



DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
ON TUESDAY MARCH 6, 2019 AT 5:00PM
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

Meeting convened at 5:00PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Mike Marriott, Allan Staker, Joe Pitti Jack Burns, Suzanne Elger, and Tyler Young.

ABSENT: Cindy Purcell from Zion National Park

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 Joe Pitti to approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Burns: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Brown announced that the 2019 required Public Officials Training would be held Friday March 29th at 8:30 AM at the Heritage Town Square in Virgin. RSVPs were requested by Friday March 15th. Ms. Brown also highlighted a Town-wide Russian Thistle (Tumbleweed) clean-up event on March 30th from 8:00 AM – 12:30 PM at the George A. Barker River Park. Participants were encouraged to wear long sleeves and gloves, but all other supplies would be provided. Later that same day on March 30th from 5:00 PM – 7:00 PM the Town would host a 60th birthday celebration at the Canyon Community Center. The Community Quilt would also be revealed and displayed at the event.

- Mr. Pitti added that the annual St. Patrick's Day parade would be on Saturday March 16th. Line-up was scheduled to begin on Lion Blvd at 1:30 PM with a 2:00 PM parade start time.

Mr. Pitti asked what measures the Town was taking to mitigate the excess water flow from the recent storms.

- Mr. Dansie said the streets department was working hard to document where drainage issues occurred throughout Town and apply straw bale wattles to absorb some of the silt and mud overflow. Staff was currently investigating additional curb and gutter needs which they would be taking into account during the annual budget process.

Mr. Pitti asked if the SR-9 street light revision project was still being considered as a top priority.

- Mr. Dansie said that Town staff had developed a system to shield and mitigate light trespasses and was currently in the process of getting the shields mass-produced. The shields would then be installed on the problematic street lights throughout Town.

Mr. Marriott asked if the Town would address some of the water flow issues throughout Springdale in areas where water was draining across SR 9.

- Mr. Dansie replied that public works was addressing each problem area incrementally and was continually observing and identifying problem areas to find long-term solutions.

Non-Action Items

1. Discussion of Planning Commission Meeting Protocol: Mr. Dansie and Mr. Marriott had spoken briefly about the Public Hearing process and how it might benefit the Commission to have the Public Hearing and the Commission's decision take place in separate meetings. Giving the Commission time to

digest the comments received in a Public Hearing could result in very well-crafted and articulated motions and findings.

Ms. Elger asked if there were resources available to the Commission related to crafting findings and motions.

- Mr. Dansie offered to send the Commission some reference materials for further training.

Mr. Staker asked if the Commission had to commit to a certain protocol, or if it was appropriate to decide their course of action at each meeting based on the nature or the application/comments received in the public hearing.

- In the interest of communicating clearly with applicants who were usually anxious to know the time-frame of their application, Mr. Dansie suggested that the Commission develop a standard procedure. The Commission was free to make procedural changes as needed but a standard process would help give applicants some measure of consistency.

Mr. Pitti observed that deferring a motion could potentially delay the application for several months.

- Mr. Burns felt the Commission should be able to make a motion in the same meeting as a Public Hearing if there appeared to be a very clear consensus among the Commission.
- Mr. Staker agreed and was in favor of not delaying the process for applicants unnecessarily.
- In cases where motions were deferred to the next meeting, Ms. Elger urged the Commission to come prepared with findings to avoid excessive deliberation.

Mr. Pitti asked if Commission would essentially have to deliberate twice in cases where they opted to wait until the next meeting to deliver a motion.

- Council Member Lisa Zumpft was present and mentioned a circumstance where an application came before the Council for a Public Hearing and the motion was delayed until the following month. The Council used that time to seek legal counsel, then had an abbreviated discussion at the next meeting before the motion was made. Ms. Zumpft suggested having staff summarize the Commission's deliberation discussion from the Public Hearing and craft draft motions to deny or approve for the Commission to consider for the next meeting.

Mr. Staker asked if the Commission would allow the applicant to adjust their application based on Commission deliberation during the Public Hearing.

- Mr. Marriott liked the idea of allowing the applicant to provide further information that would be relevant but was not in favor of the applicant having a second public hearing. The information provided on the original application should ideally be as complete and accurate as possible so the Commission had all the information they would need to make a recommendation.
- Mr. Pitti was concerned that allowing applicants to adjust their application after the Public Hearing would essentially make the process longer for both the applicant and the Commission.

The Commission was generally in favor of moving the deliverance of motions and findings to the next regular meeting following the Public Hearing.

Mr. Pitti suggested having sign approvals executed at the staff level.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission would need to follow the ordinance revision process but agreed that sign applications were generally straightforward and could be handled on the staff level.

The Commission was in favor of sign applications being approved or denied at the staff level.

Mr. Marriott announced to the Commission that he wanted to instate the Pledge of Allegiance for the regular meetings.

Mr. Burns asked if the Commission could discuss ideas on how to collectively come together with polarizing issues such as Affordable Housing.

- Mr. Dansie offered to continue sending the Commission emails containing training opportunities.
- Mr. Staker felt that the Commission likely had more commonalities in viewpoints than differences.

