



**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, JULY 1, 2008 AT 5:00 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UT.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Colin Dockstader, Commissioners Dan Mabbutt, Paul Mailloux, Mike Marriott, and Matt Rayner, who arrived late.

**EXCUSED:** Tom Haraden, Rebecca McKown

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Council Liaison Robert Warren, DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Fay Cope.

Mr. Dockstader welcomed Mr. Marriott to the Commission.

**Approval of Agenda: Motion by Dan Mabbutt to approve the agenda, seconded by Paul Mailloux:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Continued Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision – Amendments to the Central Commercial zone affecting section 10-2-2 and Chapter 10-11A: Motion to open the public hearing by Dan Mabbutt, seconded by Mike Marriott:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

No public, no comments. Mr. Dansie said there were no written comments, either. Mr. Dansie said the Commission wasn't obligated to make a decision in the same meeting as the hearing; the purpose for continuing the hearing was to allow additional public comments and feedback. The Commission could close the hearing and make a decision in this meeting or a later meeting. The Council would not be hearing this until their August meeting.

**Motion to close the public hearing by Paul Mailloux, seconded by Dan Mabbutt:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Dansie had made some changes to the emailed draft and distributed a new version to the Commission. He reviewed the changes in the latest draft. (There was a chart note on page 4, language about in-lieu parking lots on pages 7-8, preserving open space and wildlife corridors as objectives in 10-11A-11, and language in 10-11A-14 B (1) clarifying requirements for covered porches.)

Mr. Mailloux had prepared a graphic CAD presentation to show the Commissioners how parking and open spaces would be affected by the determination of open space/landscaping percentages in the CC zone.

Mr. Mailloux explained that the ordinance revisions contemplated redevelopment of many of the CC zone properties, which could take many years. In the interim, the Commission needed to be aware of how the landscaping/open space percentages and parking would affect the way the downtown looked. They discussed an inventory Mr. Dansie had undertaken that showed there was very little undisturbed 'natural open space' or even 'natural grade' remaining in the CC zone. Most properties had been altered within the past fifty years. Mr. Dansie reviewed the percentages chart as drafted on page 5 of the landscape ordinance.

Mr. Mailloux had mapped the CC zone and modeled hypothetical buildings and parking lots on several properties. He explained that landscaping was not an inverse of coverage; it was a requirement for developers to make landscaping improvements to portions of their properties. His presentation showed that even highly developed properties could have at least 30% open space/landscaping. He had simplified the parking lots and maximized the building size, irrelevant to slope, flood plain, topography or aesthetics, but incorporating all required setbacks. He hadn't taken fire turnarounds into consideration, either. He said he was surprised that the open space percentages he had calculated were higher than he would have expected. Mr. Rayner remarked that he thought the required percentages needed to be higher than they had been discussing, because properties could look very congested and still meet 40% landscaping/open space. In conclusion, Mr. Mailloux said the ranges he'd derived on most properties he analyzed were within 30% and 48%.

Mr. Marriott asked for clarification about the sidewalks. Mr. Dansie explained that they could be considered as landscaping if they were integrated into the landscaping plan, but if they were used to merely connect parking and buildings, they wouldn't be.

The Commission discussed small lots and how it would be more problematical for them to be redeveloped unless they were merged with other lots.

They also discussed how courtyards or porches could be utilized at the front of buildings as well as at the sides of long buildings. They also discussed how fire turnarounds would add to parking lot requirements.

Mr. Dockstader didn't think 40% was too low. He pointed out that the Best Western, which was beautifully landscaped, was at approximately 30% landscaping.

Mr. Rayner pointed out that the Bumbleberry property could be dramatically developed with condominiums and if the landscaping number was too low, it could be a very dense-looking property.

The Commission discussed the landscaping percentage chart at length, weighing different options. Mr. Marriott suggested adding an additional category for very small lots. Other Commissioners were concerned that adding benefits to small lots could lead to subdivided properties.

Mr. Dansie said there was a growing feeling in town that the CC zone and VC zones should be eliminated and commercial properties should be regulated by their size. The Commission discussed that theory. They acknowledged that Springdale was a small town and it had comprehensive zoning determinations. Mr. Mabbutt suggested that there should be a compact, centralized commercial area surrounded by a more 'flexible' commercial area. They discussed the benefit of a pedestrian-oriented central zone. Businesses on the outlying ends of town didn't have the same pedestrian benefits as the center of town. They determined there was a real benefit to having protection in place for the part of Town near the Park entrance. They left that discussion for another time.

The Commission discussed how the chart as drafted was an enormous incentive, because it allowed developers to develop much more of their land than the old ordinance. Even if

the numbers remained at 50%, there was still a big incentive because there were so many features that could be excluded from coverage under this revision.

Most of the Commissioners were satisfied with the chart as presented. Mr. Mailloux suggested that the breaks should be different: less than .5 acres – 30%; .5 – 1.0 acres – 35%; 1.0 – 1.5 acres – 40%; greater than 1.5 acres – 45%. Mr. Mabbutt said those numbers were supported by Mr. Mailloux's analysis and he would support them, too. Mr. Rayner also agreed. Mr. Dockstader thought the spread should be 1.0 – 2.0 at 40% and greater than 2 - 45%. He also thought the numbers as drafted also worked.

Mr. Dansie reviewed the chart he had drawn up of actual properties and how their current development percentages would look under the new regulation. Mr. Rayner pointed out that the chart wasn't completely accurate because the total percentage of lot area on some properties didn't include portions of properties excluded from coverage because they weren't covered with an impermeable surface.

