

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 intended 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 increase 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 limits 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 affect 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 rental 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

