



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON WEDNESDAY,
APRIL 6, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 05:02 pm.

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

EXCUSED: Commissioner Pat Campbell.

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

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the agenda. Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements:

Ms. Carlson announced that the interpretive signs had been installed at each of the five tortoises placed throughout Town. She encouraged the residents to participate in the scavenger hunt associated with finding the five tortoise sculptures. She also announced that Earth Day was April 30th.

Mr. Dansie announced that the Transient Lodging Task Force would bring their initial recommendations to the Planning Commission's next work meeting scheduled for May 4th.

A. Action Items

- 1. Public Hearing – Ordinance Revision:** Repeal of Chapter 10-13F – Cottage Housing Development Overlay Zone.

The Town Council had adopted an ordinance creating the Cottage Housing Development Overlay Zone intended to promote lower-cost housing in the private market. The tools contemplated to produce the lower-cost housing included; reduced structure size of units, slightly higher density for the number of units, and allowance to cluster the units together to reduce infrastructure costs. The overlay zone, as written, was not producing the desired results. The Commission was to determine if that provision should be removed from the Town Code and then make a recommendation to the Town Council. Town staff had not received public comment on this item.

Commission Questions to Staff:

Ms. Topham asked what the process would be if the Commission wanted to consider implementing something similar but more refined in the future.

- If it were something the Commission wanted to address, they would do so through a work meeting to discuss research and revisions to the ordinance that would align with the Town's goals.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Motion made by Kyla Topham to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Ave

Benson: Ave

Rioux: Ave

Kenaston: Ave

Inghram: Ave

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Ave

Benson: Ave

Rioux: Ave

Kenaston: Ave

Inghram: Ave

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

The Commission discussed the goal of removing the Cottage Housing Development Overlay Zone in a previous meeting since it had not achieved its intended purpose. Because of the lack of public comment, the Commission decided to move forward with the repeal. The Commission could implement a more refined ordinance that would achieve the Town's goals in the future.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston that the Planning Commission recommends repeal of the Cottage Housing Development Overlay Zone as found in Chapter 10-13F. The original stated purpose of the Cottage Housing zone was to further Springdale's housing goals as detailed in the General Plan and to promote lower-cost housing in the private market by encouraging modest house sizes. This motion for repeal is based on the following findings: 1) The increased density and other incentives allowed by the Cottage Housing Development have not produced the desired outcome of lower-cost housing in the private market. 2) The increased density, design, and appearance of projects in the Cottage Housing Overlay are not consistent with the Town's village atmosphere and have significantly negatively impacted the Town's character. 3) Because the intended goals of the Cottage Housing Development Overlay zone have not been met, the Commission finds the impacts of Cottage Housing Development on the Town's character are not justified. In short, the Planning Commission recommends the repeal of the Cottage Housing Overlay Zone, and we would like to forward our recommendation to the Town Council for their consideration. Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Ave

Benson: Ave

Rioux: Ave

Kenaston: Ave

Inghram: Ave

Motion passed unanimously.

- 2. Public Hearing – Ordinance Revision:** Changes to the definition of “Setback” and related terms in Section 10-2-2, clarifications to setback standards for recreational facilities in Section 10-7A-4.

The proposed ordinance clarified the method that the Town used to measure setbacks. It added to the distance of the required setback from a residential zone regarding commercial recreational facilities. The ordinance also clarified what recreational facilities were included and explained additional standards for that setback.

Commission Questions to Staff:

Mr. Benson asked what types of facilities qualified under the definition of commercial.

- Broad language was added to the definition of “commercial recreation” in section 10-2-2.

Ms. Topham asked if the term “permanent element” used in section 10-9A-11 was defined in the code.

- The term was not currently defined in the code. The Commission could discuss in their deliberation if they wanted a definition added, and it could be added to their motion.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Ave

Benson: Ave

Rioux: Ave

Kenaston: Ave

Inghram: Ave

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Ave

Benson: Ave

Rioux: Ave

Kenaston: Ave

Inghram: Ave

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

Mr. Benson expressed concern regarding the revisions in section 10-7A-4(F)(3). He stated that the setback distance should be required in all cases to minimize any potential negative impacts on the residents. He suggested removing the term “the setback and” and the reference to subparagraph one in section 10-7A-4(F)(3) to ensure that additional screening was not required. Still, the setback would be required regardless if there was a building between the recreational facility and a residentially zoned property.

The other Commissioners discussed that having a building that completely blocked the view of the recreational facility from all residentially zoned properties, with a height requirement of at least 16 feet, would create a better sound and visual barrier than a screening fence, vegetation, or the setback. Therefore, they did not feel the setback distance should be required. They added that the sound ordinance could mitigate other impacts. They did express concern about possible impacts from the lighting of the recreational facilities.

- Mr. Dansie added that the outdoor lighting ordinance limited the height of pole-mounted outdoor lighting for recreational facilities to 18 feet with a setback of 60 feet from adjacent properties.

