



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development
Date: September 28, 2023
Re: Accessory Dwelling Units: Draft Community Survey Questions

Background

The Planning Commission has been discussing potential changes to the standards for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for the past several months. Issues the Commission has been discussing include:

1. Should external ADUs be allowed in the FR zone?
2. Should more than one ADU be allowed per property?
3. Should caregivers and/or caretakers be allowed to occupy secondary dwellings on a property?

The Commission has requested public input on these topics. Staff has solicited public comment through the newsletter and has received three written comments from members of the community. These are attached to this report.

In the last meeting the Commission expressed a desire to receive broader public input through a community survey. The Commission directed staff to produce draft survey questions for the Commission to review. The first draft of survey text and questions is shown below.

Draft Community Survey on ADUs

Introductory Text

COMMUNITY SURVEY - ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are becoming more popular and prevalent across the country as one solution to housing affordability. An ADU is a second living quarters on an owner-occupied single family residential property. An ADU is different from a guesthouse or a casita. The former is permanently occupied, while the latter is used occasionally by guests of the main residence. An ADU can be internal (meaning it is completely contained within the same structure as the primary dwelling) or external (meaning it is in a structure that is physically separate from the primary dwelling).

The Town currently allows internal ADUs on owner-occupied properties in the Valley and Foothill Residential zones. In contrast, external ADUs are only allowed on owner-occupied properties in the Valley Residential zone. The Town currently only allows one ADU per property. Complete details about the Town's current ADU regulations are available in section 10-22-9 of the Town Code.

The Town's General Plan states that the Town should:

Make allowances for expanded use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's), while ensuring these uses do not detract from the character of existing neighborhoods. (Housing, Subgoal B2a)

Based in part on this General Plan direction, the Planning Commission is considering making changes to the regulations for ADUs. They want your input to help guide these changes. Please respond to the following questions regarding ADUs:

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe increased allowance for ADUs in the Town will have a negative impact on any of the following: (Mark all that apply)
 - a. Traffic congestion in the neighborhood where the ADU is located due to increased vehicle trips to and from the ADU
 - b. Parking congestion in the neighborhood where the ADU is located due to a need to park the vehicles associated with the ADU
 - c. Loss of peace and quiet in the neighborhood where the ADU is located
 - d. Diminished infrastructure and utility capacity in the Town due to increased demand caused by the ADU
 - e. Loss of Single family nature of the neighborhood where the ADU is located
 - f. Other
 - g. None of these

2. Do you believe increased allowance for ADUs in the Town will have a positive impact on any of the following: (Mark all that apply)
 - a. More housing options for key contributors to the community (e.g. employees of Zion National Park, shuttle drivers, workers at local businesses, etc.)
 - b. Revenue opportunity for owner occupants of single-family properties
 - c. Opportunity for owners of single family properties to age in place by downsizing to an ADU and renting the primary residence
 - d. More oversight and management of rental properties in the Town since the owner of the rental property also lives on site
 - e. Environmental benefits since ADUs require less energy to heat and cool, and fewer resources to construct, than a primary single-family dwelling
 - f. Other
 - g. None of these

3. Do you feel ADUs are an effective way to provide more affordable housing in the community?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Comments:

4. External ADUs are currently only allowed in the Valley Residential zone. Should the Town change the code to allow ADUs to be rented in the FR zone?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so, why?
 - b. No
 - i. If so, why not?

5. Currently only one ADU is allowed per property. Should the Town change the code to allow multiple ADUs on a property?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so, why?
 - b. No
 - i. If so, why?

6. If you believe the Town should allow multiple ADUs per property, which of the following additional standards regarding multiple ADUs on a property should the Town adopt? (Mark all that apply)
 - a. The property should be at least one acre in size to qualify for multiple ADUs.
 - b. A maximum of two ADUs should be allowed on a property.
 - c. The Town should allow two ADUs on a property, but only if one is internal and the other is external.
 - d. Other standard (specify)
 - e. There should be no additional standards for additional ADUs on a property.
 - f. The Town should not allow multiple ADUs on a property.

