

From: [Tom Dansie](#)
To: [Darci Carlson](#)
Subject: FW: Follow-up letter re CHD - O
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 3:48:14 PM
Attachments: [18-12 Springdale Neighbord letter to Planning Commission.docx](#)

Darci-

Another comment letter on the Cottage Housing proposal.

Thanks!

Tom

From: Ken Dailey
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 10:11 AM
To: Tom Dansie <dcd@infowest.com>
Cc: ROBERT CARLTON ; Kurt & Becky Goeble
JoNell Jensen
Subject: Follow-up letter re CHD - O

Happy Holidays Tom -

As neighbors we've drafted a letter to voice our ongoing concerns regarding the CHD overlay zoning requests, and to express our appreciation to the Planning Commission and Town Council members for their thoughtful consideration regarding this matter.

As members of both the Planning Commission and Town Council express interest in understanding the position of residents, we ask that you forward to each of them a copy of the attached letter - preferably before the scheduled Town Council meeting tomorrow evening.

Thanks in advance.

Best regards (with holiday cheer),

Ken Dailey

Teach InfoWest Spam Trap if this mail is spam:

REMEMBER: Never give out your account information, password, or other personal information over e-mail.

December 11, 2018

Town of Springdale
Planning Commissioners
Town Council Members
118 Lionhead Blvd
Springdale UT, 84767

c/o Tom Dansie. AICP
Director of Community Development
dcd@infowest.com

Dear Commissioners and Town Council Members:

As Springdale residents we express our collective appreciation to the Planning Commission for the thoughtful consideration given and response expressed at the Planning Commission Meeting held on November 7, 2018 regarding the request for a zone change by AIL Group for the purpose of developing a Cottage Housing Development in our neighborhood. We recognize that no final decision has been made but are pleased that our concerns, along with your thoughtful deliberation, were reflected in 3-1 vote by the Commission to disapprove the request.

This letter is submitted to express our continued support ongoing concerns of the views expressed by the planning commission, and our ongoing concerns to oppose the request of a Cottage Housing Development in our neighborhood (on lot S-141-NP). And, while this letter focuses on the request by AIL Group, our concerns are equally valid regarding a similar request (scheduled for consideration this week by the Town Council) by Mr. Wilson for a zone change from Valley Residential (VR) to Valley Residential-Cottage Housing Development Overlay on parcel S-CCWS-2 (1775 Zion Park Boulevard, located adjacent to Silver Bear) for the purpose of building a 9-unit cottage neighborhood development.

Following are, in part, our reasons for opposing these proposed developments:

We concur with the following comments made by commissioners that a CHD-O is not appropriate:

- 1.1 RENTAL UNITS - We agree that the CHD-O was not designed to accommodate rental units for employee housing and therefore the proposed development by AIL Group to provide subsidized employee housing (rentals) is not in harmony with the CHD-O purpose and objective.
- 1.2 LACK OF LONG TERM SPECIFICITY - We share the Planning Commission's deep concerns that, if the proposal were to be approved, there is far too much ambiguity and flexibility regarding potential future use for the individual units.
- 1.3 COMMUNITY CHARACTER - We agree, as stated by one commissioner, that the proposed development "absolutely maximize(es) the building potential of a property, ... for financial gain. [And when that happens,] there is compromise and one of the things that gets lost along the way is our community character."¹ We applaud that position and agree that the nature and identity of our neighborhood as well as the identity of the Town of Springdale would be compromised by such a development.
- 1.4 WASTE MANAGEMENT - We share the commissions concerns regarding the waste management solutions within the proposed development, namely "What's going to happen

¹ Commissioner Burns, Planning Commission Meeting, November 7, 2018

to all of these peoples 24 garbage cans”² including the accompanying visual detractions and odors?

- 1.5 A NEW PUD - We agree with the commissioner who recognized that the proposed project is a Planned Unit Development.³ However, we disagree that a PUD is appropriate or congruent with our neighborhood. We maintain that building density should contradict neither the General Plan nor Valley Residential ordinance
- 1.6 IMPACT – We disagree unequivocally with the applicant that two or three (2 or 3) five-thousand square foot (5,000 sq. ft) houses would be more impactful than the proposed project – citing two or three (2 or 3) additional families/ neighbors would have less impact on our existing neighborhood than twelve (12).

