

From: [Louise Excell](#)
To: [Darci Carlson](#)
Subject: FW: Development agreement with Best Western and Springdale Historical Commission
Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 10:00:17 AM

Darci,

FYI

Louise

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Louise Excell
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 4:10:00 PM
To: Stan Smith; Randy Aton; 'Mike Alltucker'; aplayer@springdaletown.com; lzumpft@springdaletown.com; Tom Dansie
Subject: Development agreement with Best Western and Springdale Historical Commission

Dear Mayor and Council:

As something of an amateur historian, I am interested in the history of Springdale and Zion Canyon, and I have often been asked to speak or write about the town's history. Likewise, I am very supportive of the Springdale Historical Commission and the work that they do. I would love to see a venue to showcase Springdale's colorful and interesting past, so I was initially very supportive of the acquisition of the old house on the Best Western property for that purpose.

However, I cannot support the proposed development agreement between Springdale and the Best Western owners because, while it achieves a goal of preserving and showcasing our history, it fails to serve the town's best interests in other very important ways:

- The incentives in the agreement for the Best Western, namely the increased density and addition of eight new nightly rentals, is too excessive, given Springdale's recent and rampant expansion of lodging.
- In addition, the agreement requires the creation of yet another non-conforming lot at a time when Springdale has been trying to resolve the issue of existing non-conforming properties. This just doesn't make sense, because it will violate Springdale's existing ordinances.
- While some may think a precedent for the Historical Commission's request was set earlier when Stewart Ferber abandoned his plans to develop a hotel on a high-visibility lot in the center of town in exchange for the approval to develop additional nightly rentals on another properties, the two situations are not comparable. The property in question (about 5,000 sf) will have to be rezoned to public use, and even then, it won't meet zoning requirements for the PU zone, nor will it meet lot size, landscape, or setback standards for the Central Commercial zone, the zone in which it is located, as the staff report states.

And while there is considerable support for preserving Springdale's history in General Plan, this goal

should not be outweighed by the overall detriment to zoning ordinances and the rule of law. The overall message approval of this agreement sends will not serve Springdale well in the future.

I urge you to deny the agreement as it is currently drafted. Perhaps the parties can go back to the drawing board and come up with a plan that will not violate Springdale's ordinances, a plan that will not create more nightly rentals than the property is currently zoned for, and one that will conform with the General Plan.

Sincerely,

Louise Excell

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Teach InfoWest Spam Trap if this mail is spam:

[Spam](#)

[Not spam](#)

[Forget previous vote](#)

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