public properties.

- The study was comprehensive and looked at all properties in town, regardless of whether they were private or public.

Ms. Inghram asked if more private properties would be coming before the Commission for improvements.

- Anytime development is proposed in the Erosion Hazard Overlay zone, erosion damage mitigations were required. The Planning Commission had already reviewed several erosion hazard mitigations for private properties in the Town.

Ms. Inghram asked if the Town was actively reaching out to property owners within the Erosion Hazard Overlay zone to encourage mitigation measures outside of development.

- Yes, there were several other instances where critical infrastructure was located on private property that could be threatened in an erosion event. Town staff had conversations with specific property owners about the potential to mitigate erosion hazards on their properties. None of those properties presented as much of a risk as the location of this application.

Mr. Swanson referred to page two of the staff report and asked if the erosion control crossed into private property.

- After the Town identified the threat to public infrastructure, the owner of the two adjacent properties expressed interest in protecting improvements on those properties as well.
- Mr. Dansie explained that a requirement under the US Army Corps of Engineers was that if projects adjacent to each other were proposed, they needed to be considered as a single project when being considered for permitting.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on why the funding only covered part of the project.

- Jared Bates, representing Rosenberg Associates, explained that a migration study had been conducted to determine how much of the area was a risk to the infrastructure.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on why hardened riprap was the only feasible option.

- Mr. Bates explained that the cost was not the issue. It was the erosive forces, which included the velocity and height of the water, the steepness of the slope, and the lack of vegetation in the area.

Mr. Kenaston asked if any follow-up was recommended to ensure the Willows were seeded properly.

- Mr. Bates believed that monitoring was outlined as part of the plan to ensure the vegetation was working properly but explained that they may not thrive in certain areas due to the movement of the water flow.
- Weston Pickett with Rosenberg Associates explained that along the western bank, the slope was steep, so the riparian species in that area required access to water year-round. There was a decrease in viability in those plants by taking away five feet of the river. In the diagram provided, there were two rows to hopefully keep them as close to the low-flow channel as possible.

Mr. Swanson asked if Willow plantings were proposed for the other side of the river as well.

- It would be a benefit to enhance both banks while completing the project.

Mr. Benson asked if invasive species would be removed while planting the Willows on the other side of the bank.

- If that was desired to be in the scope, it could be added.
- Mr. Dansie added that the Town was pursuing funding from the US Forest Service to complete an invasive species project throughout the entire Town.

Ms. Inghram asked if there were other ways to remove the large trees without digging them up entirely, potentially leaving more protection for the erosion hazard area.

- Most of the time, the technique used would be to cut the tree and then treat the stump.

Mr. Swanson asked how the requirement for unobstructed access pertained to the private property.

- The private plan identified a certain access location. The staff report recommended adding a condition requiring an easement to be recorded, allowing that specific point to be used for access.

Applicant Presentation:

No further information was presented.

Commission Deliberation:

The Town's Engineer also reviewed the proposal and determined that it complied with the Town Code. The Commission agreed and determined to grant approval.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Erosion Hazard Zone Permit for the streambank protection project at the George A. Baker River Park, 1559 and 1599 Zion Park Boulevard, as discussed in the Planning Commission meeting on June 19, 2024. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The Erosion Hazard Permit complies with the requirements of 10-13E of the Springdale Town Code relating to Erosion Hazard Zone Permitting.**
2. **The applicant has submitted an engineering analysis covering the required elements, including the floodplain/floodway impacts, stream stability impacts, proposed erosion protection improvements, materials, maintenance, vegetation mitigation, and a statement of methodologies.**
3. **The engineering analysis concludes that bioengineering erosion protection techniques alone are insufficient to protect the existing infrastructure and development.**

4. The engineering analysis has been reviewed and approved by the town engineer, and when completed, the erosion protection will minimize future flood damage to Springdale public facilities and utilities.

