

1. Planning Commission Work Meeting Agenda

Documents:

[070622.PCWM.NEIGHBOR.PDF](#)

2. Packet Material

Documents:

[ITEM A1 - WORKFORCE HOUSING PC REPORT 7-6-22 \(1\).PDF](#)

[ITEM A2 - RIDGELINE AND BUILDING SEPARATION DISTANCE PC REPORT 7-6-22.PDF](#)

[ITEM A3 - AG ZONE PC MEMO 7-6-22.PDF](#)

3. Public Comment

Documents:

[PUBLIC COMMENT - R. LEE_REDACTED.PDF](#)



118 Lion Blvd • PO Box 187 • Springdale, UT 84767 • (435) 772-3434

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2022, 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 electronic login information below****

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Update and discussion on a proposed workforce housing overlay zone and associated restrictive covenant template.
2. Proposed revisions to requirements for the distance between buildings and development on ridgelines in the CC and VC zones.
3. Potential revisions to the standards and permitted uses in the Agricultural zone.

B. Adjourn

This notice is provided as a courtesy to the community and is not the official notice for this meeting/hearing. This notice is not required by town ordinance or policy. Failure of the Town to provide this notice or failure of a property owner, resident, or other interested party to receive this notice does not constitute a violation of the Town's noticing requirements or policies.

****To access the electronic webinar please click the Zoom link below:**

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83040081283?pwd=KjwSZS_WMJgUYO7UHEaeosRBPSqKJn.1

Meeting ID: 830 4008 1283
Passcode: 503085

One tap mobile
US: +13462487799,,83040081283#,,,,*503085#

Dial by your location
US: +1 346 248 7799

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

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/agendacenter>



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development
Date: July 1, 2022
Re: Workforce Housing Overlay Zone

The Planning Commission reviewed a draft outline for a proposed workforce housing overlay zone in the June meeting. The Commission gave staff direction regarding modifications to the proposed overlay zone. The Commission also requested the Town’s housing consultant review the outline and provide insight on actual construction costs and construction feasibility. The Commission directed staff to bring a revised version of the ordinance back to the Commission.

The attached draft includes the revisions the Commission requested and those based on the housing consultant and housing committee’s input. These revisions are highlighted in the attached draft and are summarized below:

Allowable Uses

Based on analysis by the housing consultant and the housing committee, it is neither economically feasible for developers to build nor beneficial for the Town’s workforce to have access to single family residences. Therefore, the option to build single family homes in the workforce housing overlay zone has been removed from the ordinance.

Appropriate Locations for Workforce Housing

In the last meeting the Commission discussed what areas of the Town are appropriate for the increased density associated with workforce housing. While the commercial zones are appropriate for more density, there is no need to apply the workforce housing overlay zone to commercial zones because the commercial zones already allow the same or greater density than what is proposed in the workforce housing zone. Therefore, the workforce housing zone would only be beneficial if applied to a residential zone. The Commission discussed if both the Foothill and Valley Residential zones would be appropriate for workforce housing, or only the Valley Residential zones. The Commission did not come to a clear consensus on this point in the last meeting.

Rather than only looking at the zoning designation of the property to determine if it is appropriate for the workforce housing overlay zone, staff suggests the Town should consider the specific setting and context of the property. This analysis should be done in light of the nature and extent of the proposed development on the property to determine whether or not the workforce housing overlay zone is appropriate. Staff has developed a set of Zone Change Criteria in the proposed ordinance that are intended to guide a decision whether or not a specific property is appropriate for the workforce housing overlay zone. Staff feels this will allow the Town more discretion, control, and flexibility with regard to where the overlay zone can be applied.

Building Size

The Commission discussed the proposed maximum building size allowances for the different types of development (SFR, duplex, multi-family) in the last meeting. The Commission felt the building size limits for single family and duplex structures were too large. As noted above, single family homes have been removed from the ordinance. Duplex building size has been reduced to 3,000 square feet.

Buffering

The Commission requested additional detail on buffering and screening requirements for workforce housing developments adjacent to residential properties. Staff has added additional language and standards to this section. Because approval of the workforce housing overlay zone is a legislative process the Town has the ability to analyze the buffering on each application on a case by case basis. Through a legislative approval the Town can apply site specific requirements for buffering and screening that respond to the unique screening needs of each property.

