



**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, APRIL 1, 2008 AT 5:00 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

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Council Liaison Robert Warren, DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Fay Cope. Lisa Zumpt and Tim Killen were also present.

**Approval of Agenda: Motion by Steve Masefield to approve the agenda, seconded by Dan Mabbutt:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Masefield: Aye**

**Rayner: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Ordinance revisions:**

**Revisions to acceptable building materials, including materials for walls and fences:** Mr. Dansie reviewed the ordinance changes he had drafted. He had added rusted metal to acceptable materials for buildings, walls and fences. The Commission agreed they should remove the verbiage "if the applicant can show that it is an integral part of the construction requirements and/or".

Mr. Mabbutt thought split faced block should not be prohibited.

Mr. Dockstader suggested that window trim should be considered in the allowed materials list. Vinyl window trim, soffits, and door trims should be part of the Design/Development Review. Mr. Dansie said the colors were addressed in the color palette, but the materials could be reviewed, too, if the Commission so directed.

They discussed allowing or disallowing some of the new synthetic materials (i.e., recycled materials, plastic composites, Trex, Hardyboard, etc.) There were materials that could be stained and materials that couldn't be stained – Mr. Mailloux thought Hardyboard and similar materials should be prohibited. He thought if a material wasn't stainable, it shouldn't be allowed. Vinyl fencing should be prohibited. Mr. Mabbutt suggested that the verbiage in the building section about compatibility be added to the wall section. If large cement blocks were allowed for structural stability, they had to be stuccoed so they didn't look like big blocks and they became compatible with the surroundings.

They discussed allowing cedar post/sheet fencing except in conjunction with commercial uses. The question of barbed wire came up, as well as chain-link fencing, wind-screening at the tennis court, even concertina wire. They discussed fencing around swimming pools. Mr. Masefield suggested that fences could be given some exemptions regarding allowed materials if the fences were related to the enjoyment of the sports activities. They discussed railings, painted or unpainted. Painted rails were very different in appearance than rusted metal. There were some materials that would be appropriate in agricultural circumstances, i.e., chicken wire and rabbit

fencing (aka sheet fencing.) Tortoise fencing would need to be allowed. They discussed adobe – it would remain prohibited. Mr. Dockstader agreed to work with Mr. Dansie to finalize the ordinance revision so it could be scheduled for hearing at the April 15 meeting. Fiberglass, Lexan and Plexiglas should be listed in paragraph b as prohibited materials, except perhaps around pools. That would need discussion. Mr. Mailloux suggested that glass walls for solar applications (sunspaces with limited lighting or trombe´ walls) should not be prohibited. Mr. Dansie said the FR zone addressed escaping light but none of the other zones did. Light trespass might be a problem.

**Discussion of gated community ordinance:** Mr. Dansie distributed a draft that included language suggested by the Town Attorney – it allowed the closing of a road to protect property rights, intending to keep private roads from prescriptive easement. Mr. Dansie said this section was intended to cover only subdivisions, not private driveways for single homeowners. Subdivisions that already had gates installed would need to be self-regulated if the occupants didn't want a gated community; this ordinance would regulate only yet-to-be-approved subdivisions. Mr. Masefield said there was a marked difference between someone closing a road with a gate to prevent a prescriptive easement and someone installing a permanent gate with a sophisticated locking mechanism. The Commission discussed the potential problems with allowing locking mechanisms on the gates, gating off fire access roads, and the need to create a road master plan showing critical linkages. It would not be acceptable to gate off critical linkages. The Commission discussed whether the same kind of language that limited improvements to non-conforming structures applied to existing gates, which would become non-conforming when this ordinance was enacted. The Commission suggested language that prohibited extensive upgrades to non-conforming gates.

There was a short break.

**Discussion of building setback and building size in the CC zone:** Mr. Dansie reported that he had been at a planning conference pertaining to sustainable zoning codes. Those were codes that offered incentives or even had requirements for sustainable development. He thought there were many things that could be incorporated in the CC zone change. He explained that sustainability referred to 'green' construction, developments that required less vehicular travel, developments that were sustainable in terms of natural resource usage and impact on the environment, long-lasting, low maintenance, etc. He had a model ordinance and would try inserting pertinent sections where he thought they would be most suitable. The Commission could consider them at that point.

Mr. Masefield and Mr. Rayner had worked on a **building size/setback** chart. Mr. Masefield said they had started with the old building size chart as a reference, but had established an absolute maximum size of 12,500 SF, which could be obtained with a series of incentives. The intent was to 'drop back' large massing and encourage stepped structures.

Mr. Dockstader said he and Mr. Dansie had discussed eliminating re-entrant corners as an incentive and just making them a building design requirement. The Commission discussed the idea and agreed. They eliminated the first bullet point incentive and discussed how long the building could run before a re-entrant corner would be required. As a construction practicality, it was best to work in multiples of four. They considered several lengths between 28 feet and 40 feet and concluded that based on their contemplation of buildings already existing in the CC zone, 40 feet was a reasonable size before requiring a re-entrant corner.

Mr. Masefield clarified their intent with the last bullet point: A building of 8000 SF could be built between 50-100 feet setbacks. Smaller buildings could be closer.

