



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
ON TUESDAY JANUARY 2, 2019 AT 5:00PM
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

Meeting convened at 5:05PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Joe Pitti, Allan Staker, Suzanne Elger, and Tyler Young

EXCUSED: Jack Burns and Cindy Purcell

ABSENT: Mike Marriott

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Sophie Frankenburg, and Deputy Clerk Katy Brown recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Suzanne Elger to approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Young: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: No comments.

Non-Action Items

Discussion of revisions to the Cottage Housing Development Overlay (CHD) Zone: The Commission discussed the merits of the CHD ordinance in previous work meetings and had reviewed two applications for the CHD zone since the ordinance had been approved. Mr. Dansie asked the Commission if they wanted to revisit the following portions of the ordinance based on their past discussions:

- Overall Density: Currently set at six units/acre, but the General Plan (GP) envisioned five units/acre.
- Separation required between CHDs which was currently set at 1,000 ft. Mr. Dansie referenced the modeling done in the staff report to simulate different separation requirements and how many total CHDs would be allowed with each scenario.
- Density in terms of Net Developable Acreage which subtracted hazard areas on the lot from the total developable area.
- Site design standards in terms of driveways & parking, cottage orientation, and cottage size to achieve the goals set out in the ordinance to promote more affordable housing options in Town.

Mr. Pitti asked the Commission to consider the CHD in terms of overall essence and spirit of the Community. Based on the two application the Commission had reviewed, he felt that five units/acre would be a better fit than the current maximum of six units/acre.

Mr. Staker reiterated the primary objective of the CHD ordinance to increase density in the development in order to promote more affordable housing options. He also thought the numbers in terms of units per acre were arbitrary and wanted to identify a cottage community that already existed so the Commission could review density standards in a real-life application.

Ms. Elger felt it was hard for the Commission to determine maximum limits without being able to observe a built Cottage neighborhood in Springdale. She noted that the Commission had spent a lot of time on standards for building materials, but in her research of other existing Cottage Neighborhoods she was seeing a lot of time and consideration placed on landscaping.

- Mr. Dansie noted that the Housing Committee who had been assembled to review housing needs in Springdale had spent most of their time conducting analyses based on many other communities who had tried the cottage neighborhood endeavor. The density numbers were suggested based on their findings and extensive modeling they had conducted.

Mr. Pitti asked if the Commission could wait to make any more changes to the ordinance until the two current applications had a chance to be approved, built, and the impacts observed.

- Mr. Dansie affirmed that the Commission could indeed make a recommendation to the Council that, although applications could still be submitted and reviewed, the Commission would not recommend favorably until the current applications had a chance to play out.

Mr. Staker felt that the Commission had a great opportunity to study the implementation of a CHD if the two applications so far had a chance to be developed.

Mr. Young agreed that it would be valuable to see a cottage neighborhood developed. He also thought the CHD ordinance was very much in line with the GP in terms of affordable housing.

For modeling purposes and assuming that all eligible lots for the CHD zone would be developed, Mr. Dansie had determined that the maximum potential number of CHDs under the current ordinance with 1,000 ft separation was seven. He noted that increasing the separation distance between the developments would decrease the potential number of CHD developments allowed in Town. The Commission would need to discuss how to balance their desire for diverse and affordable housing with the potential for cottage neighborhoods to be clustered in one particular area creating greater impacts on that neighborhood. The purpose of the separation distance in the ordinance was to for the developments to be spread more evenly throughout the Town.

In response to the modeling that Mr. Dansie had provided, Ms. Elger had concluded that a separation distance of 1,500 ft was too limiting and would allow too few CHD developments. She felt that the current separation set at 1,000 ft, which held the potential for seven total CHDs, was appropriate and the likelihood that all seven potential sites would be developed into a CHD was not a definite.

Mr. Staker asked if there was a minimum distance set for any other type of business entity.

- Mr. Dansie said there was currently no other circumstance where ordinance limited the distance between types of business or developments.

The Commission liked the concept of Net Developable Acreage that would subtract hazard areas from the developable area of the lot.

- Mr. Staker suggested that undevelopable hazard zones could be utilized for parking lots/spaces in CHD designs.

With direction to staff to provide sample ordinance language regarding Net Developable Acreage, the Commission agreed to put a hold on approving any new applications until the two pending applications had a chance to be approved and built.

Discussion of revised regulations for transient lodging: Mr. Dansie reviewed the past Commission discussions and highlighted changes in the proposed ordinance since the last meeting.

Mr. Pitti suggested separating out “boutique hotels” and setting caps.

