



118 Lion Blvd • PO Box 187 • Springdale, UT 84767 • (435) 772-3434

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, May 4, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD – SPRINGDALE, UT 84767
A live broadcast of this meeting will be available to the public for viewing/listening only.

****Please see electronic login information below****

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Discussion / Non-Action Items

1. Review initial recommendations from the Transient Lodging Task Force.
2. **Ordinance Revision:** Graduated Setbacks and Net Developable Acreage.
3. Discussion of workforce housing zone proposal.

B. Adjourn

APPROVED *Ric Ryan*
DATE *05/04/22*

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately *3:00 am/pm* on *04/28/2022* by *Den Emerson*.

****To access the electronic webinar please click the Zoom link below:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89458684061?pwd=M002NUF4ckZnYWVvMjJVMVljaTgxZz09>

Meeting ID: 894 5868 4061
Passcode: 958674

One tap mobile
US: +13462487799,,89458684061#,,,,*958674#

Dial by your location
US: +1 346 248 7799

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Darci Carlson at 435.772.3434 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/agendacenter>



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 5:00 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Ric Rioux, Commissioners Kyla Topham, Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Town Clerk Darci Carlson, and Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the meeting.

Commissioner Adam Hyatt arrived at 5:02 pm.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the agenda. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion Passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements:

Mr. Dansie announced that the Town Planner position had been filled with a highly qualified candidate and would soon be another resource for the Commissioners to utilize.

A. Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

1. Review initial recommendations from the Transient Lodging Task Force.

The Transient Lodging Task Force presented the framework for the revisions, and the details needed to be refined. The presentation intended to gather input from Commissioners on the policy direction and proposed strategies to see if they were moving in the right direction. If so, the refined details would be brought before the Planning Commission in a public hearing at the May 18th meeting. Mr. Dansie introduced Hans Dunzinger and Theresa Silcox, who presented the findings from the Transient Lodging Task Force.

In reviewing the feedback received from the surveys, Theresa Silcox and Hans Dunzinger stated that a compelling concern of the community was damage to the village atmosphere of Springdale. The surveys also raised concern about the loss of Residential and diverse Commercial uses. Rather than banning transient lodging or capping the number of units allowed, the Task Force decided to identify the different types of transient lodging.

- Type one Transient Lodging was geared more toward a traditional space where a room and restroom would be included, and there was full-time on-site staff dedicated to assisting customers.
- Type two Transient Lodging were establishments with no full-time on-site staff, and the space would typically include more space such as a kitchen and living area and a room and restroom.

The Task Force implemented the requirement of an overlay zone that would only apply to properties within the Commercial zones. The process would be to have the applicant apply for a rezone to add the overlay zone on top of their Commercially zoned property to develop transient lodging. The rezoning would be legislative and gave the Town discretion in requiring an additional mixed-use business to that property.

Ms. Inghram suggested adding a cap of approvals per year.

- The Task Force discussed adding a cap, but the requirements were stringent and would significantly limit the proliferation of the nightly rentals. The provision of the mixed-use would help promote the goal of the Task Force, which was to provide a diverse group of businesses.

Ms. McPartland commended the Task Force for the hard work in researching and providing the information. She suggested that the Task Force refine the definitions further to avoid misclassifying any properties, such as hotels with suites and single rooms.

Mr. Campbell suggested having both types of transient lodging require 24-hour service staff.

- The requirement was for the staff to be within 10 miles to respond to emergencies for the type two transient lodging because they are more closely related to an Airbnb.

Mr. Dansie clarified that adopting the Ordinance would make all of the existing transient lodging non-conforming uses because they did not currently comply with those standards.

Mr. Benson questioned why the Task Force felt that applying the overlay zone to type two transient lodging would fundamentally alter how the community perceives its legislative zoning authority.

- The Town's current policy was that the Town doesn't make zone changes except in the three narrow circumstances. If an overlay zone was adopted either; 1. The policy would stand, and no zone changes would be made, in which case they essentially adopted a prohibition on new transient lodging. 2. Or upon the approval of the overlay zones, which could open the door to other types of zone changes and potentially undermine how the community perceived zoning.

Thinking about unintended consequences, Ms. McPartland asked if the Town was opening itself up to encouraging more significant developments in identifying the two different types of transient lodging.

- Any new hotel developed in Town would be subject to the existing zoning regulations that would not allow the larger structures.

Ms. Topham appreciated that the overlay zone needed to be granted before the DDR came before the Commission. She suggested clarifying or defining the word "sufficient" to avoid misinterpretation.

Mr. Benson expressed his concern about the hindrance to the development of smaller businesses.

Mr. Kenaston suggested adding a percentage of total square footage to be developed as mixed-use to help mitigate the impact on the smaller developments.

The Commission agreed with the framework presented in the current meeting and the direction the Task Force was moving. They wanted them to refine some of the more minor detailed concerns for the next Planning Commission meeting and provide examples of specific calculations of square footage percentages and how a radius would be measured with a map to demonstrate to the community.