Ms. Inghram suggested changing the wording in section 10-7A-4 paragraph F(3)(B) from “all residentially zoned properties” to “all adjacent residentially zoned properties” to avoid confusion if a facility were to be seen from above, but not create any negative impacts.

Mr. Dansie suggested changing the wording in 10-7A-4(F)(2) to “within 100 feet of the subject property” to state that the 100 feet would be measured from the property boundary rather than the pool.

Motion made by Pam Inghram that the Planning Commission recommends approval of an ordinance revision to clarify the definition and measurement of ‘setback’ as proposed by staff, which includes the following changes:

- 1. Under section 10-2-2, accept revised language that clarifies the definition of a commercial recreational facility.**
- 2. Section 10-7A-4(F) clarifies a commercial recreational facility must be located at least 100 feet from a residentially zoned property and be screened on all sides facing a residentially zoned property with solid fencing at least 8 feet in height and vegetation that will exceed 12 feet in height at maturity.**
- 3. Also changing the language under 10-7A-4(F)(3)(b) to read “from all adjacent residentially zoned properties.” Seconded by Kyla Topham.**

Topham: Aye

Benson: No

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed 4:1.

B. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Ordinance Revision: Continued discussion on potential changes to the VC zone. Revisions included considering moving to net buildable in the VC and CC zones to preserve village character and protect views. The Commission should discuss if it applied to any other restrictions. Ms. Inghram presented the four major discussion items that the Commission decided to pursue further from the previous work meeting.

1. Adopting a “net developable acreage” standard to determine allowable density on properties.
2. Revising the building separation distance requirement in the VC zone.
3. Adopting a graduated setback based on building height in the VC and VR zones.
4. Adopting a single-story restriction in conjunction with the graduated setback proposal.

The reasons for the proposed revisions were to make future development in the VC zone more consistent with the stated purpose of that zone. The intent of the changes were also to protect views and open space and maintain the village character goals outlined in the General Plan. The Commission had previously reviewed the FEMA flood hazard zone map, which stated that no permanent buildings were allowed and identified areas where development was prohibited. The Commission’s objective was to determine if the changes outlined aligned with the Town’s goals and if the standards should apply to the density calculation alone or any other restrictions.

The Commissioners agreed with keeping restrictions on density specifically the number of units that could be developed on one property and felt that using undevelopable land as part of the vegetation calculation was a great use of that undevelopable land.

Mr. Kenaston expressed concern about restricting the construction of any multi-family long-term housing units in the CC or VC zone due to the proposed changes.

Ms. Inghram asked if there was a specific density calculation for a multi-family unit that differed from an apartment in the VC zone.

- Currently, the only zones that allow multi-family residential were VC and CC zones and moderate-income housing overlay zones. If the changes were applied in the VC and CC zones, the same density calculation to determine transient lodging units would also be used to determine the number of multi-family housing units. There would be an impact on the potential number of multi-family housing units on a property in the VC or CC zone if applied without any exemptions.

Ms. Inghram stated that the difficulty in creating an exemption for multi-family housing units was that there would be no control over how they may be rented or sold.

Upon discovering this, the Commissioners expressed concern about the changes limiting the amount of density of multi-family housing units.

Mr. Dansie added that the housing workgroup had discussed creating a new multi-family housing zone geared toward workforce housing and the need to develop deed restriction language associated with that to develop affordability.

Ms. McPartland stated that having this in place would help alleviate some of the pressure to maximize development space within the Town, while the Commission continued to work on the issue. The Commissioners agreed and wanted to proceed with the net buildable area initiative. It would not preclude them from coming up with another zone that could be overlaid on top in the future.

The Commission decided to prioritize number three regarding graduated setbacks. Staff had reviewed various points along SR9 and set geographic landmarks on the hillsides to determine the view angle of those landmarks. They specifically narrowed in on the Springdale sandstone and the Navajo sandstone and determined the view angle on those landmarks. Using trigonometry, staff determined how far back and the height a building could be without interrupting the view of those features. They found that relatively short structures would still impact the views. Staff considered coming up with a height at a 30-foot setback and an additional height and setback for the rest of the property at which there would be no other view obstruction. The Commission was to use the findings to determine if they would like to implement a graduated setback and how to establish those heights.

Mr. Benson asked where the view was being analyzed from.

- Staff analyzed the view from the property line. The view would be further back than the property line in most instances.

The Commission discussed the importance of preserving the views and that they liked the idea of having a graduated setback along SR9. They considered applying the graduated setback rule to any property within the VC and VR zones in the future. To trigger the setback rule, they wanted to add a minimum lot size of a half-acre in the VC and three-quarters of an acre in the VR zone to eliminate the impacts on some smaller properties. The Commission would draft language revising the height and setback distances in terms of the graduated setback.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 07:11 pm made by Kyla Topham Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Aren Emerson, Deputy 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.

DRAFT