- Mr. Dansie agreed and suggested setting limits on two different categories: Number of hotel units for properties with 40 units or more, and number of hotel units for properties with 39 units or less.

Mr. Staker was concerned the limits being discussed could be construed as an infringement on property rights. He believed the free market should direct how many lodging units each property owner had the right to build.

Mr. Dansie reiterated the findings from the Community forum on lodging which was conducted in 2017. From that forum, the general consensus among Community members and stakeholders was that they were not opposed to adding lodging options in Springdale, but smaller hotels with less impacts overall would be ideal.

In terms of lodging limits and unit growth potential (placing caps on number of units based on the type of facility), the Commission agreed to change total allowable lodging units for hotels/motels from 1500 units to 1250 units. They felt this approach would encourage growth for smaller hotels.

Mr. Dansie summarized that the Commission would like a differentiation on large hotels/small hotels with caps added. The Commission affirmed they were comfortable moving the ordinance forward for a public hearing.

Discussion of revisions to event policy and planning: Mr. Dansie summarized the draft ordinance and the purpose of it. Staff suggested categorizing by event types: Class 1 – Private events on private property with 50-100 people, Class 2 – Private events on commercial property, Class 3 – Large public events that staff would recommend to the Planning Commission for review, Temporary Structure Permits, and Special Event Permits.

Mr. Staker asked which types of events had raised questions about the way the Town currently oversaw the permitting process.

- Mr. Dansie used the Zion Half Marathon, which attracted over a thousand people, as an example of an event that created a large impact on the Town. There were also some events, particularly outdoor categories, that had created impacts in the community that went unregulated such as noise, parking, and traffic congestion.

Mr. Pitti asked if there would be a fee schedule associated with each category.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission could suggest appropriate fees (if any) for each category of event. He added that a municipality could only charge a fee to cover costs associated with processing a permit.

Ms. Elger asked how staff arrived at the drafted ordinance.

- Mr. Dansie had researched event policies from a number of other communities and drew from the existing temporary use permit standards.

Mr. Pitti had some initial concerns about trying to regulate smaller family gatherings and how the new standards would impact the residents.

Mr. Young wondered if political protests or expressions had been considered or if language could be added to clarify that those assemblies were allowed.

- Mr. Dansie affirmed that the constitution protected the right to assemble and freedom of speech. The Commission could choose to add language related to public assembly and that even though those were constitutional rights, the Town could still regulate the time, place, and manner in which those could occur through the permit process.

Mr. Pitti pointed out that if an applicant wanted to have a Class 1 event, they wouldn't be allowed any lighting or it would qualify as a Class 2 event.

Mr. Dansie agreed to adjust the ordinance in consideration of smaller gatherings. He agreed to come back with two scenarios, one to strike it completely and another with less overwhelming standards. The Commission would discuss the requested changes in another work meeting.

Discussion of General Plan priorities: Mr. Dansie gave the Commission a status update in the staff report that lined out what they had determined as priorities over the course of the last year.

Mr. Pitti referenced the section on “Pedestrian Oriented Streetscape” and mentioned that it lacked information on the plan for more sidewalks, curbs, and gutters.

- Mr. Dansie agreed that the Commission could make that a priority.

Mr. Staker also referenced “Pedestrian Oriented Streetscape” and asked if the Town had observed an increase in bicycle use with the new bike lanes.

- Mr. Dansie reported that, anecdotally, the Town and residents who offered their observations had seen an increase in bicycle use on SR-9. However, some business owners had actually observed a decrease in pedestrian traffic throughout the center of town.

Mr. Pitti offered some suggestions he had heard in speaking with residents and guests of his business. Some feedback he had gathered was in regard to landscaping the old historic ditches rather than keeping the rock fill that was currently in place. He had also heard suggestions about adding planters to the light poles.

Ms. Elger asked if landscaping the ditches was an option.

- Mr. Dansie indicated that UDOT would be the governing authority on any improvements in regard to the ditches.

Mr. Young offered that many of his business patrons commented on the lack of reflective elements near the crosswalks throughout town.

- Mr. Dansie agreed to research ways to enhance the visibility of crosswalks at night.

The Commission agreed to discuss General Plan priorities in subsequent meetings.

Motion to adjourn at 6:52 pm made by Joe Pitti; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Young: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Katy Brown, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ DATE: _____

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk’s Office. Please call 435-772-3434 or via email at springdale@infowest.com for more information.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Work Meeting Date 1/2/19

Mark Stevens
Name (please print)

/
Name (please print)

Alan Jensen
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Judith Schraut
Name (please print)

Name (please print)