In addition to the commissioners’ positions stated above, as adjacent property owners we submit the following additional concerns:

- 2.1 CHD-O STANDARDS: Most notably we believe that the AIL Group’s request for a zone change, with accompanying proposed development, does not warrant approval because it does not satisfy the CHD-O standards, namely: that it would “not create ... [a] significant detriment to adjacent properties ... [and] to the adjacent areas in which it is located” (10-13F-10-C). The proposed development would create a significant detriment to adjacent properties and property owners including a compromise of the neighbor’s peace, sense of privacy, and quality of living as outlined in the Springdale General Plan, FLUM, and Valley Residential codes. Factors contributing to this detriment include an increase in light and noise and congestion generated from twelve additional households: 24-48 people, 24 autos, as many as 12-24 pets, and countless visitors. It would also create a detriment to the agricultural-residential quality of the Town of Springdale.
- 2.2 AFFORDABLE HOUSING: We maintain that the proposed development by AIL would, even if altered to promote private residences, likely not provide significantly lower cost housing in the private market significantly different from what is or has been previously offered. Example: If, at any future date, the proposed cottages were to be sold, we wonder to what extent the calculated current market value of \$300-\$400k / unit (see estimated calculation below)⁴ - would be dissimilar to other Springdale options including the current Moenave development. This proposed project would therefore not adequately address Springdale’s housing goals of (Ord. 2018-04, 2-14-2018) 10-13F-1
- 2.3 SELECTIVE FINANCIAL BENEFIT: We recognize and acknowledge that the underlying purpose of the proposed project is to financially benefit an individual property owner. We further recognize that a zone change afforded one property owner would incent others to seek similar zone changes. Once a change is approved – to the financial advantage of one property owner – it becomes difficult to deny the same benefit to others. Or, in other words, if a zone change was permitted to allow one property owner to maximize the financial potential of his/her property, the same should be afforded to all other neighboring property owners. The idea of allowing a few, selective zone changes might be likened to introducing just a few, selective tamarisk trees along the river. The long term result is, of

² Commissioner Elger, Planning Commission Meeting, November 7, 2018

³ Commissioner Staker, Planning Commission Meeting, November 7, 2018

⁴ A \$300,000 - \$400,000 price per unit is estimated with the following assumptions: a) 1,500 foot cottage; b) \$150-\$200/foot construction costs; (\$225k-\$300k); c) the associated land costs; (\$30-\$40k/unit?) d) the cost of infrastructure development including roads, parking, utilities, screening, impact fees, other fees, etc.; and (\$20k-\$30k/unit); e) the appropriate profit margins for the developer (10% min).

course, to the detriment of remaining residents, and indisputable damage to the general nature and character of Springdale. Sacrificing Springdale's unique character and identity may also be likened to killing Aesop's goose that lays the lifestyle golden eggs that we, and visitors, enjoy in Springdale.

- 2.4 CONTRADICTS THE SPRINGDALE GENERAL PLAN & FLUM: As neighbors we individually and collectively embrace Springdale's historical identity and we express our appreciation to Planning Commissions and Town Councils (past and present) for recognizing that the agricultural / residential nature of our town and neighborhoods is a unique identity worth preserving. 8-10 years ago the distinctive agricultural/residential qualities of the neighborhoods and overall characteristics of the Town of Springdale were lauded. (See attachment: "Past Praise for Springdale") As we are all only too-well aware, in recent years, the areas adjacent to SR-9, where this character once prevailed, has steadily decreased. We submit that the CHD-O contradicts the standards of this neighborhood and the General Plan with accompanying Future Land Use Map (FLUM) which define and identify the unique characteristics that constitute the identity of our town with, presumably, the intent of preserving those characteristics.

*"The Town of Springdale has a unique village atmosphere and character. The town is characterized by low density residential development in the foothills, agricultural and pastoral uses intermixed with residential development on the canyon floor, and pockets of commercial development—mainly tourists related services—distributed throughout. Large expanses of natural open space surround the town. Residents and visitors alike appreciate the small town feel and rural charm in the town."*⁵

- 2.5 CONTRADICTS THE VALLEY RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS: Similarly, we agree that CHD-O contradicts the Valley Residential standards as described in the town code. We submit that the potential good to be derived from a CHD-O in this neighborhood – or any other Valley Residential neighborhood (with short term financial benefits to one property owner) cannot justify the accompanying long-term cost to the individual neighbors, the collective neighborhood, and the town.

*The valley residential (VR) zone is established to provide areas in the town where residential uses may be harmoniously integrated with incidental agricultural pursuits. This zone is intended to allow the keeping of farm animals and fowl in conjunction with single-family dwelling units to an extent consistent with said development. It is also intended to retain land in parcels large enough to provide efficient and attractive residential development which preserves the historic open agricultural and farm type impression of the area. (Ord. 2013-11, 12-11-2013).*⁶

- 2.6 JUSTIFICATION We acknowledge that the town of Springdale has the right to enact zone changes as they determine necessary or appropriate. But, as adjacent property owners, we submit that the costs and detriments to us, to the surrounding area (10-13F-10 -2), and to the identity and character of the town of Springdale do not warrant a zone change.
- 2.7 COST / BENEFIT We unanimously agree that benefits of retaining the agricultural/residential nature of our neighborhood are a significant to both us and, especially, to the Town of Springdale. The proposed development by AIL Group would cause irrefutable disruption to these standards and values.

