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, JULY 15, 2026, 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. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Discussion about potential changes to the Land Use Code that will be necessary following adoption of the Wildland Urban Interface Zone. Staff contact: Eugenia Akiyom

2. Discussion about potential changes to Section 10-18 of the Code to improve water efficiency in landscape. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

B. Adjourn

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

https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeeting

APPROVED Jennifer McCulloch DATE 7/15/26

This agenda was posted at the Springdale Canyon Community Center and Town Hall at 5:00 am (pm) by A Raddatz on 7-9-26

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

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: http://www.springdale.utah.gov/AgendaCenter

MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2026, AT 5:00 PM AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767

The meeting convened at 5:00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Jennifer McCulloch, Commissioners Rich Swanson, Paul Zimmerman, Kashif Bhatti, Mellisa LaBorde, and Jorge Hernández from Zion National Park.
EXCUSED: Commissioner Terry Kruschke
ALSO PRESENT: Town Manager Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development Niall Connolly, Eugenia Akiyom, Associate Planner, and Deputy Town Clerk April Raddatz recording. See the attached sheet for attendees.

Ms. McCulloch designated Mellisa LaBorde and Kashif Bhatti as voting members in the absence of the excused Commissioners.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Rich Swanson.
Vote on Motion:
Swanson: Aye
McCulloch: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
Bhatti: Aye
LaBorde: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements:
Mr. Dansie announces that there will be a Two-Acre Two-Cent event where anybody can come and see the Town Hall and give their thoughts and ideas about the Two-Acre vacant lot next to Town Hall that will be developed. That event will be July 30th at 9:00 AM, held at the Community Center.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: There were no declared conflicts of interest.

A. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Discussion about potential changes to the Land Use Code that will be necessary following adoption of the Wildland Urban Interface Zone. Staff Contact: Eugenia Akiyom

Staff Presentation:
Ms. Akiyom stated that the item was a continuation of the Planning Commission's discussion from its May 1, 2026 meeting regarding the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Code. The purpose of the report was to highlight potential conflicts between the Town's land use ordinance and the WUI Code and to present draft ordinance language for the Commission's consideration.

Following the previous discussion, Ms. Akiyom stated that staff had reviewed the Commission's comments, evaluated the relevant sections of the code, and prepared draft ordinance language addressing the potential conflicts identified. The report primarily focused on two topics: building construction materials and landscape requirements related to defensible space.

Regarding building materials, Ms. Akiyom stated that staff had prepared draft amendments that would prohibit wood roof shingles and wood siding while continuing to allow timber structural elements. Staff also proposed adding cement board siding as an approved building material.

Regarding landscaping, Ms. Akiyom stated that staff had presented two options concerning the existing tree replacement requirement in the code and had proposed amendments to the minimum tree-planting requirements within the Town's adopted WUI Zone.

Ms. Akiyom stated that staff was seeking direction and feedback from the Commission to determine the preferred approach for moving forward with preparation of a final ordinance amendment. She offered to answer questions from the Commission.

Commission Questions and Discussion:
Mr. Swanson asked about the proposed prohibition on wood roofs. He stated that while he was not opposed to identifying wood as an unapproved material, he questioned whether the focus should instead be on requiring new buildings to meet a specific ignition rating. He noted that the code did not prohibit wood roofs but instead assigned them a lower ignition rating. Mr. Connolly confirmed that Mr. Swanson was correct that the WUI Code provided options regarding the applicable parameters. He stated that, based on discussions with the Town's Building Inspector, wood shingles were considered particularly problematic in terms of wildfire risk. The Building Inspector had recommended prohibiting wood shingles in this instance. Mr. Connolly reiterated that the WUI Code provided options but stated that, based on the Building Inspector's recommendation, prohibiting wood shingles would likely be the best approach.

Mr. Swanson asked about wood siding. Mr. Connolly stated that wood siding was more flammable than other materials and could remain in the code subject to WUI compliance review. He noted that the Commission could also remove wood siding from the list of approved materials as an additional measure to limit hazardous materials.