This motion has the following conditions of approval:

1. Any vegetation in the riparian zone that is disturbed by construction must be replaced with appropriate revegetation using plants native to Zion Canyon.
2. The owner of properties at 1559 and 1599 Zion Park Boulevard must record a perpetual private easement to allow for unobstructed access for maintenance and inspection purposes.
3. The applicant must obtain a floodplain development and excavation permit from the town prior to construction.
4. Where feasible, from an engineering perspective, the riprap should be constructed of stone occurring in the Springdale area. If that is not feasible, the stone should blend with the natural character of the Virgin River and may include basalt.

Second by Noel Benson.

Discussion of the motion:

Mr. Zimmerman proposed adding the condition of approval to remove invasive species.

Mr. Kruschke accepted the proposed amendment.

Mr. Kenaston asked if they wanted to add any follow-up to ensure the bioengineering was grown successfully on the riprap.

Mr. Kruschke stated that the ordinance already called for the town to perform an inspection.

Mr. Dansie said the ordinance required inspections after flood events and ongoing inspections in that regard. If the Commission wanted a specific requirement that the willows be regularly and periodically inspected to ensure their viability, it would be appropriate to include it.

Mr. Benson asked if the prior Spring was considered a flood event due to record run-off.

Mr. Dansie said that any time there is a flood event that could damage the erosion hazard mitigation, an inspection is supposed to be performed.

Mr. Swanson asked if removing the non-native plants would hurt the ability of the new plants to grow. He questioned whether leaving the plants would help the new willow plants grow and if they should be left in for a while.

Mr. Pickett said it would remove competition for the willows to grow.

Mr. Dansie asked Mr. Pickett to clarify if he meant it would remove competition for the willows to grow if the invasive species were removed.

Mr. Pickett confirmed that was correct. He recommended removing the invasive species but on a case-by-case basis. He expressed that full-scale removal was a bad idea, in his opinion. For example, they would look at the situation, and if there were five Russian Olives, probably two or three could come out without negatively impacting the bank. The others, where it might be questionable if they were helping more than hurting, would be left alone. Generally speaking, they left them alone unless it was obvious that there were problems.

Mr. Kruschke said he felt they should not add it and let the town address the invasive species separately.

Mr. Benson proposed adding "as deemed appropriate by the engineering firm" to the invasive species removal condition.

Mr. Kruschke accepted the proposed amendment.

Vote on the motion:

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes from April 17th, and May 1st, 2024.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the Consent Agenda for the Minutes from April 17th, and May 1st, 2024. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjourn

Motion made by Pam Inghram to Adjourn at 06:52 p.m. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Kruschke: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

Benson: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Robin Romero, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____

DATE: 8/21/24

A recording of the public meeting is available on the Town's YouTube Channel at [youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings](https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings). For more information, please call 435-772-3434 or email springdale@springdale.utah.gov.





PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Regular Mtg. Date 06/19/2024

ATTENDEES:

Row Reber

Name (please print)

Andrew Coen

Name (please print)

Alex Pelton

Name (please print)

Teri Spahnauer

Name (please print)

Jared Bates

Name (please print)

Wesley Pickett

Name (please print)

Trish Jennings

Name (please print)

Aaron Tetts

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

ATTENDEES:

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Dear Planning Commission members,

A couple of weeks ago, the principals of the Bit and Spur met with a few residents of Gifford Park, specifically those of us who will border their proposed employee-housing project. We appreciate the time they spent explaining their plans to accommodate some of their employees.

We had concerns about a previously approved structure on Bit and Spur property directly behind and adjacent to Gifford Park. They indicated that the approval of this proposed project will eliminate the two-story structure and allow for a one-story garage/storage structure. The new concept of constructing three single-level structures is much more appealing to us as it will not obstruct our views or allow for views into our backyards. We like the design of the Canyon Casitas very much. Overall the new plan should be very beneficial for the Town, for employees, and for our visual impact. They also indicated that they plan to pave the gravel road. This means a lot to me as I can hear the vehicles on the gravel road from my bedroom. We're also very pleased that they are going to build a fence between us.

