

To Town Council;

I know that many people worked hard on the proposed Streetscape plan for Springdale, and my opinion will carry little weight. With due respect for the time and effort members of our community invested to produce this plan, I have multiple concerns and observations regarding many aspects of the design.

Overall, the proposal appears to be a 'theme-park' attempt to re-create Springdale in the likeness of a modern day caricature of itself. There is very little in this plan that separates our Town from the many other 'streetscape' designs that Kimley-Horn has mass produced. In many respects, this is an assembly line 'mold' that detracts from the true Springdale experience. Though some of this plan introduces beneficial safety, informational, and recreational improvements and innovations, some of it is also sensational theatre. Presented are some of my general impressions based on recurring design elements and themes, and then some specific design concerns.

Crosswalks

I agree that safe crosswalks are important and some of those could be improved, perhaps with the addition of one or two more crosswalks at strategic locations, as the plan suggests. But the installation of RRFBs and ground lights is absurd. How many on-street, auto-pedestrian crashes have we experienced in Town? Since 2017: None, not one. All this lighting will make the center of Town look like runway 27-Left at LAX. This is solving a problem we do not have and will only add 'glitz' to the landscape, while detracting from the 'small town feel' the General Plan is trying to capture. Why not stay with Iridium-based or glass-beaded paint for crosswalk borders, which is the current technology, or contact UDOT, which claims they will have weather-resistant, 'glow-in-the-dark' paint for street applications available within a year.

Improving sidewalks: Yes, for safety concerns. But "Sidewalk Treatments", curved, river-flowing, contrasting brickwork? Why? This is not novel; every transformed City center has this...it's a gimmick and it looks cheesy. It's a sidewalk, not the Guggenheim. And if people want to see a river, there is a real one not far away.

Shade Structures: The ones depicted in the plan are extravagant, too big, and overstated. Some appear to actually block the views the proposed 'interpretive signage' might be describing. Shade is important, but this is the desert, people coming here know it's the desert, and it's really hot in the summer. Perhaps signage reminding people of the danger of extreme heat, and to wear a hat and bring water. Do we want shade? Then let's plant trees. And we've all heard the 'tree roots wreck sidewalks' retort. Yes, but there are lots of engineering solutions that can prevent this.

Misters: For the relatively short time people wait for shuttles, misters seem a bit much. A waste of water and high maintenance. An informative solution: See sentence #3 of the previous paragraph.

Interpretive Signage: "Interpretative signage highlighting history, geology, culture, or astronomy would be beneficial throughout the Town." Beneficial how? Some interpretive signs, OK. But why so many? And precisely what needs interpreting every 500' to 1,000'? How about one central location where all the 'interpretation' happens, like the proposed, Town-owned, vacant property along SR-9 (see concept Plan L, Section 6) instead of spread out all over Town?

Activity Nodes: "With seating and information describing historic drainage ditch pavement markings". What? Has anyone ever been asked by a visitor what those 'historic drainage ditch pavement markings' are all about? Again, this is way over the top. Will these be gathering areas? What type of 'activities' are these nodes going to present?

Pavement Lights: Is there a problem with the lighting we have now? Again, solving problems that do not exist in some areas. Is it because they "look" nice? If so, compared to what? Perhaps we could consider pavement lights in some historically dark areas, but not every time there is a stretch of bare sidewalk. Why is there a recurring need to fill empty space? Don't we want open spaces?

Viewing Binoculars: This is a hideous notion. First of all, who comes here and does not have binoculars? This is not Laguna Beach and we're not watching whales. And pairing these with peak identifiers? Why? Some information signage pointing out prominent peaks would work well, at certain key locations, but not at every turn. The Park doesn't have these for the same reason we shouldn't. They're ugly, obtrusive, and contradict the Town experience.

Amenities

"The intent of this plan is to build upon these existing, successful streetscape elements and to encourage continued use of many of these same or complementary features in areas that are currently lacking amenities." What amenities do these areas lack? Aren't the wonderful and vast views in and around Town THE amenity people come to see? Or will these amenities take the form of food options, recreational equipment, gift shops or what?

Again... 'Amenities at shuttle stops, such as water refilling stations'. I cannot imagine that someone leaves a local hotel, planning to go into the Park, knowing it's hot, and brings a full water bottle, and from the hotel to the shuttle stop, drinks ALL the water in the bottle. What other 'amenities' is this plan imagining at shuttle stops? I do think filling stations are a good idea, but we don't need as many as are depicted in the plan. How about only a few at the Park entrance?

Winderland Lane: According to the plan, this 1/2 mile stretch of street has FIVE (5) "seating areas, with an art benches, shade trees, and interpretive signs highlighting Springdale's culture and history." That's one every 440'. I've walked that street dozens of times, as all of you have, and I can count on one hand the number of times I've seen tourists walking there. Additionally, the introduction to this segment touts that this "will help encourage more pedestrian and bicycle travel, thereby reducing vehicle trips through the neighborhood." First, there are no bike lanes shown, so I'm not sure why there is mention of "bicycle travel". Perhaps this is a holdover, a cut-and-paste, from some other plan. I do see in the revised plan that the wording has changed to "Winderland Lane could also become a designated bicycle boulevard using signs and pavement markings to help discourage through trips by vehicles." And finally, "reducing vehicle trips through the neighborhood"? Is tourist vehicular traffic on Winderland a problem that is solved with five seating areas?

Artwork: Springdale has artistic roots that run deep, but this plan is inundated with an 'overpopulation of art'. There are only so many electric boxes posing as daisies that one can take. Maybe paint some of them as rocks?

Northern Segment: "Interpretive signage or art and shaded seating, including directional sign leading pedestrians to Park entrance"? Again, interpreting what, exactly? And more art? And more shade? But a directional sign leading pedestrians to Park entrance makes sense.

Specifics

Why build a crosswalk at the Post Office when we're not sure where the new Post Office will be built, unless we know it will be in the same location?

What's with the crosswalk and benches at Serendipity Lane? If this comes from neighbor concerns, then it makes sense.

"Remove the existing crosswalk north of Park Lane. Install new stamped concrete crosswalk north of Hummingbird Lane with in-ground lights and crossing nodes per Crossing Node design template". Good idea moving this crosswalk, but again a crosswalk stamped with what? And more lights?

Provide pedestrian-scale bollard lighting where feasible. What's with all the lights? Are we actually experiencing issues with lack of lighting? I understand that the IDA may soon designate Springdale as a Dark Sky Community. Is Town lighting also restricted with this designation?

In the Town Council Staff summary, dated February 2, 2023, there is mention that Commission's concerns and suggestions were forwarded to the Streetscape Consultant and that they have reviewed the

Commission's input and have revised the Plan accordingly." Reviewing the latest version I find only three edits:

- Page 34: Re-wording of the original decorative pavement language, but no substantive change;
- Page 38: In the original plan there is mention that bike travel is promoted on Wiinderland, but no bike lane shown...to Winderland could do something for bike travel in the revised plan, but still no actual plan to do so;
- Page 54: From a photo of a painted planter in the original plan to a photo of a plain, steel planter in the revised version.

Overall, not much of a change.

And finally, the plan reads: "Springdale shouldn't become a 'typical gateway town' - it needs to maintain its charm and character." This plan does not do that. This is a boiler-plate, cut-and-paste document that you see in 100s of other US towns. There is very little in this design that makes Springdale stand out. We seemed to do pretty well over the past few years without all this glitz. Let's not make the mistake of turning this incredible and unique paradise into a Disneyland attraction.

Pat Campbell
Springdale, UT