Mr. Marriott suggested that the Commission could dedicate some time during work meetings to discuss key issues and find some common ground.

Mr. Staker questioned the objectives of the Commission; He asked if the Commission was in place to help accommodate an applicant's ideas for development or to discourage someone from developing their property or their dreams.

Mr. Young was in favor of the Commission setting aside 20 minutes during the work meetings to have open discussions about the larger issues that affect the Commission's cohesiveness.

Mr. Pitti felt that imposing a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was intrusive and he was opposed.

- Mr. Marriott thanked Mr. Pitti for his comments and mentioned that the Pledge of Allegiance had been recited in past Commission meetings. It was his intent as Chair to continue the tradition.

2. Discussion of Cottage Housing Development (CHD) Overlay Zone revisions: Mr. Dansie reviewed the Commission's discussions over the last several months regarding the CHD Overlay Zone. Density had been a prevalent topic. He presented modeling with five units/acre and six units/acre. The Commission had also asked for pictures of real-world applications of cottage housing. Mr. Dansie provided photos of the closest concept he could find from a small, clustered development in Southern California.

Mr. Burns had general concerns about inserting the CHD Zone into residential neighborhoods where it would impact residential properties. He questioned whether or not the concept made sense for Springdale.

- Mr. Marriott felt the CHD concept did make sense in residential areas as Cottage Houses were intended for residential use.

Ms. Elger was excused at 6:00 pm.

Mr. Burns asked how the Town Code defined a "single family unit."

- A Single-Family Unit could be occupied by one family. "Family" was defined as "any number of people living together related by blood, marriage, or adoption; Or up to four unrelated people living together as a single housekeeping unit."

Mr. Staker referenced past discussions about the CHD and argued against the notion that no one was in favor of it. He felt the people who would support the CHD were the people who would benefit from lower cost housing offerings, which he felt was the intent. Discouraging the development of lower cost housing seemed to communicate an attitude of slamming the door on new and diverse potential residents.

- Mr. Burns didn't agree and felt that the larger issue at play was maintaining the character of Springdale as a small rural community.
- Mr. Marriott felt that six cottage-housing units likely would not change the complexion of Springdale.

Mr. Young spoke on the complexion of Springdale when viewed in terms of its human history. Large-scale homes may offer lower density circumstances, but there was a time in Springdale's history when the character was defined by its residents who were, more often than not, residing in small homes with a great number of family members packed in. In that respect, high-density living quarters could be viewed as more in-keeping with Springdale's earliest beginnings and perhaps its overall character.

- Using an example of the evolution of his own group's CHD proposal process, Mr. Marriott said that at one point they had entertained a model with only three units. It had actually yielded a design that was much more out of character within in Springdale than the six-unit design. He felt Mr. Young had raised an interesting point of view.

Mr. Pitti referenced portions of the General Plan and the Future Land Use Map related to maintaining low housing density in residential zones. The suggestion for low density development was in place to minimize impact to neighbors and natural environment, and to be congruent with village scale. He felt that the way to reconcile the CHD concept with the General Plan was to focus on lowering density in the CHD

if it was located in a residential area, or to encourage the development of CHDs in already dense areas such as the commercial zones.

- Mr. Staker observed that commercial property was highly valuable and it was unlikely for a commercial property owner to develop a residential neighborhood on commercial property.

Mr. Burns felt that the very nature of a high-density CHDs directly contradicted the low-density nature of residential zones.

- Mr. Young pointed out that the CHD Overlay was in effect a zone change which, if granted, would remove the conflict.

Mr. Staker felt the CHD was sufficient the way it was drafted. If the Commission wanted to further decrease density, they were essentially promoting the development of regular homes instead of promoting a more affordable and diverse housing stock.

Mr. Marriott suggested having further discussion on site selection and number of units. He also recommended discussing net developable land in relation to all other zones in Springdale, not just the CHD.

3. Discussion of Event Permit revisions: The Commission directed staff in their last work meeting to revise the policy to loosen requirements for private parties in the residential zones and clarify standards for free speech and assembly.

Mr. Pitti felt there was enough in the constitution to cover free speech rights and the addition of language in the draft policy seemed over-reaching. He suggested striking the free speech altogether.

- Ms. Frankenburg offered that the inclusion of standards for public assembly would ensure that Town staff and police officers would be apprised of the event and available to assist if needed.

Mr. Marriott and Mr. Pitti were not in favor of the free speech portion. Mr. Young thought it was very important and wanted to retain. Mr. Staker was neutral. Mr. Burns felt it was good to have protections in place. Mr. Marriott asked if anyone had strong objections in keeping the free speech portion in the policy. Other than concerns raised by Mr. Pitti, the Commission agreed to retain it.

The Commission directed staff to clarify language in regard to temporary structures, residential structures on the rear half of the property, and adequate disposal of wastewater. Staff would present the requested revisions at the next work meeting.

4. Review of incentive and development agreement procedures: In the interest of time, the Commission opted to carry the item to their next work meeting.

Motion to adjourn at 7:12 pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Burns: Aye

Pitti: 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.