The language in the proposed outline is intended to set a minimum level of performance standard and allows the Planning Commission and Town Council to negotiate with property owners on how to achieve that standard. The specific requirements for screening that will be required to meet those minimum standards can then be enacted as binding regulations specific to that property through the zone change approval.

Restrictive Covenant

The Commission asked for more detail on what could be included in a restrictive covenant that would run with the workforce housing zone property. Working with the Town's housing committee, staff has drafted a proposed restrictive covenant template for workforce housing. It is based on restrictive covenants governing workforce housing in other resort communities and is attached to this report for the Commission's review.

Staff notes this restrictive covenant could also act as a template for workforce housing developed through other channels, and not just workforce housing approved as part of the workforce housing overlay zone.

Financial Analysis

The Commission requested a financial analysis of the feasibility to construct a workforce housing project under the regulations in the proposed ordinance. The Town's housing consultant and housing committee have been working on this analysis. The housing committee has not yet completed the analysis. The committee will produce a full report for the Commission in the next meeting.

Preliminary results from this analysis suggest it would not be financially feasible to construct single family residences in the workforce housing overlay zone that Springdale employees could realistically afford based on projected rental rates. However, it could be feasible to construct multi-family units and rent them at rates between \$1,500 and \$1,700 per month. This rent rate is more than the rents associated with income-restricted affordable housing, and less than estimated market rate rents. The

housing committee will continue to refine this financial analysis and provide more information to the Commission.

A copy of the updated draft workforce housing zone outline and a copy of a proposed template for a restrictive covenant are both attached. Staff anticipates receiving direction from the Council on revisions to these documents.

WORKFORCE HOUSING ZONE - DRAFT OUTLINE

Purpose: To provide more attainable housing options for employees working in Springdale and Zion National Park.

Allowable Uses: The following uses are allowed in the workforce housing zone:

- Duplex and multi-family housing.
- Commercial uses, including transient lodging, are not permitted in the workforce housing zone.

Active Employment Requirement: At least 75% of the dwelling units in a development in the workforce housing zone must be occupied by households where 50% of the adults in the household work:

- 1) within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Springdale or in Zion National Park,
- 2) for an employer whose primary business location is in the Town of Springdale or Zion National Park,
- 3) for at least 30 hours per week during at least nine months per year.

Allowed Density: The maximum allowable density in the workforce housing zone is:

- 1) Eight units per acre if the property is developed with duplexes.
- 2) Twelve units per acre if the property is developed with multi-family residential.

(NOTE: single family residences removed)

Areas of 30% and greater natural grade and areas in floodways are not included in determining the maximum allowable density.

Deed Restriction and Compliance: The property owner must record a restrictive covenant in the Washington County Recorder's Office that stipulates at least 75% of the units in the development will be occupied by households meeting the active employment requirement.

The property owner must submit a report to the Town on July 1 of each year certifying that the deed-restricted units are occupied by households meeting the active employment requirement.

Failure of the property owner to submit the report, or failure of the property owner to ensure 75% of the units are occupied by active employment households, will result in penalties which could include:

- 1) Monetary fines.
- 2) Forfeit of any rental revenue received from renting units in violation of the standards of this ordinance.
- 3) Liens placed on the property.

Zone Change Criteria: In addition to the Town's general policy regarding zone changes in section 10-3-2, the Planning Commission and Town Council shall evaluate all requests for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone according to the following criteria.

- 1) The property where the workforce housing zone is proposed is large enough to accommodate the proposed workforce housing development, associated parking and other development, and comply with all land use and development standards in a manner that is consistent with the Town's village character, as defined in the General Plan.
- 2) Proposed development on the property will not be located on a hilltop, ridgeline, or the edge of a mesa.
- 3) The property where the workforce housing zone is proposed has sufficient vehicular access to accommodate the increased vehicular traffic the proposed development is projected to generate.
- 4) Recognizing that the intent of the workforce housing overlay zone is to allow residential development at greater density than what is otherwise allowed in the residential zones, the proposed development on the property will not significantly detract from the character of the surrounding properties in terms of loss of viewshed, loss of privacy, or other similar impacts.