⁵ Springdale General Plan – Future Land Use Map - Overview

⁶ Springdale Town Code – 10-9B-1 (Valley Residential – Purpose and Objectives)

As a side note, we find it curious that the CHD-O ordinance would have been approved to allow cottage development in the Valley Residential zone - in full view of visiting tourists and adjacent to the river (arguably Springdale's most valuable resource) but not in the Foothills or Plateaus where higher density development – though at the possible danger of undesired erosion - could be alternately considered. We submit, in contradiction to the recently passed Cottage Housing Development Overlay ordinance, the Valley Residential zone is, in general, not an appropriate choice for future consideration of CHD-O. We support Chairman Pitta's recommendation for a moratorium to be placed on receiving additional proposals for Cottage Housing Developments until the ordinance can be modified to accurately reflect and protect the long-term guiding principles and values of Springdale.

We don't want to simply oppose these developments without recognizing and offering a potential solution for the need for low income and/or employee housing. Therefore, given that the driver (in part) for needing additional low-income housing is the influx of additional lodging establishments, why don't we (Springdale) require these large corporations who have more than x number of local employees to dedicate a portion of their lodging to house their local employees on site. This would help the Town mitigate this issue. It could apply to existing establishments and certainly any new ones being considered.

Lastly, we acknowledge and applaud the past and present contributions to the Town of Springdale by the AIL Group principal's and representative. We embrace them as neighbors and welcome them to develop their property on equal terms with us and in harmony with the currently established residential / agricultural guidelines outlined in the General Plan, FLUM, and previously established Springdale Town Codes (Valley Residential).

Again we express our appreciation for the thoughtful consideration afforded by commissioners and council members to protect the unique characteristic of the town while, simultaneously, balancing the demands for growth.

Most respectfully – adjacent property owners.

Ken Dailey Family

Bob & Pam Carlton

Curt & Becky Goeble

Alan & JoNell Jensen

ATTACHMET:

PAST PRAISE FOR SPRINGDALE

In **2010 Chris Weiss**, author of **Matador Network**, conducted a search for the perfect American town for getting into nature. He was searching for small town that provided a mixture of solitude and adventure that people looking to escape urban and suburban landscapes would appreciate. He focused on towns that had more trails miles and vertical feet than people. Ultimately, after a year of comprehensive research and travel he chronicled his experience in an article listing his top 5 which included spectacular and remote sites including Haines, Alaska and Jackson, New Hampshire and Hanalei, Hawaii. The top spot on his list, however, was Springdale, Utah. (<https://matadornetwork.com/trips/5-of-the-best-small-town-adventure-escapes-in-the-u-s/u-s/2/>)

In **October, 2008, Forbes Traveler magazine** released a list of America's 20 prettiest towns, as selected by travel writers and affiliated professionals. Springdale was included with the following comments:

"Springdale was a sleepy Mormon farm town until 1909, when President Taft designated the area Mukuntuweap National Monument (later changed to Zion National Park) and tourists started flocking to its brilliant sandstone canyons. Fifty years later, Springdale incorporated as a municipality, but its pioneer roots are still evident.

"'Gateway' towns adjoining national parks can often be eyesores," says Rough Guide USA author Ward, "but Springdale is a true delight, arrayed along the Virgin River beneath the full splendor of Zion Canyon's red rocks."
<http://www.travelheadlines.utah.com/2008/10/springdale-park-city-list-with-americas.html>

Also in **2008, a panel of USA Today** travel writers identified some of the subjective characteristics used as measurements by the travel writers:

"I felt that for a town to be considered 'pretty,' it must have something more going for it than simply enjoying a 'pretty' location," says travel writer Greg Ward, co-author of *The Rough Guide to the USA*. **"The town itself has to have some aesthetic appeal on a human scale."**

"They're the kind of places that don't exist much anymore," Krist says of list. ... **"They haven't been homogenized, they still have their local character—and the charm is real."**

http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/travel/destinations/2008-10-14-forbes-prettiest-towns_N.htm

Rand McNally comments 2010 <http://www.bestoftheroad.com/town/springdale-ut/21948>

Danno Glanz, an urban designer with the Berkeley, Calif.-based urban design, community planning and architecture firm Calthorpe Associates, says he gravitates toward **"places that have an exceptional, unique urban form."**

Melville explained the criteria he used in making his choices: "Each of these places is among the most picturesque (in the country)—**whether it's the natural surroundings, the architecture, or more likely a combination of the two.**"

Beyond the outward aesthetic appeal of the destinations chosen by our panel, and regardless of whether the towns are situated on colonial waterfronts, amidst awesome, snow-capped peaks or in stark western deserts, **there seems to be a deeper quality that unites our experts' choices—namely, how the towns "feel."**