



TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

118 Lion Blvd PO Box 187 Springdale UT 84767 * 435-772-3434 fax 435-772-3952

MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008 AT 5:10 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UT.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Colin Dockstader, Commissioners Tom Haraden, Dan Mabbutt, Paul Mailloux, Steve Masefield, Matt Rayner and alternate Rebecca McKown

EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, Town Clerk Fay Cope and citizen Jaye Mundy.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Steve Masefield to approve the agenda, seconded by Matt Rayner:

Dockstader: Aye

Mabbutt: Aye

Mailloux: Aye

Masefield: Aye

Rayner: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Central Commercial Zone revisions: Mr. Dansie recapped that the Commission had discussed broad concepts in earlier meetings; in this meeting the Commission could establish more specific guidelines. Mr. Dockstader, Mr. Mailloux and Mr. Dansie had met earlier in the week to set some preliminary guidelines. They had discussed using the 'Larry McKown Triangle' or an alternative method called 'cumulative building frontage' to determine front setbacks. Mr. Dockstader expressed concern that if the same triangle was used on every property, it might prevent creative building design and make the appearance of the town monotonous. The cumulative building frontage concept still allowed a designer to use the McKown triangle but allowed other alternatives, too. Mr. Dansie explained the 'cumulative building design' theory and reviewed alternatives for building size and height and how incentives could be used to allow increases from a base point. A maximum size and height would need to be determined.

Building setbacks: Mr. Mailloux reviewed scenario layouts he had drawn for two existing central commercial lots, should they be redeveloped. He said it would be difficult to use the McKown Triangle on most of the lots in the CC zone, but especially on the small lots. He suggested that the Commission use either the front of the curb or the back of the curb for a beginning point instead of the SR-9 right-of-way, which varied in width and easement throughout town and might be more subject to change. Mr. Dansie said the built highway was not the same as the right-of-way in many instances. Currently the ordinance required using the property line, which was typically consistent with the right-of-way.

Mr. Mailloux said he had explored how effective it would be to accomplish designing a 26' high building with 8000 SF at a 40' setback. It was easily done. Mr. Mabbutt summarized; it would liberalize the current ordinance to revise the way front setbacks were determined.

Mr. Mailloux explained that his examples aligned the fronts of the buildings with the front edge of the property. He thought the Commission could consider allowing a range of setbacks if the building was 'skewed' on the lot. He also demonstrated how a shallow setback would

encourage more monument signs because buildings with varied front facades could hide wall-mounted signs.

They discussed how multiple buildings would be counted toward cumulative frontage. Mr. Dansie clarified that the 'cumulative building frontage' method was a variation on the 'McKown triangle', but it allowed greater flexibility in building design. Mr. Masefield suggested a combination of both theories so that an applicant could use whichever worked best on the property. Mr. Dansie said that was a reasonable option, since the cumulative method was just a variant of the McKown method. The verbiage would just have to make them equivalent. Mr. Mabbutt suggested using the closest corner of a building to determine the setback. That would encourage buildings being parallel to the street. The Commission realized that illustrations would be absolutely necessary to accompany the verbiage in the ordinance. Mr. Dansie asked for volunteers from the Commission to meet independently of a meeting to work out the numbers and bring back their findings to the Commission. Mr. Dockstader and Mr. Mabbutt would work with Mr. Dansie to develop some methods then pass them along to Mr. Rayner and Mr. Mailloux to 'work their technical wizardry'. Mr. Mailloux suggested that building size be discussed in four-foot increments, which was more construction-friendly. Mr. Mailloux thought the most important objectives the Commission should be considering during this process was to keep properties pedestrian friendly as well as identification friendly.

Building size: Mr. Dansie said it was important to determine what the maximum sized building would be in Springdale. The larger the building, the more urban it 'felt', but many small buildings adjacent to each other also made for an urban feeling. Mr. Mailloux suggested that the Commission should consider the frontal elevation impact. He used the West building as an example – its impact from the street was much greater than the Pioneer Lodge even though the Pioneer was a larger building.

Mr. Dockstader said the larger the building, the sooner it approached its height limit. He thought that would discourage diversity in design, because roof pitch would be limited. Mr. Mailloux said the view of the mountains from the street would be affected by height. Mr. Rayner said he preferred the existing method of basing building size on distance from the highway. Others agreed.

They discussed the charette participants' preference for second stories as living space. Mr. Mailloux said that would be easier if the building wasn't wide.

They discussed public restrooms as size incentives. Mr. Mailloux said Larry West had been supportive of the idea; he thought restrooms could be a business draw. He'd even indicated he might be willing to use some of his property for that purpose.

Mr. Dockstader said there were several large lots in the CC zone that were currently undeveloped. He thought those lots would be developed before most other lots were redeveloped. The ordinance needed to address current needs as well as future needs. He used the Dennett property as an example; there would be rectangular buildings scattered around the property because the owner wanted to keep his elk farm. They also discussed the Cable Mountain Lodge, which was a large development packed into a small space, somewhat mitigated by the relative size of the Giant Screen Theatre building.

The Commission discussed maximum size. Mr. Masefield suggested 12,000 or staying with the existing 12,500 but beginning with 8000 SF and require incentives to get to the maximum size. Mr. Rayner agreed because of his personnel experience designing a motel. Mr. Dockstader said the current ordinance penalized covered patios and covered balconies. They discussed how that space was visual mass, which was why it was counted now. Mr. Dockstader said those amenities were desirable and they should reconsider that. They discussed using those as incentives. Mr. Haraden said village scale included being able to see people eating outside or being able to walk short distances between businesses. Mr. Masefield said he would work on this with Mr. Dansie.

Building height: Mr. Dockstader suggested they add this item to the work meeting for the March 18 meeting.

Adjourn: Motion by Steve Masefield to adjourn at 6:30 PM, seconded by Paul Mailloux:
Dockstader: Aye
Mabbutt: Aye
Mailloux: Aye
Masefield: Aye
Rayner: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.



Fay Cope, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: 