7. Should a caregiver (a person providing onsite care to an occupant of the main dwelling on the property) be allowed to occupy a secondary dwelling on the property?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so, why?
 - b. No
 - i. If so, why?

8. Should a caretaker (a person providing maintenance and upkeep of the property) be allowed to occupy a secondary dwelling on the property?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so, why?
 - b. No
 - i. If so, why?

9. What other comments regarding ADUs would you like the Planning Commission to consider as they discuss this issue?



Feedback on changing ADU requirements

Rich <rich.w.swan@gmail.com>

Wed, Sep 6, 2023 at 9:47 PM

To: "tdansie@springdale.utah.gov" <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Thanks for asking for feedback.

I am opposed to the ADU changes that are being considered in the foothill residential zone by the planning commission as they are counter to the intent of the foothill residential zone as defined in section 10-9A-1 of the town ordinance.

Per section 10-9A-1V: The foothill residential zone is intend to allow for open space, low density, and low-profile single-family dwellings... Allowing external ADU's will negatively impact each of the forementioned intents.

Negative impact on "open space"

Allowing external ADU's will encourage the development of additional buildings that can be up to 1,500 square feet. The town currently limits the size of the primary dwelling on the property to 3,000 square feet. With the addition of an ADU, the allowed combined dwelling size will increases from 3,000 square feet to 4500 square feet. The increase in the combined dwelling size along with the required space between buildings and additional parking space will greatly reduce the available open space within the FR zone.

Negative impact on "low density"

Allowing external ADU's will essentially allow for the equivalent of a two-family or duplex dwellings and would double the density within the FR zone. The town has minimum acreage requirements that limit the population density within the zone which limit's the impact on the surrounding landscape. The higher density will result in more disturbance to the landscape and the wildlife in the area.

Many of the roads within the FR zone are narrow private roads that cross over neighboring properties. The increase in population will result in an increase in traffic, noise level, and wear-and-tear for lots that have a common private road on their property. Neighboring properties will be negatively impacted by the increase in traffic from external ADUs.

Impact on "low-profile single-family dwellings"

External ADU's will create more urban sprawl on the lots in the FR zone. This will negatively effect the look of the FR zone by creating properties that resemble more of a military compound versus the desired single-family look. I have experienced the impact of ADU development in neighborhoods in California. It changed neighborhoods from having backyards with trees and open space between houses. And created dense neighborhoods due to the removal of the trees and elimination of open space to accommodate the construction of new ADU's. I do not want to see that occurring in Springdale.

It can be argued that not all properties will add an external ADU. But the above issues will occur for any property that is next to one or two neighboring properties that do add external ADU's. And once the ordinance is changed it cannot be undone when issues occur and will only get worse with time.

My other concern is how the ADU codes can be enforced. We already have two homes on Valley View Drive that are advertising on Vrbo for rental periods that do not meet the 90 day minimum retail period. This shows how individuals are wanting to develop ADU's for longer term transient housing vs. actual long-term rentals.

Furthermore, how is the city going to determine if the ADU is being rented or if they just have a lot of friends visiting? It becomes the job of neighbors to try to police the activity and alert the city if a violation is suspected. This puts undo stress on our citizens and will cause issues between neighbors.

Overall when moving to Springdale, I choose a location in the FR zone because of the zoning rules and the intent of the FR zone as defined in the city ordinances. The ADU changes being considered by the planning commission would essentially rezone the FR area by allowing for two-family homes which will have a large negative impact on the area. The current zoning ordinances have protected the scenic beauty of the foothill residential zone and should not be modified.

Finally, for many of the same reasons I described above, I do not recommend allowing for more than one ADU per property in any residential zone. Doing so would create multi-family properties which will negatively impact the neighboring properties and the neighborhoods.

The town has worked hard to maintain the current look and feel of it's neighborhoods. We should not sacrifice that work by essentially re-zoning our residential area's to increase the allowed density. I have seen the negative impact of such changes in California and do not want to see that repeated in Springdale.

