

Hello TC and town staff,

In regards to the agenda items below, please see my comments inserted thereafter.

Many thanks,

Jonathan Zambella
[REDACTED]

Sent from my mobile tether...please pardon my brevity...

On Jun 17, 2022, at 2:16 PM, Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov> wrote:

B. Administrative Action Items

[1. Public Hearing - Ordinance 2022-10: Changes to the front setback requirements in the Valley Residential and Village Commercial zones, making front setback distances dependent on building height](#)

As a recent DDR applicant in the CC zone, and several revisions to my plans due to misinterpretations of the town code, I would encourage the Town Council to simplify, not complicate the ordinances. These additional variables that are inconsistent from zone to zone significantly increase the cost of development reducing developers interest in higher quality finishes landscaping to reduce costs. Additionally the greater the complications of the ordinances the greater the aversion to developers including employee housing into their projects. The 18' max height within 50' of SR9 should align with the CC zones and be set to 20'.

[2. Public Hearing - Ordinance 2022-11: Changes to the method of determining maximum permitted density \(units per acre\) in the Central Commercial and Village Commercial zones by exempting land in the regulatory floodway and in slopes of 30% and greater grade from the density calculation](#)

I agree that lower density properties align with the General Plan objectives, but I am not confident the town will actually see any benefit from this ordinance change with several developments already approved but not yet built, that violate this. Nicholas's old property is one example where 30% slopes are being exploited to maximize the density of the lot. If this is approved, it should be applied to all development in the town to see an actual difference. EG parking lot sizes, residential dwellings etc, not just hotels.

[3. Continued from June 8, 2022 - Ordinance 2022-09: Revisions to various sections of Town Code regarding Transient Lodging regulations and enacting of a Transient Lodging Overlay Zone](#)

I agree that there were some infirmities with transient lodging development in Springdale, but the new ordinance is borderline insane. As proposed, this ordinance will:

1. Essentially rezone existing VC and CC lots to residential use only. These land owners will be entitled to compensation for this taking. I am guessing already 3 or 4 lawsuits coming out of this and in the end, the Town will lose.
2. Will eliminate any chance of a hotelier to build employee housing on their project. If developers can't count employee housing toward their mixed use, it will not get built anywhere else in Springdale unless the "Workforce Housing Zone:" solves that. Employee housing SHOULD be included in the mixed use requirements as it does significantly help with housing shortages even if the employees are required to be employed at the hotel to reside there.
3. raise building costs through the roof and continue to poise Springdale as an elitist community who says they want employee housing but are unwilling to make any necessary ordinance changes to make it feasible.
4. Alienate and brutally handicap any small land owners or existing "Type 2" operators and incredibly benefit the 5 big players in town who will never be effected by this ordinance since they have legally binding developers agreements which are not subject to future ordinance changes. The economics of this will play out with higher room rates in town excluding an entire population of visitors from being able to stay in Springdale.
5. Force long residents to sell their lots and move to more economically viable towns to live out their life.

[4. Public Budget Hearing - Resolution 2022-10 to open and amend the FY 2021/22 budget](#)

Is there an available summary page showing the PnL for the Town and the Town's Balance Sheet?

END OF COMMENTS:

Thank you for reading and addressing these concerns,

Jonathan
