

## Darci Carlson

---

**Subject:** FW: Deny HPC DevAgreement

Hi all  
Mark Chambers was unable to send this to the PC and asked me to send it.  
Suzanne Elger  
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Mark <[mark@undertheeaves.com](mailto:mark@undertheeaves.com)>  
**Date:** February 18, 2019 at 10:42:15 AM CST  
**To:** [joepitt](mailto:joepitt) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Deny HPC DevAgreement

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [mark@undertheeaves.com](mailto:mark@undertheeaves.com)  
**Date:** February 18, 2019 at 10:25:57 AM CST  
**To:** undisclosed-recipients;  
**Subject:** Deny HPC DevAgreement

Dear Planning Commission,

I support Historic Preservation and have owned two historic homes. I know the value and richness it brings. I applaud the historic Preservation Committee for their commitment to find a location to house our notable documentation and photos.

The Planning Commission is charged with reviewing the plan and making a recommendation to the Town Council whether or not 1) the amenities being proposed justify the incentives being requested, and 2) the extent of the incentives the Town should offer.

In order for the Town to own and operate this building it needs to ask for special treatment in the follow areas:

**o resolve the issue with lot size standards**

o **Allow a reduction in setback standards**

o **Allow a reduction in the lot width requirement**

o **Allow a waiver from parking requirements**

By allowing this new 5,000 square foot lot, the town is creating a new non-conforming lot that requires many variances. The Town should be set to higher standards when complying with its own ordinances, or at the minimum meet them. Many Business Owners and Residents would love to have the above requirements waived. It sends the wrong message if the Town does not follow the Town Code and opens the door for others., especially having no parking for a museum or visitor center.

The Planning Commission has been discussing the ratio between nightly rentals and residents and whether there should be a moratorium placed on nightly rental units. Adding eight more units does not follow that logic or concern.

Eight more units could easily equate to a half million dollars of annual revenue to the property owners. This seems excessive to the waivers the Town will have to obtain to use the building. Eight rooms is more rooms than 83% of the Bed and Breakfasts in town.

Because the Town would have to ignore four of its ordinances and grant an increase to the density of nightly rentals which is in opposition to the General Plan, I believe the Planning Commission must deny this proposal.

## **General Plan**

**1.5. To preserve the character of the town, smaller scale “boutique hotels” should be encouraged. Smaller hotels, inns and bed and breakfasts will do a better job of promoting and preserving a small town character and feel than larger lodging establishments.**

- **Investigate potential strategies to reduce the maximum number of lodging units allowed at a hotel property.** • Encourage hotel development that complements the small town atmosphere and village scale. • Examine building size limits for lodging establishments to ensure the scale and mass of lodging establishments are consistent with the Town’s village atmosphere.

**Objective 3.1.1.** Develop policies to ensure sustainable level of development is not exceeded and unique village atmosphere is

preserved. The Town has completed a comprehensive “Build Out” study to determine how much future growth is possible. This study took into account the availability of land, water, sewer capacity, and economic projections. This study is nearly ten years old and should be updated. The study projected a total of 700 residential units and 1,600 lodging units being developed in town, given past development patterns, current zoning, and development constraints such as the availability of land. **These projections predict more than double the number of residential units as currently exist, and approximately 60% more hotel rooms than currently exist. The development projected by the building out study will have a dramatic effect on the character and nature of the town. The Town should adopt policies to ensure this anticipated growth is orderly and retains the town’s unique village character.**

**Objective 3.1.3.** Develop policies that will help new lodging facilities promote Springdale’s unique village atmosphere. In keeping with its village atmosphere and unique character, Springdale encourages hotels, inns, bed and breakfasts and other lodging facilities that promote the Town’s “in the Park” feel, its small village scale, and its unique atmosphere. The Town seeks to provide attractive, memorable, and unique lodging that complements the visitor’s experience in Zion Canyon and Zion National Park. **Typically, smaller lodging establishments are more successful in achieving these goals than larger ones.** The Town encourages “boutique” hotels, small inns, bed and breakfasts, and other similar lodging establishments that help promote the village atmosphere and small town scale.

**3.1.3.d.** Revise the maximum number of hotel units allowed in a transient lodging facility. **This could be accomplished through reducing the number of units allowed per acre, establishing a unit cap per property, or other similar strategy.**

**Priorities and Implementation 14.5.** Lodging Establishments that are Compatible with Village Atmosphere and Scale Springdale’s unique location, character, and position as a gateway to Zion National Park create an increasing demand for Tourist accommodations, specifically lodging establishments. The General Plan emphasizes the goal to preserve the Town’s small town character and village scale. To preserve the character of the town,

smaller scale “boutique hotels” should be encouraged. Smaller hotels, inns and bed and breakfasts will do a better job of promoting and preserving a small town character and feel than larger lodging establishments. • **Review potential strategies to reduce the maximum number of lodging units allowed at a hotel property.** • Encourage hotel development that complements the small town atmosphere and village scale.

In the past the Town has used development agreements to do the following:

- Prevent the construction of a 45-unit hotel on a highly visible Central Commercial zoned property, instead distributing those units to other commercial zoned properties in the Town (increasing the total number of units allowed on those properties above what the underlying zoning allows). NO Added units resulted.
- Restrict the use of a property that was changed from residential to commercial zoning to a single vacation rental unit on the property.
- Allow the construction of a restricted-income affordable housing development, increasing the residential density on the property by many times.

**The Planning Commission must decide which is more important to the Town; adding more nightly rentals or the use of this venue with multiple waivers of the Town Code for a museum. The General Plan makes it clear that the priority is to reduce lodging units over this concession for this property; therefore, this agreement must be denied.**

**Sincerely, Mark Chambers**

---