Mr. Swanson inquired about wood fencing. He asked about the fire risk, because it isn't against somebody's house, but it could provide more fuel for a fire. Mr. Connolly stated that the WUI assessment was based on the individual property and suggested that a wooden fence may present less risk than wood siding on a home

because it was not directly attached to the structure. He noted that prohibiting wood fencing could be considered but cautioned that wood was a popular fencing material and that a prohibition could limit fencing options for homeowners.

Mr. Zimmerman and Ms. McCulloch both stated that they felt the wood siding wasn't as much of a problem as the shingles on the house. Mr. Swanson agreed, and added that some people might want to use wood siding as an accent and not a full covering.

Ms. McCulloch asked for staff's opinion on the risk of these items. Mr. Connolly explained that if the Commission was not comfortable prohibiting wood siding outright, the building inspector, Ms. Akiyom, and he would still review properties for WUI code compliance. He noted that compliance included defensible space and other factors, and that wood siding could potentially be allowed when other WUI requirements were met. Any concerns would still be addressed through the building code review process.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the process if someone had a tree on their property that needed to be removed for WUI purposes: would they need a permit, replant 2 to 1 somewhere else, or just remove the tree? Ms. Akiyom explained that the options presented for properties within the Town's WUI boundary included allowing existing trees to be removed without requiring replacement when development occurred, or removing the existing tree requirement from the land ordinance altogether. Ms. Akiyom clarified that the proposed option would apply to any tree removal within the WUI boundary, regardless of whether the property involved a renovation or new development. Trees removed within the WUI boundary would not be required to be replaced. Mr. Swanson asked what the current Town Code was. Mr. Connolly explained that the current code required replacing native vegetation greater than six feet in height that was removed at a 2:1 ratio. The code also required preserving native vegetation during grading and construction activities. Mr. Connolly clarified that the proposed language was that the replacement requirement would not exist within the WUI boundary.

2. Discussion about potential changes to Section 10-18 of the Code to improve water efficiency in landscape. Staff Contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:
Mr. Connolly stated that water conservation was a longstanding and complex issue for communities such as the Town. He recommended addressing the issue incrementally, with the current discussion focused specifically on landscaping and potential changes to improve water efficiency. He identified several potential changes, including removing the prohibition on artificial turf and limiting the amount of grass permitted in commercial landscaping, with possible limitations in residential zones also considered. Mr. Connolly noted that Commissioners Zimmerman and Kruschke had provided comments raising additional considerations and recommended that the Commission focus on practical, incremental adjustments to the landscape ordinance rather than a broader discussion of water conservation.

Commission Questions and Discussion:
Mr. Swanson asked about artificial turf and said the look and design have come a long way, and that artificial turf looks better now than when it first came out. Ms. McCulloch wondered whether it should be allowed, with limitations on square footage coverage. Ms. LaBorde stated that she has a neighbor that has artificial turf and it looks nice, and she believed that it was real grass when she saw it initially. Mr. Zimmerman stated that his biggest concern was the cooling affect that occurs with natural grass, and that

natural grass is generally in open space areas. He stated that artificial turf and cement and hardscapes are not cooling to the environment.

Ms. McCulloch said she was leaning toward allowing it, but with limits. She also wondered whether they could set a requirement for a certain rating or grade. Mr. Connolly said they could do additional research on artificial turf. He noted that artificial turf varied in quality and had improved over the years, but was not a universal solution. He suggested that it could be an option within xeriscaped areas to provide some greenery and recommended exploring potential limitations on its use, including whether different grades or qualities of artificial turf could address concerns.

Mr. Zimmerman raised a concern about potentially creating guidelines that would reduce open space and advised caution with the direction the Commissioners took. He documented his notes, which will be attached here as **EXHIBIT A**.

Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Swanson shared ideas about what certain water conservation guidelines would mean for agriculture and farmers. Mr. Connolly stated that the pastures and semi-agricultural areas were a treasured part of the community and noted that most were zoned Valley Residential. He cautioned that restrictions on natural grass in Valley Residential zones could make it difficult for those areas to remain semi-agricultural. He suggested setting aside the Valley Residential zones for now and focusing instead on commercial landscaping requirements. He proposed greater restrictions on grass in commercial properties, potentially limiting it to functional areas such as recreation spaces. Mr. Connolly noted that this approach could improve water efficiency as commercial properties were redeveloped and suggested that water-wise landscaping could provide an equally attractive alternative to extensive grass while conserving water.

Mr. Swanson said one of the best ways to conserve water was to get rid of lawns and plant native plants. He queried how that would be enforced. Mr. Connolly explained that amendments to the landscaping ordinance restricting grass would be future-facing and would apply as properties were redeveloped. Existing commercial properties would not be required to remove their grass immediately; instead, landscaping would gradually become more water-efficient as redevelopment occurred. Mr. Dansie explained that adopting water conservation ordinances could provide an immediate impact rather than requiring the Town to wait for properties to redevelop. He noted that the Washington County Water Conservancy District offered rebates to property owners for removing grass, but eligibility required the Town to adopt ordinances containing certain water conservation elements. He suggested that adopting the proposed measures could qualify Springdale property owners for these incentives and encourage faster grass removal.

Mr. Connolly summarized the Commission's discussion on water conservation. He stated that the general consensus was to allow artificial turf with some limitations, which staff would further research. The Commission agreed to focus grass limitations on commercial rather than residential properties, revisit the Washington County Water Conservancy District rebate program, and explore whether irrigation efficiency requirements could be strengthened. Staff would also investigate irrigation schedules and potential time-of-day watering restrictions. The Commission agreed not to pursue water features at this time. Mr. Connolly suggested that commercial properties could limit grass to defined functional areas, such as recreational spaces, rather than applying a percentage limitation. He also offered to provide examples of water-efficient landscaping in Town for the Commission's consideration.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Rich Swanson to Adjourn at 6:53 PM The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.
Vote on Motion:
Swanson: Aye
McCulloch: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
Bhatti: Aye
LaBorde: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF SPRINGDALE, UTAH INCORPORATED MAR. 9, 1959 WASHINGTON COUNTY

April Raddatz, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ **DATE:** 10-21-26

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

SPRINGDALE
Utah

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting: Planning Commission **Date:** 7-15-2026

ATTENDEES:

Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)
Name (please print)	Title (please print)

EXHIBIT A

The General Plan states that:

> *"Open space within the Town boundaries can come in multiple forms and serve a variety of purposes. Open space in the foothills preserves important views of Zion Canyon and provides habitat for native flora and fauna. Open space along the Virgin River improves river corridor health, provides recreation for residents, and preserves important riparian areas. Open pastures and orchards along State Route 9 (SR9) establish a link to the Town's agricultural heritage and promote a rural village feel. Parks and other developed open spaces provide important outdoor recreation opportunities for the community. All of these open space types are important to the Town's character. And, as directed by the General Plan, the Town will actively seek to preserve open space within the community to achieve these goals."*

The following excerpt from the Town's Open Space Plan states:

> "For example, an owner of a large pasture may be interested in preserving the pasture for open space. The Town could partner with the property owner on irrigation practices and infrastructure and/or water use rates that make maintaining the property as an open pasture less of a financial burden on the property owner."

Remember, the General Plan directs that *"the Town will actively seek to preserve open space within the community to achieve these goals."*

Remember also the previous argument regarding preservation of

Open Spaces within the Residential Zones (e.g., Valley Residential Zone) raised at the Previous Planning Commission meeting:

> "We all likely drive by a number of properties in Town that contribute to the OPEN SPACE spirit of the Town's Open Space Plan but at the same time may not recognize that many of these are involved in what could be considered, for lack of a better term, "Passive" Agricultural use. And, depending on one's interpretation of "limited on-site commercial use" they could be held to be in violation.
>
> Consider a situation wherein a property owner desiring to enhance the visual beauty of the land and make maintaining the open space less of a financial burden engages with someone to graze cattle on his pasture, or plant and cut alfalfa, or start a vineyard, or a garden with rows of lavender to maintain the land in a visually appealing state, and the owner of the cattle later sells the cattle, the hay, grapes, or the lavender and receives minor compensation from those efforts.
>
> They could be prohibited from doing so if one were to interpret our current code such that these were commercial farming practices that could only happen in an Agriculturally zoned property.
>
> This situation seemed quite contrary to the spirit of the Town's Open Space Plan. As such, it was added to the Planning Commission Work Priorities."

