



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON  
WEDNESDAY APRIL 21, 2021 AT 5:00 PM**

**This Planning Commission meeting did not have an anchor location and was conducted entirely via electronic means. Commission members connected remotely. The meeting was available to the public for live viewing/listening and contained public hearings.**

**Meeting convened at 5:02 pm.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Barbara Bruno, Commissioners Ric Rioux, Jack Burns, Dawn McComb, Tom Kenaston, Kyla Topham, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie and Deputy Clerk Katy Brown recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the electronic meeting.

**Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Ric Rioux to approve the agenda with the revision to strike Item A2. Seconded by Jack Burns.**

**McComb: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Rioux: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Bruno: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission discussion and announcements:** Mr. Dansie announced the results of the Appeal Authority meeting: The Administrative Hearing Officer upheld the Planning Commission's denial of the Design Development Review for a transient lodging facility at 358 Zion Park Blvd. The Hearing Officer conversely granted the variance for a retail/lodging facility on the same parcel.

- Ms. Bruno asked if anyone could appeal either of those decisions.
- Only Mr. Wilson as the applicant could appeal the DDR denial, but any party who could be adversely affected by the variance could appeal that decision.

Mr. Kenaston asked the Commissioners if they would be interested in crafting an application review checklist to consult during project evaluations.

- Ms. Bruno understood that commercial design/build proposals started out conceptually and often left out details like landscaping until closer to completion date. With that in mind, having to approve projects conditionally put the onus on the Commission to ensure that the applicant stayed true to the plan presented.

The Commission agreed to draft a checklist at the next work meeting.

**A. Action Items**

**1. Public Hearing: Design/Development Review: Multi-family housing (four-plex structures) on Moenave Subdivision Lots 15 and 16 (VC-PD zone) – Richard Webster, Mountain Vista Homes:** The applicant was proposing two (2) four-plex buildings on the final two undeveloped lots in the Moenave subdivision. The four-plex structures had been approved conceptually when the subdivision was approved. The Commission should verify the correct floor elevation with the applicant in addition to determining where the wall mounted sconces would be located. Staff also recommended a condition for

the applicant to use a native seed mix for reseeded. A public comment letter was received and forwarded to the Commission (Attachment #1).

Mr. Burns noted that, although the parcel fell in the Village Commercial zone, the Planned Development Overlay (PD-O) zone prohibited nightly rentals.

**Questions from the Planning Commission to staff:** Ms. Bruno asked if there were any restrictions in the PD-O zone other than nightly rentals being prohibited.

- Mr. Dansie said there were no restrictions or stipulations in the PD-O. There were certain deed restrictions on other multi-family units within the subdivision but the restrictions did not apply to lot 15 or 16.

**Questions from the public to staff:** Loy Dobson asked staff to summarize the main points from the public comment letter. Mr. Dansie read five statements/requests from the letter. (See Attachment #1).

John Thomas stated that he concurred with Loy Dobson's public letter comments.

**Summary explanation and presentation by the applicant:** Mr. Webster said the structure was a rambler-style residential building. He was very open to responding to comments from the public and neighbors. He would make an effort to conceal the tops of the propane tanks. He would be installing the same lighting sconces that were used in the six-plex structures. Wall sconces would be located next to the front and rear entry.

**Planning Commission questions to applicant:** Mr. Burns asked if Mr. Webster could address the dumpsters.

- They would be located in the front end of the parking lot. Front-loading dumpsters presented some constraints and safety issues since travelling far into the parking lot to access the rear would present conflicts between other cars, children, residents, etc. The concerns regarding dumpster location had been taken under advisement but much consideration had been given to the best logistical location. The dumpster would be concealed with a concrete wall surrounding it.

Mr. Rioux disclosed that he owned and lived in a single-family home in Moenave. The land surrounding the current six-plex buildings was hydroseeded back in December and none of it looked viable at this point. He asked what would happen if the hydroseed planned for lots 15 and 16 failed to grow.

- Their current landscape architect had noticed the issue and recommended bringing in native soil to encourage the native seed to grow. The previous application was the right kind of seed but perhaps not the right soil mixture.

**Questions by the public to the applicant:** Jay Crosson lived on Trapper's Circle and was hoping for grass. He also asked if the PD-O restricted how many units could be owned by a single owner.

- Staff responded that there were no restrictions in the PD-O zone in terms of how many units a single owner could own.

John Thomas asked if there was a start and stop date for the construction. He complimented the applicant on their excellence with the other residential structures.

- Mr. Webster said he was unsure of timeline as materials and supplies were often delayed and availability varied. Construction was scheduled to start in May.

Loy Dobson asked if the developer could put a walkway to the dumpsters rather than having to open gates to access.

- Mr. Webster was hesitant to have the dumpsters accessible via an open walk way due to concerns with wildlife accessing them. Unfortunately, they were not currently able to revise the dumpster access design.
- Kurt Wilson noted that one of his neighbors was trapped inside the dumpster enclosure and felt the gate design could be reevaluated.
- Mr. Webster responded that he would research options for a latch release on the inside of the dumpster enclosure.

**Motion made by Dawn McComb to open Public Hearing. Seconded by Jack Burns.**

**Burns: Aye**

**McComb: Aye**

**Rioux: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Bruno: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comments:** Gary DeLong complimented Mountain Vista Homes on their development so far. He supported the application and felt the sooner the better in terms of finalizing construction. Any accommodations related to Mr. Dobson's concerns/requests would be much appreciated by the community.