Use Limitations: The following use limitation standards apply to property in the workforce housing zone:

- 1) Transient lodging is not allowed. Units must be occupied by the same household for periods of 90 consecutive days or more.
- 2) Units in the workforce housing zone must be available on the open market to the general public, as long as they meet the active employment standard. Housing that is contingent on a person's employment at a particular business is not allowed in the workforce housing zone.
- 3) The entire property where a workforce housing zone project is located must be under single ownership. All housing units in the workforce housing zone must be rental units. Subdividing property in the workforce housing zone and/or conveying an individual unit in the workforce housing zone to another owner is not allowed.

Development Criteria: All projects in the workforce housing zone must conform to the following standards:

- 1) Setbacks: 40' front, 15' sides, 15' rear.
- 2) Building height: 18' if within 50' of SR9, 26' otherwise.
- 3) Building size: Duplex: max 3,000 sf. Multi-family: max 6,000 sf.
- 4) Landscape: 50% of property required to be landscape or natural open space.
- 5) Parking: All parking must be located to the side or rear of buildings. No parking allowed between a building and SR9.
- 6) Buffering: When adjacent to another residential zone, the project must include screening and buffering to protect the privacy and enjoyment of existing development on the adjacent residential property. Such buffering may include solid fencing, vegetative screening, and increased setbacks as determined necessary by the Planning Commission and Town Council.

WORKFORCE HOUSING RESTRICTIVE COVENANT

RECITALS

Whereas, the undersigned Owner holds fee ownership interest in property located at _____, Springdale, UT and more specifically described in the legal description in Attachment A; and

Whereas, in furtherance of the Town of Springdale's goal of providing workforce housing to qualified households who work in Springdale or Zion National Park and who will occupy the housing as their primary residence, the Springdale Town Council placed the property in the Workforce Housing Overlay zone on _____; and

Whereas, Owner consents to all the restrictions on use of the property for workforce housing contained in this restrictive covenant and declares that property shall be bound by these restrictions in perpetuity, subject to the provisions of this document; and

Whereas, Owner intends for these same restrictions to bind future Owners, successors, and assigns;

Now therefore, in satisfaction of the conditions set forth in the Workforce Housing Overlay zone in the Springdale Town Code, and in consideration of the foregoing recitals, which are incorporated in this this document by reference, Owner hereby declares, covenants, and agrees for itself and each and every person acquiring ownership of the property that the property shall be used, occupied, developed, and transferred subject to the following restrictions in perpetuity.

Section 1. Duration.

1.1. The restrictions in this document shall be binding on the property in perpetuity. However, after a minimum of 25 years from the date a certificate of occupancy is issued for the development allowed by the Workforce Housing Overlay zone approval, the Town Council may elect to modify or remove certain provisions of this restrictive covenant. Any such modifications or removals shall:

- 1) Be based on the findings of a housing needs assessment performed by a credible third party approved by the Town Council with expertise in workforce housing, and
- 2) Be designed to more effectively accommodate the housing needs of Springdale's workforce, and
- 3) Promote the Town's housing goals as stated in the then current General Plan.

Section 2. Qualified Households must Occupy Workforce Housing Units.

2.1. At least _____ dwelling units on the property (which is equal to or greater than 75% of the total number of dwelling units on the property) shall be occupied by Qualified Households.

- 1) A Qualified Household is one where at least 50% of the adults in the household are actively employed by a business or organization whose primary physical location is within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Springdale or within the boundaries of Zion National Park.
- 2) To be “actively employed” a person must work for the business or organization for at least 30 hours per week, for at least nine months of the calendar year.
- 3) A person may work for multiple businesses or organizations to meet the minimum hours per week and months per year standards, as long as all the businesses or organizations meet the requirements described in this section.

2.2. In order to be considered a Qualified Household no member of the household may own real residential property anywhere in Washington County, Utah.

2.3. For the purposes of this restrictive covenant, units which are required to be occupied by Qualified Households are “Workforce Housing Units.”

