



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD,
SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 5:00 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Ric Rioux, Commissioners Kyla Topham, Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, Adam Hyatt, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie and Town Clerk Darci Carlson. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the meeting.

Mr. Rioux wanted to change the order of the agenda. He requested under section B that the Commission start with item 3, then proceed in order.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the adjusted agenda. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion Passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements:

Mr. Rioux announced he and his wife planned to move in the fall. He would remain involved in the Planning Commission until that time.

A. Action Items

1. Reconsideration of exterior building material request for Canyon Springs Lot 21 – Sean Keightley: Derek Bulloch was the contractor who represented the applicant. The Commission had received the applicant's letter. The Architectural Committee had previously approved the sample boards; however, the Town rejected the aluminum siding because the code recognized aluminum as a prohibited material.

The property owner researched the material's properties, specifically about the reflectivity. If the roof had a reflective rating of 33%, then, he argued, the reflective rating of 6% for the aluminum siding should be approved. The two areas using the siding were on the north and west side. The square footage covered in the aluminum was small. His reason for requesting this material rather than an approved one was that it was low maintenance and fire safe.

Ms. Topham asked if other materials had been considered.

- Mr. Bulloch said this was high-grade and should be considered. He argued aluminum could be used on facia, so he questioned why this material was being rejected.
- Mr. Dansie said non-rusted material was prohibited except as trim or soffit material.

Mr. Campbell asked the question being debated.

- Mr. Rioux said the Commission needed to see if the proposed material met the code.

Robert Bulloch addressed the Commission. He understood the objection was that the material was aluminum. He noticed homes that have aluminum and vinyl siding. This material was a quality product. The HOA approved the material, so he questioned why the Town disallowed it.

- Mr. Rioux stated the other homes could have been constructed before the ordinance was in place. To his knowledge, there had not been an approval of those materials.

Mr. Benson noted if the house was under 3,000 square feet, they could use aluminum siding. The concerns were not reflectivity, but it was worrisome that this set precedence. Feedback was received from residents who expressed their concern about introducing this product into the construction.

Ms. Topham acknowledged this was an upgrade from what aluminum siding typically was. If the Commission approved the aluminum siding, that would set precedence and could allow different types of aluminum in the future with varying reflectivity ratings. She researched different (ISR) standards and learned that the numbers did not equate to how much glare a material would have.

The Commissioners stated there was a set of rules set by ordinances. Those could change over time, and the product list could be adjusted. A recommendation to modify the ordinance could be made at a separate time. The ordinance allowed for other options that would produce less glare and be fire safe.

Motion made by Pam Inghram that the Planning Commission denies the request for utilizing aluminum siding as an alternative building material on the walls of the proposed residence at Canyon Springs Lot 21. This denial is pursuant to section 10-16-4(5) of the Town Code, prohibiting vinyl and aluminum siding as wall-finished materials. Aluminum siding is not included in the materials list, where exceptions may be granted. Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

1. Discussion regarding revision or repeal of the Cottage Housing Overlay zone:

The Cottage Housing Overlay (CHO) zone was adopted 7-8 years ago. The intent was to allow lower-cost housing with a slightly higher density. The code expressly anticipated it would influence housing affordability through market forces. As seen, this tool has not achieved the desired result. The CHO was a zone change; therefore, there was broad discretion to approve or deny applications. The Commission could choose to investigate revisions to the ordinance or determine that the CHO was not an appropriate tool for Springdale. It was currently allowed in the VR zone but only in limited areas. It was permitted in the Commercial zones, but they already allowed a higher density development, so it was unlikely that anyone would want a cottage housing development in the Commercial zones.

Ms. Topham asked about applications that the Town had received.

- A proposal was received for a property near the south end of town. The proposal was to develop 12 cottages on the property and was ultimately pulled by the applicant after the Planning Commission recommended denial. The recommendation was based on concerns of the surrounding property owners and the Commission's concerns that the location was not suitable for cottage housing.

Ms. Inghram noted the real estate market allowed the current CHO project developer to market cottages in fractional interest. Market forces influenced building costs. In looking at the developments, it was

allowing higher-density residential construction that did not achieve an affordable standard. She felt that this ordinance should be repealed.

Mr. Kenaston agreed. He added that if there were a percentage of units required to be deed-restricted, there would be a mix of market-rate and affordable units. He stated that the Commission should repeal the ordinance until it could be resurrected to meet the housing goals of the General Plan.

