
08/17/22 Planning Commission Notice & Agenda

Jonathan D Zambella [REDACTED]
To: Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov>

Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 9:37 PM

I would like to submit public comment on the agenda items below. Please see my comments inserted with each item.

Jonathan Zambella

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

On Aug 12, 2022, at 6:39 PM, Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov> wrote:

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA

THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17, 2022 AT 5:00 PM AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD – SPRINGDALE, UT 84767

A live broadcast of this meeting will be available to the public for viewing/listening only.
Public comments for public hearing items may be made at the meeting or submitted two days before the meeting.
****Please see electronic login information below****

**Approval of the agenda
General announcements****A. Action Items**

1. Public Hearing – Design/Development Review: Clay Lister requests approval for a reconstructed commercial building to allow the expansion of Oscar's Restaurant at 948 Zion Park Boulevard in the CC (Central Commercial) zone (parcel S-55-A).

Though Oscars is an iconic restaurant in the town of Springdale there are a few inconsistencies in the application for its renovation process and combining the two buildings that should be addressed by the planning commission. Looking at sheet one and sheet three there are inconsistencies on the calculation of building square footage and setbacks. If a satellite overlay were to be placed on the property in comparison to the drawings as they are presented there's significantly more coverage, and square footage that has been developed possibly with permits, but seems to be non-complying.

On sheet one they show the original Oscars building as it was developed maybe 20 years ago, but since then has had many shed roof and porch additions that seemingly encroach upon the required 10 foot side yard and rear yard front setbacks. The applicant should clarify and show an as built facility with the setbacks. Due to the large nature of the renovation, they should be required to come in to setback and landscape requirements per the zone.

2. Public Hearing – Zone Change Request: Andrew Green, representing the Bit and Spur, requests a zone change from FR (Foothill Residential) to VR (Valley Residential) on a 1.28-acre portion of parcel S-161-A-1-A.

I am a huge proponent of employee housing in the town of Springdale. I do not believe the workforce housing agreement is adequate to substantiate a zone change.

I don't believe a zone change should be granted on any lot in the town of Springdale. This has nothing to do with any landowner or their proposed projects. This is simply belief that zone changes do not benefit the residence of the town of Springdale nor the businesses that currently operate in the town of Springdale nor do they align with the provisions of the general plan.

If the planning commission and town Council were to consider a zone change on this lot, I highly encourage a more thorough workforce housing covenant on the deed, and the applicant should be required to submit a full development plan for that zone change area. Currently this packet does not include any DDR material to show what the proposed development would be on that lot and how it would layout. It is my understanding that is a requirement of any zone change applicant to include the future development product in the packet so that the planning commission and town Council have a thorough understanding of what they're approving.

In the case for this FR lot, if a significant portion of the lot is 30% grades and cannot be counted toward lot coverage it would be optimal to see what the actual allowable development will be and if it is worth the town's efforts to provide a zone change and a future DDR if it doesn't turn into a significant number of employee housing units available to the general public.

For example, if the proposed building lot can only handle six employee housing units is it worth it to do the zone change? It seems like the intent of the general plan is to provide for more significant contribution to the community when doing a zone change, say 20 units. Is Mr. Green able to provide a development overlay on the lot to demonstrate the number of units that would be available for development if the zone change were to be approved?

3. Public Hearing - Zone Change Request: Kathy LaFave, representing the Worthington Gallery, requests a zone change on parcels S-4-A-3 and S-4-A-5 (789 Zion Park Boulevard) from Central Commercial to Central Commercial - Transient Lodging Overlay to allow the development of Type 2 transient lodging on the property with a total of four transient lodging units.

This seems like a great mixed use opportunity for the Worthington Gallery notwithstanding the applicants legal right to apply for this zone change, I would like to oppose any new zone change in the town of Springdale. I feel that overlay zones misrepresent the true intent of the general plan and they allow leniency's in areas that would not otherwise be allowed in the prior ordinance. In this case, adding a multi use to Centralcommercial lot would have been allowed prior to the overlay zone ordinance being in place. To have this completely contrived transient lodging overlay zone now being put upon the owners of this project seems inappropriate overreach of the towns authority and ability to manage development. The transient lodging overlay zone should be removed from the ordinance and this project should be able to be moved forward without any zone change and still be in compliance as it would have been eight months ago.

[Quoted text hidden]