2.4. Owner has designated the following dwelling units as Workforce Housing Units:

Insert Description of Units

2.5. An Owner who employs workers in the Town of Springdale or Zion National Park may give preference to its own employees to occupy the Workforce Housing Units. However, in no case shall occupancy of the Workforce Housing Units be contingent in any way on continued employment with the owner’s business or organization.

2.6. A person who is retired may occupy a Workforce Housing Unit if:

- 1) The person has met the active employment criteria for Qualified Households for at least eight of the ten years immediately preceding the person’s retirement, and
- 2) The person enters into a lease for the Workforce Housing Unit within one year of retirement.

Section 3. Restrictions on Use of Workforce Housing Units.

3.1. Workforce housing units must be occupied by a Qualified Household as its primary residence. Qualified Households may not sub-lease a Workforce Housing Unit for any duration of time.

3.2. The minimum lease period for a Workforce Housing Unit is six months.

- 1) The lease agreement for a Workforce Housing Unit must include a clause that states the lessee understands the active employment criteria for Qualified Households and that the lessee acknowledges it meets these criteria.
- 2) The Owner must provide a copy of all lease agreements to the Town within 15 days of the lease agreement being executed.
- 3) If at any point during the lease the lessee no longer meets the criteria to be a Qualified Household, the lessee must vacate the Workforce Housing Unit within 90 days. If the 90 day period extends beyond the end of the lease period, the Owner may allow the lessee to continue

to occupy the Workforce Housing Unit on a month to month lease basis until the 90 day grace period has expired.

3.3. The maximum number of unrelated persons who may occupy a workforce housing unit is:

- 1) Two, if the unit is a one-bedroom unit or studio.
- 2) Three, if the unit is a two-bedroom unit.
- 3) Four, if the unit contains more than two bedrooms.

3.4. If authorized by the Owner, a Qualified Household may allow invited non-paying guests to occupy a Workforce Housing Unit on a limited basis, provided the number of nights that guests stay in the unit is less than 10% of the total number of nights in the term of the lease.

3.5. A Workforce Housing Unit may not be used for transient lodging in any way.

Section 4. Other Requirements.

4.1. The Owner must submit annual documentation to the Town of Springdale on or before July 1 of each year demonstrating the Workforce Housing Units have been and are currently occupied by Qualified Households. This documentation must include:

- 1) The names of all persons occupying each Workforce Housing Unit.
- 2) Affidavits from the employers of all persons claiming to meet the actively employed criteria for a Qualified Household that include the employee's name, number of hours per week the employee works at the business, number of months of the year the employee is employed at the business, and the business owner or manager's name submitted on the business or organization's letterhead.

4.2. The Owner must retain the documentation described in section 4.1 for a minimum period of five years.

4.3. The Owner must maintain the property in a state of good repair at all times. Specifically, the Owner must:

- 1) Ensure the property is free from weeds and the accumulation of trash, junk, and other debris.
- 2) Provide adequate parking for all tenants and ensure that all tenants park in approved parking spaces that meet Springdale Town Land Use standards.
- 3) Require tenants to store personal property within an enclosed structure, except that large items such as bikes or other outdoor recreational equipment may be stored in an organized manner outside if screened from view from neighboring properties.
- 4) Ensure all structures on the property are maintained to provide a safe and sanitary living environment for tenants.

Section 5. Restrictions Run with the Property.

5.1. The standards, requirements, and restrictions contained in this restrictive covenant run with the property and are binding on all future owners of the property.

Section 6. Enforcement.

6.1. The Town of Springdale shall have the right to enforce this restrictive covenant on the property. Owner authorizes the Town to take all necessary actions to compel compliance with the standards, requirements, and restrictions contained in this restrictive covenant, including those actions specified below.

6.2. In the event the Town of Springdale documents a violation of this restrictive covenant has occurred, the Town shall notify the Owner in writing of the specific violation and give the Owner 15 days to fully correct the violation and bring the property into compliance with the provisions of this restrictive covenant. If the violation is not corrected within that time, the Town shall be entitled to daily penalties of \$500 per day until the violation is corrected.