Regards,

Rich Swanson

408-623-0738
PO Box 754
245 Valley View Dr
Springdale UT 84767



Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

RE: ADU's

Cheri I. <cherii@outlook.com>

Tue, Sep 12, 2023 at 2:46 PM

To: Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Dear Tom and the Planning Commission,

Thank you for asking for our input on the ADU's. I am okay with having an external ADU in the foothill residential zone for more affordable housing, and hope people will be reasonable with the rent to help with the housing constraints and high prices here in Springdale. Regarding the 2nd question – should more than one be allowed. I would like to see just one ADU per property so we don't get over built too much here in Springdale. Also it is important to conserve open space for the wildlife here and remember that the more we build, the more water is being used and we are all called to conserve on water. Please keep in mind when building ADU's, that native plants and flowering plants are important for hummingbirds, bees, butterflies etc. for pollination and these plants should be preserved as much as possible and not removed too much as this is an important part of our eco system here in Springdale. Not to mention, we still need open space for roaming wildlife.

Thank you for listening.

Cheri Ikerd

What's Wrong with Open Space?

Some questions follow.

How many more than one ADU? 3? 5? Or maybe we should take California's lead and allow 10? What is enough?

I mention California because I have seen first-hand the rapid destruction of single family neighborhoods that is going on there as every single tree in sight is bulldozed to make way for maximum density housing with no open space on lots where a single home once stood. You might think that we're just going to start with a few ADUs, but this is headed in the exact same direction as California in time. And while all of this is going on, did housing become more affordable in California? No, quite the opposite.

Will there be setback requirements? How close to the lot line are you planning on letting homeowners build these multiple ADUs? Will there be a percentage of land that cannot be developed? How many stories are you going to allow each structure to be? You are proposing a rezoning that would mean lots that currently have privacy will no longer exist.

What about parking? How will the excess cars that come with each unit be handled? Because the likelihood that each unit will come with only one car is slim. Will they have to provide parking for more than one car? If so, where? Enclosed garage space? Or just piled up in a driveway? If not, are the neighbors supposed to be okay with countless cars parked along the street?

And what about infrastructure? Do we have an electrical grid capable of supporting this? How about water? Aren't we already hearing talk of water conservation? How about our sewer capacity?

Is the town expecting these to be used as short-term rentals? If not, how are you going to manage that? Presently, I have two neighbors just on my own street that each have their homes listed on VRBO – and neither one is listing their property at the current regulation of greater than 90 days. And one of those has had their property listed on VRBO this way for well in excess of a year. Given this, it seems the town already is unable to manage rentals that do not meet regulations. How do you propose to manage this when you've opened this up to every single homeowner with multiple structures on their property? You can say we have a regulation of more than 90 days, but if that regulation is not going to be enforced – for whatever reason – then it really is a meaningless regulation.

There has been so much building and development in just the past two years. And yet, it isn't enough? And with all of this development, what amenities have been brought to the town? New restaurants? Anything that makes the lives of the residents who live here better? Let me quote some tourists that I overheard at one of our coffee shops this past summer, “This town is nothing but a bunch of E bike rentals.” I don't disagree with them. Springdale has become a town full of rentals for tourists and overrun with E bikes.

I am so saddened by what Springdale has turned into in just the past two years. I never expected this town to turn into this when I decided to buy here – never. But at least I still had open space and privacy being in FR. And now you're proposing eliminating that too and turning it into more of what is lining SR9. You've turned Springdale into a mini Los Angeles or San Jose, minus any of the amenities that come with those cities.

And let's at least be honest with the residents of Springdale – this is rezoning without going through any kind of rezoning process. You are taking a residential area – whose original intention was to maintain some open space with its acreage requirements and limits on housing size – and turning it into multi-family dwellings.

And let's be further honest, none of this will do a single thing to make housing affordable for any employee who works in the park or in Springdale. These are just going to be used as yet more rentals – for tourists.

Enough is enough. I am absolutely opposed to this rezoning of FR to become yet another area filled with multi-family dwellings and strongly suggest that we do not allow any external ADUs in FR.

Sue Swanson
245 Valley View Drive