Mr. Rioux understood there was a moderate-income housing overlay zone and questioned if this could be used more effectively. The CHO had not worked in any aspect.

Mr. Dansie described the premise of the moderate-income housing overlay zone. The CHO was for the private market.

The Commission agreed that the CHO did not accomplish what was intended, and the best decision now was to repeal it. The next step would be to hold a public hearing.

2. Ordinance Revision: Changes to the method of measuring setbacks and associated setback changes, plus changes to the development standards in the Village Commercial zone:

In a previous meeting, the Commission had asked for revisions to the definition of a setback and clarified setbacks for recreation facilities. The topics that the Commission should discuss were related to graduated setbacks and about the Village Commercial zone and potential strategies to use in the VC and VR zone to address some of the concerns that the Commission identified.

Ms. Inghram stated that one of the main concerns brought up by Commissioners in the previous meeting was identifying properties that a change may impact net buildable area versus lot area for density calculation purposes. A map was put together that overlaid the floodways and the slope to identify those properties. They were concerned if this would be a taking, to which Ms. Inghram stated that it was not a legal concern.

Concern was also raised if property owners would need to be given a reduced setback to compensate them. Ms. Inghram stated that doing so would not accomplish the intent of moving to net buildable area because the density would be where it was initially. Adopting different setback rules would further the goals delineated in the General Plan. Using net buildable area would reduce the number of lodging units, apartments, and condos in the VC and CC areas. It could potentially reduce the number of lots that could be subdivided on any given parcel if they were more significant than the minimum lot size. It was suggested to adopt tools that could accomplish something similar to net buildable. The tools presented were using graduated setbacks, increasing distance between buildings, increasing lot size, and potentially allowing only construction of single-family residences in the FR and VR zone.

Mr. Benson asked if the Town could institute a blanket requirement in all VC of a one-story maximum but allow certain exceptions to go beyond that. He felt it was important not to take away from smaller developers.

- The Commission could write the blanket standard and add specific exceptions in the ordinance.

Mr. Rioux suggested adding a requirement to have more than one use if the properties were developed with lodging or apartments to ensure that other types of businesses would be added.

Ms. Topham favored graduated setbacks but was hesitant when it came to adding restrictions on residential properties. Affordability and accessibility should be the Commission's priority for the residents.

The next step was to clarify the verbiage and present it back to the Commission in a future work meeting.

3. Housing Strategies: Discussion of potential land use strategies to address housing

affordability: The Commission previously discussed housing strategies and agreed that more detailed language was needed. They had also addressed three possible tools to use in helping the Commission address housing affordability.

- The tools identified in the housing study included a transfer of development right program, a community land trust program, enhanced use of ADUs, and making allowance for public infrastructure districts. The Commission should pay the most attention to the transferrable development right program, as some of the other options did not apply to the Town, had already been addressed by the Commission, or did not need action.
- The enhanced use of deed restrictions language was added in the staff report to outline how future deed restrictions could work and when they could be applied.
- Possible revisions to the Town’s inclusionary zoning ordinance included moving toward a system similar to the Grand County model. Mr. Dansie noted there was proposed legislation that may disallow this, so he recommended the Commission hold off on discussing this item until a legislative determination was made.

Mr. Dansie stated that typically the enforcement was different for rental housing versus owner-occupied housing. For rental housing, there was an annual recertification. There was an income qualification for owner-occupied housing at the time of purchase. When the house is resold, it would need to be sold to an income-qualified household. It would require a lot of resources from the Town to administer the deed restrictions.

Mr. Dansie added that specific areas for preservation could be targeted as ‘sending zones’ and identified on a map. The areas that could accommodate additional density would be identified as ‘receiving zones’ and did not need to be vacant properties. The Town would not price the value of a development right. As with any legislative decision, the Commission would not necessarily need approval from the property owners to designate a property a ‘sending zone’ or ‘receiving zone.’ The Commission could incentivize receiving zones.

The Commissioners liked the concept of the TDRs but requested more concrete examples and detail to help solidify their understanding.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 7:05 pm made by Kyla Topham Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson, Attending Clerk

Aren Emerson, Transcribing Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ **DATE:** _____

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk’s Office. Please call 435-772-3434 or via email at springdale@springdale.utah.gov for more information.