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development
Date: July 1, 2022
Re: VC and CC Zone Revisions: Ridgelines and Distance Between Buildings

The Planning Commission and Town Council have both recently expressed interest in revising standards for development in the commercial zones to better promote development that is consistent with the Town's village scale. Both the Council and Commission have identified standards for distance between buildings and regulations for development on ridgelines as specific areas of potential revision.

Distance Between Buildings

In the CC zone the minimum distance between buildings is 10 feet.

In the VC zone the building separation distance is dependent on the height of the buildings. If both buildings being compared are 18 feet or less in height then the required separation is 10 feet. Otherwise the required separation is 20 feet.

Commission and Council members have suggested that larger required distances between buildings could avoid a dense cluster of individual buildings on a site, which could detract from the Town's village character. By spreading the buildings out on a property the village scale could be enhanced.

The Commission should consider whether or not greater building separation distances could be effective in promoting the Town's desired look and feel. If so the Commission should determine what those distances should be.

One alternative for a revision to the building separation distance is to base the required separation on the height of the tallest building being compared. For example, the required distance between an 18 foot tall building and a 26 foot tall building would be 26 feet.

Another alternative is to use a standard similar to that in the residential zones which requires increased separation distances based on the size and height of the smaller building being compared. See section [10-9A-11](#) and [10-9B-10](#) for examples.

The Commission should discuss these options and give staff direction on possible ordinance revisions.

Ridgeline Development Regulations

The Commission developed a building design ordinance for the SR-9 corridor last year. Part of that ordinance would have prohibited development in SR-9 corridor if such development were on a ridgeline, hilltop, or the edge of a mesa. That building design ordinance was not adopted.

Several Commissioners have suggested the ridgeline development regulation component of that ordinance could be re-examined. Such a regulation could be effective in preserving views of natural features and avoiding impacts on sensitive hillsides, both of which are goals of the General Plan. The Commission should discuss whether or not to include a prohibition on development on ridgelines, hilltops, and the edges of mesas in the VC and CC zones.

If the Commission wishes to pursue this option the following draft language could be added to the code:

No structure may be placed on a ridgeline, hilltop, or edge of a mesa as defined in Section [10-9A-15](#).



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development
Date: July 1, 2022
Re: Agricultural Zone Revisions

The Town Code currently allows restaurants in the Agricultural zone. The Commission has requested that staff research this provision and make recommendations whether or not it should be modified. Additionally, last Fall the Town Council directed the Planning Commission and staff to explore revisions to the Town's regulations for agricultural uses. Based on these directives staff has prepared the following policy options the Commission may wish to consider.

Springdale Agricultural Zone

The Agricultural Zone in Springdale is different from agricultural zones in other communities. Many other communities establish agricultural zones to preserve large areas (hundreds or thousands of acres of land) on the outlying areas of the community as farmland, pasture, or other agricultural use. These areas are intended for large-scale agricultural uses which produce industrial-scale products.

In contrast, the Town's Agricultural Zone is adopted to help protect the Town's village atmosphere and character by preserving a link to the Town's agricultural heritage. It is not intended for large-scale agricultural production.

Therefore, the development and uses allowed in the zone should help promote the stated purposes and objectives of the zone found in section 10-10-1:

The agricultural (AG) zone is established to provide areas in which agricultural or agricultural business pursuits can be encouraged and supported within the Town. The AG zone is designed and intended to preserve existing large parcels of land currently in agricultural or agricultural business use intermixed with low density residential uses to protect an important part of the village atmosphere of the Town.

The Commission should be aware that there is only one property currently in the Agricultural zone in the Town. It is unlikely, though possible, that additional areas will be added to the Agricultural zone. Therefore, the land use standards the Commission recommends for the Agricultural zone will most likely only be applied to the Trees Ranch property at the south end of the Town.

