



Darci Carlson <dcarlson@springdale.utah.gov>

Workforce Housing Proposed Ordinance

Merle Peifer [REDACTED]

Mon, Apr 17, 2023 at 3:30 PM

To: ktopham@springdale.utah.gov, nbenson@springdale.utah.gov, pinghram@springdale.utah.gov, pcampbell@springdale.utah.gov, ahyatt@springdale.utah.gov, susan_mcpartland@nps.gov, dcarlson@springdale.utah.gov, tdansie@springdale.utah.gov

Dear Tom and Planning Commissioners,

My thanks to everyone involved for the opportunity to respond to the proposed workforce housing ordinance before the commission. As I read through the plethora of supporting minutes, I appreciate the long, arduous hours put into this comprehensive proposed ordinance not only by the commissioners and yourself but also, especially, by the committee. Please accept, in advance, my apologies for any typographical (or grammatical) errors, as I am traveling and the automated tools I don't have with me make the job more difficult.

I have some very specific concerns as to the term of the deed restriction clause in the proposed ordinance, not the least of which is that the term appears to be inconsistently stated (as in 'perpetuity' and 'revisited' in 25 years), which is troubling.

Additionally, the fact that I think the town wanted to probably specify something different than what is stated in 10-13G-4 in terms of the percentage of units "occupied" versus "available", but I leave those items up to a future discussion if warranted.

Essentially, as worded, and without too much doubt, this proposed ordinance is granting preferential zoning treatment, in the form of higher density to its owner. The owner, to no one's surprise, might also be an employer.

A further stated benefit of this proposed ordinance is to house and employ a minimum of 75% of those households within Springdale as well as other stated perceived benefits as outlined in the documents provided.

I am now left to determine if the perceived benefits that the town will derive from this proposed ordinance will offset potential significant impacts on our lives and those of other residents similarly situated. As this proposed ordinance appears to be potentially applicable to any existing residential zone, this could impact most residents within Springdale, where only 3 'yes' votes can dictate how many neighbors you will have, and the corresponding impact from those neighbors, regardless of prior zoning.

As you are aware, Pam and I bought a very distressed property on SR-9 in about 2011. We spent the better part of two years having it improved, all the while knowing that this is where we would eventually retire full-time. We did this having full knowledge of the zoning surrounding this property and that zoning, especially residential zone density, was extremely unlikely to change. I am confident that all other informed buyers go through the same process when making those types of decisions.

I was uncomfortable with the cottage housing overlay and I will state both a hypothetical of what might happen and also a real-life example of what did happen. As to the hypothetical, if the owners of the properties to the north of us were to apply for this type of zone change at their now vacant residential property, we could be looking at upwards of 24 or so units (and many more residents, cars, and congestion) as direct neighbors along a long border to the north. As to the actual; just as with their previous cottage overlay proposal, there is no doubt this would have interrupted our quiet and currently peaceful neighborhood, regardless of physical barriers or attempts at other mitigating solutions. Does this indicate a not in my backyard situation? Certainly, it does, however, based on the turnout for that same cottage overlay proposal, I have no doubt the vast majority of residences on Zion Shadows thought the same. At that point, it became a not in **our** backyard situation. I commend the planning commission for listening to the property

owners' concerns and denying that application. I was also pleased to see that the cottage overlay ordinance that was enacted in 2014 was apparently repealed in 2022. The stated reasons for the repeal are documented in the minutes from the planning commission meetings in early 2022.

While the workforce ordinance is different in its wording, the impact on current residents will obviously be worse, based on the potential of a higher density versus the repealed cottage overlay ordinance. I am not qualified to speak as to whether or not the proposed ordinance will 'maybe' make housing affordable to the benefit of the businesses and those employed by them, but I can confidently indicate that, if approved, it will increase housing density within current zones and strongly suggest it will disrupt the quiet, the peaceful surroundings and maybe the views which are the reasons many of us chose to locate in Springdale.

I urge the commissioners, as was done with the repealed cottage overlay zone, to reject the attempts to increase density in currently existing residential zones by not approving this proposed ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

--

Merle Peifer


[Springdale, UT 84767](mailto:Merle.Peifer@springdale.utah.gov)



DARCI CARLSON, CMC

Springdale Town Clerk

435.772.3434 x305

dcarlson@springdale.utah.gov

[Quoted text hidden]