



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 SPECIAL MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2008 AT 5:05 P.M. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 145 ZION PARK BOULEVARD FOR AN ON-SITE INSPECTION OF BUILDING MATERIALS AT CABLE MOUNTAIN LODGE. THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UT.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Colin Dockstader, Commissioners Tom Haraden, Dan Mabbutt, Paul Mailloux and Matt Rayner

EXCUSED: Steve Masefield, Rebecca McKown, Town Council Liaison Robert Warren

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, recording; Bob Orton, Mark Wheeler, Ben Rogers and Stephen Browning were present for the on-site portion of the meeting and there were no attendees at the Town Hall portion of the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion to approve the agenda by Matt Rayner, seconded by Dan Mabbutt:

Dockstader: Aye

Mabbutt: Aye

Mailloux: Aye

Rayner: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Building materials change request – Cable Mountain Lodge, 145 Zion Park Blvd.: Ben Rogers, the project architect, explained that the original approval had been for a tile roof similar to the one on the store building. His firm had been hired subsequent to the approval and had been unaware those materials had been approved. He had designed a building with a fiberglass asphalt shingle similar to the one on the theater. Mr. Orton said they would probably have to replace the entire roofing material within a year. That was the first change the applicant was requesting. **Motion by Dan Mabbutt to approve the change of roofing material to an asphalt shingle called CertainTeed Landmark Premium 50-year Mountain Timber or a similar color called Weathered Wood by a different manufacturer. The applicant must supply the DCD with a sample to ensure the color is similar to the one approved. Seconded by Matt**

Rayner:

Dockstader: Aye

Mabbutt: Aye

Mailloux: Aye

Rayner: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

The applicants also wanted to change the siding to a stained cementitious material instead of redwood. Mr. Dansie explained that he, Mr. Dockstader and Mr. Mailloux had met with Mr. Rogers to look at the siding material they were proposing. They had determined that the alternate material was similar in look to the existing redwood siding, but for consistency's sake it would be better if the material was integrated into the complex in other areas. Mr. Mailloux pointed out a few walls where the redwood siding was 'failing' and suggested they could be replaced with the

alternate material. Mr. Orton said they would keep the redwood as long as possible and repaint the 'top'. Mr. Rogers verified that they could repaint the theater 'boxes' with the color approved by the DCD.

Mr. Mailloux expressed concern about the shininess of the clear coat on the material sample. The other sample they had seen didn't have that coating. He thought the coating would make the alternative material look noticeably different than the wood. Mr. Orton said they would be applying the finish coat on site and they would try to keep the clear coat 'flat'. Mr. Mailloux thought that might shorten the lifespan of the finish. Mr. Rogers showed them samples with different colors. Mr. Wheeler said the lead time on the pre-stained product was 3-4 weeks. The unstained material had a one-two week lead time. They discussed whether the finish would be sprayed or brushed. The contractor said it would be sprayed. **Motion by Paul Mailloux to approve the material change for the lap siding on the motel building to CertainTeed Weatherboard Fiber-cement siding. The material would be delivered onsite primed for spraying with the color Mahogany and clear-coated. The DCD shall inspect the clear coat for reflectivity as the first sample boards are sprayed. The change from cedar shingle shake drop siding for the top band around the building is approved to CertainTeed fiber-cement siding in the color Maple; it would also be sprayed on site. The DCD would also need to inspect for reflectivity. Seconded by Matt Rayner.**

Dockstader: Aye

Mabbutt: Aye

Mailloux: Aye

Rayner: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:15 while the Commission relocated to the Town Hall.

The meeting was reconvened at approximately 5:30.

Work session to discuss Central Commercial zone revisions: Mr. Dansie reviewed the process to date; he had summarized their discussions into a draft ordinance. He had provided the Commissioners with a draft that included revisions to building size, setbacks and building heights. It was his objective to review that language and go on to discuss distance between buildings.

Mr. Dockstader discussed his concern about the ordinance's failure to address underground parking structures. He thought underground parking should be encouraged. The revision presently encouraged above-ground parking by including it in the landscaping section. He thought condos and motels could recoup the costs of underground parking. Mr. Dansie agreed that it could be an incentive if it didn't affect lot coverage or building size.

Building size: Mr. Mailloux was concerned that the incentives added up to a larger-than-allowed building, or else they couldn't be combined to reach the maximum size. Mr. Dockstader said the intent was to allow different options to increase building size through a variety of incentives. They decided to increase 'c' (red sandstone) to 1500 SF incentive. Mr. Dansie cautioned the Commission about incentives for affordable housing. There were already two other places in the ordinance that allowed incentives for affordable housing. Mr. Dansie said the definition for employee housing didn't address minimum size; it required sleeping quarters and cooking facilities, but didn't address size. Affordable housing had even fewer requirements in the definitions. They only needed to be indistinguishable from the market rate homes.

