
09/21/22 Planning Commission Notice & Agenda

jonathan zambella [REDACTED]
To: Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov>

Fri, Sep 16, 2022 at 4:23 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to share comments on the included applications.

Please see my comment inline below:

On Sep 16, 2022, at 2:59 PM, Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov> wrote:

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA

THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 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 – Zone Change: Luke Wilson requests a zone change on parcel S-102-B-4-A, (358 Zion Park Boulevard) from Village Commercial to Village Commercial - Transient Lodging Overlay to allow the development of additional Type 2 transient lodging on the property with a total of ten transient lodging units.

I believe the TLO zone unnecessarily complicates this application, such as I said about the Worthington Gallery. The delineation of what is mixed use space versus TLUs is unclear.
One TLU above Feel Love
Two units in the new retail space.
Where are the other three Transient Lodging Units in the newest building? In the basement? Would benefit of the mixed uses not disappear if the units described would be converted to TLUs?

I believe the Cliffrose has a type 2 unit at the end of Hummingbird Lane under a CUP and that Flanagan's Villas is also Type 2 under a CUP. Is this not the case?

Luke was given a variance to accommodate setbacks on the property for the newest building, is this contingent with public parking? If new buildings are built such as the new 4 unit TLU/mixed use building eluded in the application would essentially eliminate any public parking? Does this affect the stipulations of the variance?

The newest building structure is stunning and certainly elevates the architectural design of the property. Further development on the property that follows that design will make it an excellent fit to the General Plan objectives. Soils reports may preclude further development on the property at large, but does the town absorb any liability for approving development on a lot such as this?

2. Public Hearing – Design/ Development Review: Stew Ferber requests approval for a meeting room, handicap lodging room and a set of bathrooms for the pool on property at 479 Zion Park Boulevard (parcel S-96) in the VC zone.

This DDR appears to comply and provide essential mixed uses to the guests of the ZCC and the single story architecture is complimentary to the existing front building (under construction) and less impact on the residential neighbors. The new buildings are a considerable improvement upon the flood damaged structures that were removed a year ago. The board and batten cold steel finishes are a vast improvement over the clapboard siding many developers are choosing to use in town.

[Quoted text hidden]