Earlier this year while reflecting on the validity of this argument the Planning Commission added to its work priorities the need to review the current code to clarify and correct discrepancies with respect to the statements in Chapters 9B-1Valley Residential Zone Purpose and Objectives and Chapter 10 Residential Agriculture and Farm Animal Regulations noted under Chapters 10-15D-1 and 10-15-D4 in a manner that supports the stated goals in the OPEN SPACE PLAN among others.

The newly proposed modifications to the Town Code to address "Landscape and Water Conservation" likewise is not considerate of the impact on OPEN SPACE retention and management. Pasture Irrigation issues present in the Landscape and Water Conservation staff proposal does not consider the timing and usage restrictions on "Big Water Users" which already limit watering to specific days and times

The "Time of Day" regulations or "Irrigation Schedule" for "Big Water Users" allows them watering only during the periods Thursday 10am – 6pm and Sunday 10am – Mon 10am, already a highly restrictive (and arguably unsustainable) period.

Further prohibiting watering during the hours between 10am and 8pm would reduce the allowable watering time by more than 56% and limit watering to only one period per week (Sunday 8pm – Mon 10am).

Pastures and other large fields would not be sustainable with this restriction.

We are not St. George and our General Plan recognizes that when stating:

"Open pastures and orchards along State Route 9 (SR9) establish a link to the Town's agricultural heritage and promote a rural village feel. Parks and other developed open spaces provide important outdoor recreation opportunities for the community. All of these open space types are important to the Town's character."

For St. George, Functional grass has been being defined as "an area where people or pets actively recreate, such as a sports field, a park or a dedicated backyard play area". This does not consider the "functionality" of using the grass for food or forage by livestock as intended under Town Code 10-9B-1 Purpose and Objectives of the Valley Residential Zone. Using such a limited definition would all but make livestock unsustainable in the VR Zone. Moreover, restricting the lot coverage by "grass" to a maximum of 8% of total lot size would have the same result.

I Recommend the Planning Commission consider combining Landscape and Water Conservation with our review of the Open Space Code Discrepancies and in addition to the Code Sections recommended by the staff include the following Town Code Areas in our review:

Chapter 9 Residential Zones, ARTICLE B. - VALLEY RESIDENTIAL (VR) ZONE, Ordinance 10-9B-1: - PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES states:

> The valley residential (VR) zone is established to provide areas in the Town where residential uses may be harmoniously integrated with incidental agricultural pursuits. This zone is intended to allow the keeping of farm animals and fowl in conjunction with single-family dwelling units to an extent consistent with the development. The VR zone is also intended to retain land in parcels or lots large enough to provide efficient and attractive residential development, which preserves the historic open agricultural and farm-type impression of the area.

CHAPTER 15D - RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE AND FARM ANIMAL REGULATIONS, 10-15D-1: it states The purpose is to allow agriculture and the keeping of farm animals on a small scale for personal, noncommercial use or **limited on-site commercial use**. The regulations in this chapter are intended to allow small-scale agriculture and animal use for personal enjoyment, local food production, and sustainability. These regulations are separate from agriculture business uses allowed in the Agricultural Zone. This chapter does not authorize large scale or commercial agriculture enterprises.

Under 10-15D-4: - GENERAL AGRICULTURE AND FARM ANIMAL REGULATIONS:

> *A. Agriculture and the keeping of farm animals are allowed for the personal use and enjoyment of the owner or occupant of the property. The agriculture or farm animal use may not constitute a commercial enterprise in and of itself. . . . nothing in this chapter is intended to prohibit the sale of excess agriculture products at local farmers' markets,*