Agricultural Zone Policy Options

The Commission should determine what the vision for the Agricultural zone should be. Three possible alternatives are listed below:

- 1) The Agricultural zone should preserve the Town's agricultural heritage by being primarily focused on preservation of agricultural uses and agricultural production. In this case the uses and development allowed in the AG zone should be limited to those that have direct correlation with agricultural production: orchards, farming, ranching, and pasture. Additionally, directly related agricultural business uses should be allowed: processing and packing facilities, warehousing, etc. If the Commission determines this should be the focus of the AG zone, very minimal changes are necessary to the AG zone (remove restaurants from the permitted uses, make a few adjustments to the development standards).
- 2) The Agricultural zone should preserve the Town's agricultural heritage by providing an opportunity to demonstrate the importance of agriculture in the community and allowing experiential learning and education about agriculture. In this case the uses and development allowed in the AG zone should allow for experiences that highlight the importance of local agriculture. These could include farm to table restaurants, retail markets specializing in products grown onsite or in the local area, and operations which allow guests to learn about and experience agriculture uses (see these examples [Vermont](#), [Flagstaff](#), [Boulder](#), [Moab](#)). Staff notes the updated General Plan includes a number of goals intended to help tourism in Springdale be based less on consumption and more on contributing to and appreciating the Springdale community. Providing opportunities for appreciation of and education about the importance of the Town's agricultural heritage could help promote these goals. If the Commission determines that this should be the focus of the AG zone then more significant revisions could be made to the AG zone.
- 3) The Agricultural zone currently functions as intended and fills the intent of Section 10-10-1. No additional revisions to the allowable uses in the zone are necessary.

Despite which of these, or other, policy directions the Commission determines is appropriate, there are a number of clarifying technical edits that should be made to the Code. These include more clarification on the maximum building size allowed, potential adjustments to the minimum lot size (currently five acres), and revisions to accessory structure height (currently 35 feet).

Requested Direction

The Commission should discuss the vision for the Agricultural Zone. Based on this direction staff will make revisions to the Agricultural zone standards.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ryan Lee** [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, Jul 1, 2022 at 7:05 AM

Subject: restaurant location at the Trees Ranch (old Rositas site)

To: Tom Kenaston <kenaston@springdale.utah.gov>, Kyla Topham <ktopham@springdale.utah.gov>, Pam Inghram <pinghram@springdale.utah.gov>, Pat Campbell <pcampbell@springdale.utah.gov>, Noel Benson <nbenson@springdale.utah.gov>, Ric Rioux <rrioux@springdale.utah.gov>, <ahyatt@springdale.utah.gov>
Cc: Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>, Barbara Bruno <bbruno@springdale.utah.gov>

Dear Planning Commissioners,

After I purchased the Trees Ranch last year I was questioned by virtually every town council member and planning commissioner if I intended to open the restaurant there again. I told them I hadn't given it much thought— to a person they all requested that I re-open that spot with a new restaurant for the town.

I told them I would consider it— and I did. I then made my decision to move forward on finding a new restaurant tenant for that space.

And I should also point out here that I have had numerous other citizens of Springdale request from me that I re-open a restaurant in that space. Virtually everyone has said to me something along these lines about the old Rositas space: the town people loved that site because it was a green space with the grass sitting area, surrounding cottonwood trees, and orchards in the distance. Also they loved that restaurant site on the Ranch because it seemed less “touristy” than the rest of the town.

I am happy report that I have been working on finding a suitable tenant for that restaurant space for the last 8 months. And at the same time I am disappointed to report that it has taken so long to do so, and I still haven't found the right fit.

I have had numerous discussions about my progress on my restaurant search with Darci Carlson— as well as occasionally updating Tom D. and the Mayor by email.

I have talked to at least 15 potential restaurant owners (including James Beard nominated chefs) about doing something on that site. I have also been approached by numerous others to open something there. Everything from bakeries, multiple coffee shops, 2 different Indian restaurants, burgers, pizza, a winery, a French restaurant, a sandwich shop (I heard you folks were looking for another Subway?) — you name the restaurant concept and it seems that someone has talked to me about doing it there.

Yet despite all of this, it hasn't worked out yet. And partially that is my choice: I am being very picky in who I chose as I don't want just any old restaurant there. Or as Adrian Player told me: get another restaurant there— but you'd better not do another Mexican restaurant! What I think he was really saying: please do something new and original (and not just another re-tread of a restaurant that we've already seen in town).

I did line up a potential sushi restaurant there— and it is a high-quality place (I eat there all the time up here in northern Utah and it extremely good). However after numerous discussions with Darci and others, we thought that it was perhaps not the best fit for that site and so we passed. Our preference would be a unique farm-to-table type offering (especially considering the site, as we do sit on the only agriculture zone in town).

