Memorandum

To: **Planning Commission**
From: **Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development**
Date: **April 1, 2022**
Re: **Village Commercial Zone Revisions**

The Planning Commission has been discussing revisions to the Village Commercial zone for the past several work meetings. The purpose of these revisions is to make future development in the VC zone more consistent with the stated purpose of the VC zone:

> *The village commercial (VC) zone is established to provide areas in the Town where low impact commercial and service uses may be harmoniously integrated with low and medium density residential uses and preserve a village scale in the development thereof. Serving as a buffer area between the low density VR and FR zones and the higher density CC zone, this zone is intended to allow for a lower density of buildings and structures and a lesser impact from noise, lighting and activity levels than those normally associated with commercial development. It is also intended to ensure buildings with a residential character and scale, a feeling of open space around buildings and preservation of public views of the area's natural and scenic beauty. (Town Code Section 10-11B-1)*

These changes include:

1. Adopting a “net developable acreage” standard to determine allowable density on properties (impacts VC and CC zones).
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 (#3 above).

Commissioner Inghram has produced an outline to help guide the Commission’s discussion on each of these proposals. This outline is attached. The Commission should refer to this outline to help ensure an efficient discussion on these topics.

ADDENDUM
With reference to the graduated setback proposal, Commissioner Inghram references a view impact study done by staff. The following is a summary of that study.

Staff analyzed views of key visual features from a number of perspectives along SR9. These natural features are the Springdale Sandstone (the prominent red-brown cliff forming geologic unit midway up the lower foothills in the canyon) and the the Navajo Sandstone (the massive tan / buff cliff forming

geologic unit that makes up the cliff walls of Zion Canyon). Staff identified the view angles from the property line of various properties to these features. Based on those view angles staff calculated the maximum height of a building that would not impact the view of those features.

Based on this analysis staff has determined that even relatively low buildings (10 to 12 feet) placed at the minimum setback (30 feet) will impact the view of the Springdale Sandstone. Similarly, buildings between 14 and 16 feet in height placed at the front setback will impact the view of the Navajo Sandstone.

At a 40’ foot setback buildings between 12 and 15 feet in height impact the view of the Springdale Sandstone, and buildings between 17 and 19 feet impact the view of the Navajo Sandstone.

At a 50’ foot setback buildings between 14 and 17 feet in height impact the view of the Springdale Sandstone, and buildings between 19 and 23 feet impact the view of the Navajo Sandstone.

At a 60’ foot setback buildings between 15 and 19 feet in height impact the view of the Springdale Sandstone, and buildings between 22 and 26 feet impact the view of the Navajo Sandstone.

Another method to conduct this analysis is to determine the maximum height of a structure at increased setback (40, 50, and 60 feet from the property line) that would not have additional view impact based on the specified height of a building placed at the minimum setback (30 feet). In other words, if the building at 30 feet will impact the view, how high can a building at a greater setback distance be without impacting the view any more than the building at a 30 feet setback. The results of this analysis are shown in the table below.

30'	**40’**	**50’**	**60’**
16	19.3	22.7	26
18	22	26	30
20	24.7	29.3	34

Based on this analysis, if a maximum building of 18 feet were allowed at a 30’ setback, a 26 foot tall building (the max allowed in VC/VR) would have no additional view impact if placed 50 feet from the front property line.

Planning Commission Work Meeting Outline for continued discussion of the following topics:

1. **Net Buildable vs Lot Area for allowed density calculations in the VC and CC zones. The intent of this change would be to reduce the opportunity for developers to concentrate buildings so as to protect views, open space and to preserve the village character as set forth in the town's general plan.**
   A. Previously the commission reviewed a map of Springdale which showed the FEMA Flood Hazard zone (no building allowed) and 30% slopes (no building allowed) with the town zoning map.
   B. The commission should discuss how Net Buildable as applied to density calculations would reduce the number of buildings that can be constructed on parcels in the VC and CC zones where the square footage of lot area that is buildable is reduced due to slope and flood hazard. Parcels with slopes less than 30 percent and/or without river frontage would not be impacted by this change.
   C. The commission should discuss how the Net Buildable construct would be applied to the density calculation and would not impact setbacks, building size and height restrictions, landscape requirements, or any other section of the code unless specifically stated.

2. **Revising the minimum distance required between buildings in the VC zone.** Current code: *The distance between any two buildings or structures on the same lot or parcel of land must be at least ten feet, if both buildings or structures being compared are less than or equal to 18 feet in height. For buildings or structures, either of which is greater than 18 feet in height, the distance required between two such buildings or structures must be at least 20 feet.*
   A. The commission should discuss whether to increase the required distance between buildings from 10/20 ft (depending on building height) to 20ft regardless of building height.

3. **For the VC and VR zones, the addition of Graduated Height Setbacks for the front setback on all parcels and for side setbacks for parcels that have a side adjacent to SR 9. Current code allows building height of 26 ft. at the front setback which is currently 30 ft from the property line in the VC and VR zones.**
   A. The commission should review the canyon view impact study done by staff and further discuss how graduated setbacks might be implemented.
   B. The intent of graduated setbacks is to reduce the amount of view obstructions that results from construction of buildings 26 ft. tall at the front setback line. Residents have expressed concern about preserving the canyon views from the valley floor.

4. **Consider restricting building at the first setback to one story on any parcel subject to a Graduated Height Setback.**
   A. The commission should discuss whether or not to place a restriction on constructing two stories for buildings that are at or behind the first setback but before the second setback.
   B. The commission should discuss the potential impact of covered and uncovered decks on top of a first story.