2. Ordinance Revision: Graduated Setbacks and Net Developable Acreage.

The Commission had extensively discussed the language they wanted to implement in a previous meeting and the general direction they would like to go. The staff report outlined the Ordinance language that would enforce the policies discussed. The first section added the net developable land area definition and clarified in both the VC and CC zone that density was based on the net developable land area instead of the total land area. The second section outlined graduated setbacks. The proposed standard was for properties in the VR and VC zone that were of sufficient size; to have the front setback dependent on the building height. The intent was to ensure the Ordinance language was in the direction the

Commission wanted and would be presented for consideration in a public hearing in the next regular meeting.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification regarding the difference in the subzones outlined in section 10-9B-7,

- The VR-B subzone applied to properties less than a quarter of an acre. The VR-A subzone applied to properties between a quarter of an acre and three-quarters of an acre. Since the Ordinance would not apply to either subzone, it should be removed.

Acknowledging the public comment letter received, Mr. Benson questioned if 18-feet was a sufficient height for a single-story home.

- The comment letter had a point that the Ordinance would affect the style of the home being developed. There were homes developed under 18-feet but typically had a shallower roof pitch.

Ms. Topham wondered if there were lots that would be excluded from having a backyard with the standards.

- This Ordinance would impact the way properties will be developed. That was inherent with any land use regulation adopted. The Commission needed to consider if the purpose they were pursuing justified the impact being placed on the property.

The Commissioners agreed with the language draft and planned to move the item forward to a public hearing.

3. Discussion of workforce housing zone proposal.

The Commission previously talked about changes to the housing policy. Mr. Kenaston worked on several housing policy options, such as a transferrable development rights program and deed restrictions. A newer opportunity presented was the idea of a workforce housing zone. It was recently adopted in Moab, and Mr. Kenaston thought it might be successfully applied in Springdale. It could allow for a larger density on a property if a percentage of those units were required to be occupied by employees actively employed in the Town of Springdale. The Commission needed to determine if this could be a successful tool for the Town so the housing group could bring a draft proposal back to the Commission with details in a future work meeting.

Ms. Inghram asked what zones the overlay would apply to.

- It would most likely be applicable in the Residential zones. Since the details had not been crafted, they could be created to suit the Town's needs.

Ms. Inghram asked how enforcement was envisioned in the event an owner was no longer employed in the Town.

- The vision behind this was that they would be long-term rental units to ensure compliance upon lease renewals or business license renewals.

Mr. Kenaston envisioned this as a managed community with financing through the private sector. They could apply a percentage based on the needs of the Town. There would be a market rate for the units reserved for employees within the Town.

The Commission liked the general direction of creating a separate workforce housing zone and wanted to work out the details in a future work meeting.

B. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 07:15 pm made by Kyla Topham Seconded by Pam Inghram.
Topham: Aye
Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Aren Emerson
Aren Emerson, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: Ric Reimp DATE: 5/18/22

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 for more information.



To the Planning Commission:

I am unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting tonight. I just wanted to voice my opinion about the graduated setback along SR9 increasing from 30 feet to 50 feet if the structure is over 18 feet and if the lot is over 3/4 acre in the VR zone. I am against this ordinance revision.

1. 50 feet seems excessive if we are trying to maintain a village atmosphere according to the general plan of Springdale. Part of a village atmosphere is having a mix of commercial and residential properties. You would essentially hide any new residential homes along SR9 giving tourists a wonderful view of open spaces but causing the residents who live there to be squished to the back of their lots not being able to have a private back yard, instead a public front yard. Is this ordinance for the tourists or for the residents? I think 30 feet for VR is more than enough space to distance from SR9 even if it is over the 18 foot height.

2. 18 feet height. I have looked at SO MANY house plans for 1 story homes. Most of the homes with a 9-10 foot ceiling (which is pretty average for new houses) have over 20-24 feet building height with pitched roofs. I am not a a building expert, but I think this ordinance would influence me and a lot of new house builds to have a flat roof which would allow me to space my home so I can have a private backyard from the busy SR9.

*** I would like you to try and go to any house plan site, I went to architecturaldesigns.com and entered into a search for 3 bedroom house that was under 2000 sq feet one story. I only clicked on the first 10. Every single one was well over the 18 foot height restriction.

3. I would like to emphasize who is benefitting from this ordinance? The tourist driving by or the resident living here is Springdale? If I want to have a pitched roof home (which is part of the "parkitecture" look valued by Springdale Town) I will have to now have a 50 foot public front yard and an extremely small private backyard... that is no longer private because now my new home would be encroaching on the privacy of my back neighbors. In my opinion residents lose on this new ordinance and the people driving by my property for 2 seconds win.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Kindest,

MJ West



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING Date 05/04/2022

IN PERSON ATTENDEES:

REMOTE ATTENDEES:
(Clerk will complete)

Teresa Silcott
Name (please print)

Mike Grim
Name (please print)

Dianne McDonald
Name (please print)

Riley
Name (please print)

BARBARA BRUNO
Name (please print)

Passek
Name (please print)

LISA ZUMPF
Name (please print)

Tracy Dutson
Name (please print)

HANS DUNZINGER
Name (please print)

Matt
Name (please print)

Mary STUTTS
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Betha Cindy
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)