I could go on about my search for a restaurant— but please be assured I am working on this and I intend to find something. I just don't want to settle.

Initially there was concern that the non-conforming C.U.P. would expire for this site— so there was an issue of urgency there to get a restaurant going quickly. However upon further examination it was found that a restaurant on this space is in fact conforming.

But (and now this brings me to the point of this letter): I am hearing bits and pieces that there is now consideration of taking away the opportunity for a restaurant for this site. Or at least regulating it in ways that may be undesirable.

I have to say I have mixed feelings on this (and, to be candid: confusion). To repeat: every person I have spoken to in Springdale (without a single exception) has requested that I put a restaurant back on that site. So why would the town be attempting to pull this? I don't know— and I can't understand...

All I can say is this: my time is extremely valuable. And at this point I can't tell you how many hours I have spent looking for a restaurant concept/owner for this space. **I don't need to be doing this.** I have many projects keeping me busy. And this restaurant won't bring in much revenue (other than a little rent money for the space).

However, my reasoning on this matter is that this could be a way that I could “give back” to the town. The tribe has clearly spoken: a restaurant they want— and a restaurant I will give them. It is just a matter of time when it happens.

However I would prefer not to deal with any unnecessary and burdensome regulations on that site (apart from what any other restaurant in town has to deal with).

To be clear; I am not coming to the town asking for a restaurant. Put another way: the town has asked me to provide one (which is indeed my intent). But please don't make this difficult for me. I don't need any additional drama in what is already a difficult process.

And finally: as you all know, I watch what happens in this town. I attend many of the meetings either in person and on zoom. And I have seen the recent push from town to add other businesses other than transient lodging (which I agree with). In fact, (as you all know)— people can't even add more transient lodging without adding mixed-use businesses (such as a new restaurant).

So— to recap: one of the town's stated goals is to add more mixed use. I am attempting to add mixed use (a new restaurant) at the town's request. And most importantly: **I am not asking anything in return** i.e. I am not asking for transient lodging here or another e-bike rental shop, or whatever. So why the town would attempt to block a restaurant here (or to even discuss blocking it) is well, a little confusing to me...

In conclusion, I will tell you what I told the Mayor: I view this restaurant as my gift to the town. I am not going to make very much money off this i.e. I am not going to own the restaurant— I am just going to rent out the space for a nominal amount.

I am mentally invested and concerned that I get a great restaurant in that space (with preferably a new food concept for the town). I am also looking for someone who is a competent businessperson (so they don't go under in a year and then I have to do this whole process all over again).

But I am actively working on it. Please don't make my job any harder by giving me a bunch of regulations that I don't want to deal with— or taking away this opportunity altogether by re-classifying the zoning there.

And if the town did take away the ability to do a restaurant at this site I believe it would be the town's loss (not really mine). I know that if you were to call around or do a poll of Springdale residents you would find that they are overwhelmingly in favor of a quality new restaurant concept for that space.

I also heard that there is concern for doing a restaurant on this site because there is too much overdevelopment for the town. That may be true— but to point out the obvious: *the building is already built and there*. So this isn't a new development. I don't see any purpose of having a building just sit empty that is already built which could be adding mixed use enjoyment for the residents of Springdale. And I think the Mayor would agree with me on this one, as I am aware that she is concerned about blight in the town and buildings that sit unused.

Thanks for listening to me. I do appreciate the work you do for this town. It does not go unnoticed. I realize that your job is a difficult (and often thankless). I don't envy the difficult decisions you have to make.

—Ryan Lee

p.s. I wrote this letter to communicate my thoughts ahead of time, because I won't be able to attend the upcoming work meeting on July 6th. Nor will I be able to attend any upcoming town meetings for next 5 weeks or so (as I will be out of the country on extended travel).

I wanted to write in now and express my feelings in case something is done on this matter while I am away. But I will tell you: I am not going to fight for this restaurant— this letter will be my only communication on this matter. I will let you decide what you want to do regarding this restaurant site, and then I will respect and live with whatever decision you make. Thanks again.