**Motion made by Dawn McComb to close public hearing. Seconded by Barbara Bruno.**

**McComb: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Rioux: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Bruno: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission deliberation:** Mr. Burns asked if the PD-O zone prohibited commercial activity.

- Mr. Dansie read from Code 10-13C-4B: *"If the project which applies the PD zone is utilized in conjunction with the VC zone or CC zone, uses permitted by the PD zone shall be limited to residential uses (single-family, duplex, and multi-family) as well as limited commercial uses when developed in combination with a residential project and regulated by section 10-13C-9 of this article."*

Ms. Bruno appreciated that Mr. Webster was using the same materials and that the design was congruent with the other standing buildings. It appeared that the details provided were in compliance with the Town's building and design standards.

Ms. McComb sent Mr. Webster a link for some ideas on dumpster walk ways.

Mr. Rioux expressed an expectation that the lighting remain consistent with the rest of the lighting throughout the subdivision and requested that the applicant employ better landscaping/seeding techniques.

**Motion made by Jack Burns that the Planning Commission approves the Design/Development Review Application for the four-plex units on Moenave Lot 15 and Moenave Lot 16. This motion is based on the following findings: The application meets applicable code section relevant to Chapter 10-11B Village Commercial Zone Two, and Chapter 10-16: Architectural Standards and Design Guidelines. In addition, the following conditions must be met: 1) The location of all exterior lighting wall sconces must be shown on a site or electrical plan and submitted to the DCD prior to the issuance of a building permit. 2) Exterior finishes in terms of colors and**

materials must match existing buildings. 3) In accordance with the Planned Development Overlay Zone, development is restricted to residential uses, despite the underlying Village Commercial zoning: Overnight rentals and commercial uses are prohibited. Seconded by Barbara Bruno.

McComb: Aye

Burns: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

**B. Consent Agenda**

Motion made by Jack Burns to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meetings of March 17<sup>th</sup> and April 7<sup>th</sup> as presented. Seconded by Ric Rioux.

McComb: Aye

Burns: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

**C. Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn made at 5:47 pm by Barbara Bruno. Seconded by Dawn McComb.

McComb: Aye

Burns: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Bruno: 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@springdale.utah.gov](mailto:springdale@springdale.utah.gov) for more information

**DRAFT**



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

**REMOTE MEETING ATTENDANCE RECORD**

Meeting: Planning Commission Work Meeting 4/21/2021

Jay Crosson

John Thomas

Gary DeLong

Lorette Bayle

Kurt Wilson

Barb Ballinger

Passek

Richard Webster

Loy Dobson

Pending Approval



Katy Brown &lt;kbrown@springdale.utah.gov&gt;

**Fwd: Planning Commission**

1 message

**Thomas Dansie** <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>  
To: Planning Commission <pc@springdale.utah.gov>

Wed, Apr 21, 2021 at 12:13 PM

Commissioners-

Please see the comments below regarding the DDR for Moenave Lots 15 and 16. (Remember that the DDR for the parking area at the end of Trapper Circle has been postponed.)

Thanks!

Tom

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Loy Dobson** <[REDACTED]>  
Date: Tue, Apr 20, 2021 at 4:42 PM  
Subject: Planning Commission  
To: <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>  
Cc: <dcarlson@springdale.utah.gov>, Loy Dobson <[REDACTED]>

Tom,

Thanks for sending out the info on Moenave. I am Loy Dobson owner of [REDACTED] on Trapper Circle.

The parking lot has me concerned as we do not know how it will be used. I didn't like the extra traffic and mud when they were using it last summer and the strange hours people were coming and going. I was wondering how they had easement from Trapper Circle in the first place as the property is right behind the Best Western Motel. The business that was using it last year was from a Zions Outfitter Business using La Quinta's motel and parking lot. If it is for the same business is there any way we could give them access through our northeast corner property than having them come clear around and up and down Trapper Circle? 30 parking spaces seems like a lot of parking also. That is more than 3 of the 6 plexes parking spaces. And now we have a lot of rentals with kids playing in the street and a lot of bikes. Then generally a business that gets a license has to have enough parking for their business at the location of their business which should be part of the motel parking lot.

Then just a few things we have noticed after the other 6 plexes have been built that would be nice or something to check into on the 2 four plexes that they are planning to build.

- 1- If they would put the dumpsters to the rear of the parking lots so they were not right out front for all to see first thing would make it nicer aesthetically. Like Lot 13 and lot 14 did. Lot 11 and lot 12 did not put them in the rear.
- 2- Then the propane tanks would be better if they were buried deeper so the red tops wouldn't show. I think that was the whole point of the walls was to hide those tanks. Again they did that on Lot 13 and lot 14 but not on lot 11 and lot 12 as you can see the red tops on those 2 units.
- 3- Is there a way we could get a separate water meter for the landscaping instead of all the owners paying for who knows how many shrubs and trees on their individual meter. Can the city have a water meter that the HOA pays to take care of all the outside landscaping and hose bib?
- 4- It would be nice if the HOA was split up having all the single homes in one and all the 4 and 6 plexes in another HOA. Maybe an item the city adds to their list of requirements as to the way the HOAs are set up.
- 5- There are electric pipes and ground cover they still have not finished around 101, lot 13, so we should ask them to finish the project properly before occupancy.

Thanks for all the information you sent out. That was very helpful.

Thanks to all for making it a nice place to live!

Loy Dobson  
[REDACTED]