We are very supportive of the Bit's project. We hope the Planning Commission will approve their plans and accommodate any necessary zoning changes. Furthermore, we support the idea of providing housing for our local workforce in Springdale. We believe that this project is good for all parties involved.

Sincerely,
Patricia Vail-Blackett
Gifford Park Resident

Bit and Spur employee housing

As one of the more affected residents of Gifford Park, I have taken a significant interest in what the Bit is planning to build adjacent to our property. We haven't been at all excited to have construction begin on the previously approved two story building directly behind us. I understand the need but feared it would look into our backyard and patio space. Further, the noise of cars, headlights at nights and the possibility of small children finding our small pond concerns us.

So I am actually very pleased to hear the two story building plan could/will be abandoned if they get approval to build 3 duplex style single story structures. Additionally, the style of building is quite appealing and the roofline very unobstructive. They have assured me the two story building would be redesigned as a one level storage structure with the possibility of a couple of apartments. It's my understanding that this change cannot be leveraged against the approval of the overlay proposal. Obviously, that would be our choice. It's also my belief that once the approval of three units happens, there cannot be additional units requested or approved in the future.

With all of that said, I trust Alex and Trish will do what that have assured. This feels like a win win to me, as always thanks for your time and consideration.

Ron Reber



Hi Barbara,

I wasn't sure where to send this and I apologize for bothering you with it, but I would like the Council to know that as a permanent full time resident of Springdale, I am in support of Andrew Greens application for a zone change to allow workforce housing.

Thank you for all you do!

Best,

Regina Pagles

Hi Tom,

I would like the Council to know that as a permanent full time resident of Springdale, I am in support of Andrew Greens application for a zone change to allow workforce housing. Thank you for all you do!

Best,
Regina Pagles

June 16, 2024

Springdale Planning Commission and Town Council
P.O. Box 187
Springdale, Utah 84767

The lack of workforce housing is a major stressor for both business owners and employees of Springdale and Zion National Park. The proposal by Andrew Green for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone (WFOZ) on parcel S-161-8 will not only alleviate this need but also enable Springdale to ensure a diverse social and economic future in this special place that we all call home.

We support this application and hope to see it come to fruition.

Sincerely,

Max and Julie Gregoric
Sol Foods



Public Comment regarding Springdale Workforce Housing Overlay Zone (WFOZ), Parcel S-161-8

June 18, 2024

To: All members of the Springdale Planning Commission

We are writing in support of the application for WFOZ submitted by Andy Green. We looked over the extensive ordinance as well as the application. It all looks good to us. The building is attractive, not overly dense and we especially appreciate the consideration of the 100 foot setback from other nearby residential areas. Much of the building will be hidden by existing structures and proposed terracing and landscaping. A friend of ours who lives in Gifford Park is pleased with the proposed lack of impact it will have on her property. We are aware that this is the first application for WFOZ since the ordinance was adopted in June, 2023. For that reason, it is very important that we support this application. It is also a great way to maintain good employees in our community.

Sincerely,

Mike McMahan and Helen McMahan

Town of Springdale, Planning Commission & Town Council:

I am writing this email in full support of the zone change being requested by the Bit & Spur.

The town of Springdale created a new zone, the "Employing Housing Overlay Zone." The creation of the new zone allows an avenue to create much needed employee housing in Springdale. I cannot think of a better property to implement this zone on. The Bit & Spur always looks forward at ways to help it's community! This is just another example of their effort to support the town of Springdale and their employees!

Please don't miss this opportunity to make a difference in the availability of more housing options for our employees. They deserve to live in town and be part of the community they work to support.

Thank you.

Kathy LaFave

Request to apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to parcel S-161-8

Hi – We have read the application and support it. As homeowners in the community, if there is one thing the town needs it is affordable housing to help support the infrastructure. There are a lot of folks that need reasonable accommodations to keep the town thriving. Thank you for considering the application.

--

John Landre & Erika Jones