The Commission discussed point 2, which restricted the building size at 100 feet setback. Mr. Dansie clarified that the building could be larger than 8000 SF, but only 8000 SF of the building could be within 100 feet of any property line adjacent to SR-9. That was more lenient than the current code. There could be more than one building at 100 feet if the property were large enough.

Mr. Dockstader said he hoped to encourage the inclusion of balconies and patios in order to break up building mass. But he was also concerned about people enclosing patios and

covered walkways to illegally increase building size. Mr. Mailloux defined a breezeway as having a wainscot-high wall that could be topped with screens or storm windows. A covered walkway had no such walls. The Commission determined breezeways would not be exempt from coverage. In fact, breezeway language should be eliminated.

Mr. Dansie reviewed what they had discussed so far:

- different definition/calculation for building size that would not include covered patios or covered balconies- an eave that overhung a walkway or patio would still be included, but not included if it overhung landscaping (eaves did count for setback purposes)
- incentives: an either/or statement that would also allow bigger buildings at different distances from the highway
- an addition 500 SF on C
- removing all references to breezeways
- in 2 – change 8000 to 8500 to be consistent

Setbacks: Mr. Dansie explained the two charts: one was based on cumulative building frontage; the other addressed separation of buildings. He explained the changes he had made relative to earlier discussions. The Commission discussed allowing zero-setbacks in specific cases. They also discussed alternative separation distances and setbacks. Mr. Mailloux had prepared diagrams showing how views of the mountains would be affected by building height at differing setbacks. The Commission discussed several options for setback distances and separation distances. Mr. Mailloux diagrammed some alternatives to see if the McKown Triangle would still be effective. The alternative allowed some flexibility; it didn't restrict the designs to the same geometry as the McKown Triangle. The Triangles would still apply, but proportional changes would 'flatten' the triangle.

There was an extensive discussion about zero-lot lines and whether they should be restricted to only one side of the property. Building size and other restrictions could cause an effect that one property's development could restrict the neighbor's options. Mr. Dansie said building size per lot could protect the rights of each property owner. The Commission discussed internal fire hydrants, sprinkling, fire walls, and other ways to address fire concerns if buildings adjoined each other.

Corner lots: Mr. Dansie said properties that didn't front on SR-9 would have the same 15' setbacks. Buildings would still need re-entrant corners so there wasn't a continuous wall on a side street.

Encroachments into setbacks: There was a discussion about appurtenances. Mr. Dockstader suggested that meant meters, junction boxes and necessary devices for utilities and screening for such devices. Mr. Dockstader asked if exterior stairways were considered part of a structure for fire separation. Mr. Mailloux assured him they were.

Mr. Mailloux asked whether sunscreens and awnings could be considered the same thing. Mr. Dockstader defined sunscreens as coming straight down.

Mr. Dockstader suggested adding uncovered patios as item eight. The other Commissioners thought that was already covered by item six. The language 'uncovered patios' could be added to number six.

Density Standards: Mr. Dansie said the language in this draft came straight from the existing ordinance. He included it because the Commission might want to reconsider it in the future.

Building Height: Mr. Dockstader questioned whether four feet were really an incentive for affordable housing. Mr. Mailloux diagrammed how a 4-12 pitch roof with four additional feet provided 16 additional feet in building length. A lower pitch would add additional size. The Commission wasn't certain that would be adequate incentive for affordable housing, but decided that it was preferable to take small incremental steps in height bonuses. Mr. Dockstader thought it was a greater incentive for underground parking lots. The Commission discussed the practicalities of underground parking and how it could be landscaped effectively. If the top of the structure could be landscaped, it could be included in the landscaping percentage instead of the

building size. The garage exit/entrance could not be visible from SR-9. Mr. Mailloux wanted to verify the structural requirements to ensure the structure would be feasible.

Mr. Dansie mentioned that 10-11A-14 referred to a Design Standards Manual. The Commission had always contemplated including color examples as part of the different sections of the code, but Mr. Dansie had learned that the codifier's charge for that kind of work would be very high. Instead, he contemplated that the Town could produce a manual and it could be adopted by reference. He asked the Commission to be considering the kind of images they wanted to include in the manual.

Mr. Mabbutt asked about the huge sign at the house near the entrance of Springdale. Mr. Dansie said the house and the sign were in Rockville.

Adjourn: Motion by Paul Mailloux to adjourn at 7:27 PM. Seconded by Matt Rayner:

Dockstader: Aye

Mabbutt: Aye

Mailloux: Aye

Rayner: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.



Fay Cope, Town Clerk

APPROVAL _____




TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please sign

Meeting of Planning Commission on May 6, 2008

If you'd like to be included on our e-notice list, please give us your email address. Your address will never be sold, though we may have to provide it as public information. If you have provided the information before, you don't need to add it again.

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

name

email

None