He also clarified the fifth bullet point – No more that 8000 SF of any building could be built within 100 feet of the highway. There could be more than one building on a lot.

The final bullet point left a few questions about what could happen closer than 50 feet from the frontage.

The discussed the incentive for public restrooms – public restrooms included men's and women's restrooms. A developer couldn't place the women's facilities in one building and the men's in a different building to get additional incentives.

They discussed the permitted and incentivized size of buildings. They recognized there could be some advantages to allowing larger buildings on large lots, but because larger buildings contradicted village scale the Commission thought it was more appropriate to leave the maximum size 12,500 SF.

They discussed allowing covered walkways between buildings to connect buildings visually without penalizing the development for larger building size. There was no consensus on this issue.

The Commission discussed employee housing incentives. In order to go from 8000 SF to 12,500 SF, the development had to include three employee housing units. He was concerned that might be an excessive requirement. The Commission determined that the way the incentive was written, it didn't allow the developer to put employee housing in a separate building. They rewrote the incentive to read 'included in the development'. They recognized that would give an advantage to larger parcels, but felt that was acceptable if buildings were to be that large. That led to the question about whether employee housing would be included in 'landscaping', which would be exempt from lot coverage, or if it would be considered 'building'. Mr. Masefield thought there should be some percentage of exemption, but a total exemption was too much. They did not resolve that question. Mr. Mailloux offered to draft images of lots once they had a better idea about where they wanted to go.

They also discussed how to ensure that employee housing was always kept at that status. Mr. Dansie said the ordinance already required that employee housing be kept only for that use.

The Commission discussed the idea that corner lots needed to have different regulations about setbacks and building size. Mr. Dansie agreed; Springdale was unique because it didn't have a grid corridor layout.

**Setbacks:** Mr. Dansie explained the charts that had been worked on by Mr. Dockstader, Mr. Mabbutt and Mr. Dansie. He used graphic representations to explain the setback building separation. He said in order to use the 'numbers' the Commission had previously discussed and the 'Larry McKown Triangle', he had to modify some of the configurations. The worksheet he distributed had two setback options and a chart showing the separation required on cumulative building frontage measurements. He explained that the options were based on 100 foot frontages. That was an average size in the CC zone. Lots could be larger, of course, which just allowed larger buildings or additional buildings.

Mr. Mailloux thought 10' was too short a front setback. He thought the town needed to contemplate having bike lanes in the front setback to encourage trail connectivity. He suggested using the on-street parking lanes for bike lanes. The Commission determined that 15' should be the minimum setback, especially in consideration of the paragraph that allowed outdoor seating and retractable awnings to encroach on the front setback. The Commission agreed that the separation chart should be 'bumped' by 5 feet and the minimum should be 15'.

Mr. Mailloux was concerned that there would be a lot of 'deep', weird looking buildings. Mr. Rayner reminded him that the ordinance wasn't the only consideration in building design – aesthetics were also important. Most developers would recognize the benefits of reducing building size. The Commission was satisfied with the concept of these charts, though they thought the numbers might still need work.

They discussed encroachments into the front setback: The draft language required the front setback to be landscaped, except that up to 50% of the area could be used for commercial use, i.e., outdoor restaurant seating, outdoor displays, etc, but not parking. Retractable awnings could protrude into the front setback five feet from the building. They discussed allowing restaurant seating in the front setback. Most of the Commission was in favor, as long as there was an adequate separation from the frontage. Mr. Mailloux asked about pool decks, which were allowed as landscaping. He was concerned about that. They discussed allowing up to 50% of the front setback to be used commercially.

Mr. Dansie said some of the things that made the downtown area interesting to pedestrians were the outdoor displays in front of several businesses. Outdoor restaurant seating would have the same appeal. Mr. Dansie said the same parking requirements for outdoor display and outdoor seating would still apply. Presently, the ordinance didn't address the maximum area that could be used for outdoor display.

The Commission asked for visual representation of these drafts.

The Clerk asked for clarification on one point – if zero side setback were allowed, did that mean that buildings could be built abutting each other? The Commission said that would be allowed if the construction met the fire code.

The Commission discussed corner lot sideyard setbacks. Mr. Dansie suggested a generic 20' side setback on a corner lot. After discussion, the Commission determined that the minimum front setback on SR-9 was 15' and to be consistent, there should be 15' setbacks on a corner lot, also.

Mr. Dansie said many of the buildings on Winderland Lane were actually side setbacks because they were on corner lots off SR-9. Most of those buildings didn't meet setbacks. Sidewalks would go into the right-of-way, not the setback.

Mr. Mailloux suggested that in the event there were ever secondary streets, they should have homogeneity with the SR-9 corridor, even though they could be considerably different in use.

Mr. Rayner questioned whether this amendment would be understandable. Mr. Dansie thought it would need pictures and diagrams before it was clear to the user. Mr. Mailloux said he would start working on diagrams. Mr. Dansie said he would begin finalizing the language.

**Adjourn: Motion by Steve Masefield to adjourn at 7:05 PM, seconded by Dan Mabbutt:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Masefield: Aye**

**Rayner: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Fay Cope, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_