The Commission discussed the importance of the landscape percentage chart in the design process. Mr. Dansie explained that there were two ways to examine this chart – one from the viewpoint of limiting development and one from the viewpoint of designing the best esthetics on a parcel. Those were differing points of view that altered the outcome of the percentages. The Commission discussed those philosophical differences. Mr. Mabbutt thought the Commission needed to make a decision on this chart so they could proceed with the revisions.

The Commission discussed the advantages to developers of lawn over xeriscaping. The initial cost of xeriscaping was high and in Springdale the cost of irrigation was low. Mr. Dockstader thought the higher the landscaping percentages were, the more grass would be planted. Mr. Dockstader thought the numbers as drafted worked best considering all the points they had discussed; he preferred keeping the chart simple and keeping the numbers lower. He said the Commission's focus needed to go immediately to the landscaping ordinance so the result was quality development. Mr. Dansie reviewed the language change the Commission 10-11A-11: "In order to promote the best possible site design and the most effective use of commercial land while preserving the open space and wildlife corridors as called for in the General Plan, the following standards are adopted to allow flexibility in meeting the requirements of Chapter 23." **Motion by Dan Mabbutt to recommend approval to the Town Council of an amendment to the Land Use Ordinance revising the definition of "Gross Area" in section 10-2-2 and revising the Central Commercial Zone Development standards in Chapter 10-11A as stated in the documentation provided, with the revision as read into the record by Mr. Dansie just prior to the motion; seconded by Matt Rayner:**

**Mr. Marriott had additional questions about the ordinance that hadn't been discussed, so he passed. Mr. Mabbutt withdrew his motion and Mr. Rayner withdrew his second so they could discuss those questions.**

Mr. Marriott had a question about the building height section on page 6. He asked about the four feet incentive in Section C. Mr. Dansie explained that it allowed for a larger building. It also allowed for partial exposure of underground parking, larger building size for buildings that included affordable or employee housing, particularly if there were walk-out basements for affordable or employee housing. Mr. Dansie explained that the above-ground portion still had to meet the design guidelines. Mr. Marriott also had a question about screening trash receptacles, which was adequately addressed in 10-11A-13B.

Mr. Marriott asked about in-lieu parking fees. He was concerned about what would happen if the Town accepted in-lieu fees but couldn't build a parking lot. Mr. Mabbutt said that would be a problem to be resolved by the Town Council, but unless this ordinance was passed, there was not even an option for the Town to collect those fees. He thought this was a good way for the Town to begin accumulating funds towards solving the parking problems. The Clerk said the onus would be on the Town, if they collected in-lieu fees, to put them to use within a certain amount of time, or she thought they would have to be refunded, much like impact fees.

The Commission discussed in-lieu parking at length. There was a considerable divergence of opinion. Mr. Rayner thought 'everyone' needed to be on board with the idea of in-lieu fees, or it wouldn't work; a checkerboard' of public and 'restricted' parking would lead to

towing and booting of cars. He said if everyone in the CC zone provided enough parking for their own businesses, there wouldn't be a downtown parking problem. Mr. Dockstader and Mr. Mabbutt recognized that some of the smaller parcels in the zone wouldn't be able to do so.

Mr. Dansie said the parking committee had discussed at length the benefit of having public parking in the center of town. The Commission discussed removing the language 'and be identifiable with the commercial facilities which it serves' because it would lead to 'restricted' parking. The countering opinion was that having it identifiable with the business that paid for it would be more advantageous and reasonable for that business.

**Motion by Dan Mabbutt to recommend approval to the Town Council of an amendment to the Land Use Ordinance revising the definition of "Gross Area" in section 10-2-2 and revising the Central Commercial Zone Development standards in Chapter 10-11A as written in the documentation provided, with two revisions: one as read into the record by Mr. Dansie, one being on page 7, in section 10-11A-11: Parking, paragraph A (5) (a) and (b), striking 'and be identifiable with the commercial facilities which it serves'. Seconded by**

**Matt Rayner:**

**Marriott: Nay**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Rayner: Nay**

**Mailloux: Nay**

**Motion failed.**

Mr. Mailloux said it was important to understand how the ordinance would be used, which might not match the intention of the Commission. He asked the Commission to be more concerned about the landscaping percentages as they related to actual use. Mr. Marriott asked if it was logical to adopt this ordinance without it being adopted in tandem with the landscape ordinance. He thought they were too connected, and he had several questions about the landscape ordinance.

Mr. Dockstader suggested removing the in-lieu parking section from this ordinance in order to move the ordinance along. Mr. Mabbutt said that didn't resolve the community problem or even open the door to a solution. Mr. Dockstader said the shuttle had increased the parking problem in town. The Park Service was willing to assist the Town in applying for Federal transportation funds, but that would still require matching funds. It would also require some cooperation, open-mindedness and creative solutions. He urged Mr. Rayner and Mr. Mailloux to offer an alternative solution. Mr. Mailloux suggested reducing the landscaping percentage as an incentive to allow additional public parking, if the developer could prove there was adequate space on the parcel.

Mr. Dansie explained there was already a method under the ordinances that allowed the Council to enter into agreements with developers to provide parking. There was already a parcel that was identified as a public parking area by the Moenave subdivision. The Town could use in-lieu fees to develop that lot. He said it was unlikely that the Town would ever be able to afford to purchase land in Springdale for a parking lot.

Mr. Dockstader said there needed to be as many options as possible to resolve the parking problems in town.

**Motion by Paul Mailloux to delay consideration of this ordinance until the July meeting, seconded by Matt Rayner:**

**Marriott: Nay**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Rayner: Nay**

**Mailloux: Nay**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Discussion of landscape ordinance revisions:** There was no time to discuss this.

**Adjourn: Motion by Paul Mailloux to adjourn at 8:10 PM, seconded by Dan Mabbutt:**

**Dockstader: Aye**

**Mabbutt: Aye**

**Mailloux: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Rayner: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

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

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

