



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

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 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.
Public comments for public hearing items may be made in person at the meeting or
submitted two days prior to the meeting.

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

Approval of the agenda
General announcements

A. Action Items

- 1. Public Hearing - Design/Development Review:** Dusty Wright requests a DDR for a three-unit transient lodging facility at 1082 Zion Park Boulevard in the VC zone.
- 2. Public Hearing - Design/Development Review:** Chance Wright requests a DDR for a three-unit transient lodging facility and retail space at 1066 Zion Park Boulevard in the VC zone.
- 3. Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision:** Changes to Title 10 of the Springdale Town Code related to the regulation of transient lodging facilities.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes from April 20th and May 4th.

C. Adjourn

APPROVED Ric Reins

DATE 5/18/22

The foregoing agenda was posted at the Springdale Town Hall at approximately 1:00 am/pm on 05/13/2022 by Don Emerson.

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

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86471782978?pwd=bHlsij0NibAyyfgmgosruGUyIePHM5.1>

Meeting ID: 864 7178 2978
Passcode: 051474

One tap mobile
US: +16699009128,,86471782978#,,,,*051474#

Dial by your location
US: +1 669 900 9128

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 REGULAR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY,
MAY 18, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 05:01 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Ric Rioux, Commissioners Kyla Topham, Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, and Adam Hyatt.

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

EXCUSED: Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Tom Kenaston to approve the agenda. Seconded by Noel Benson.
Topham: Aye
Benson: Aye
Rioux: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: None were made.

A. Action Items

1. **Public Hearing – Design/Development Review:** Dusty Wright requests a DDR for a three-unit transient lodging facility at 1082 Zion Park Boulevard in the VC zone.

The proposed DDR was for a new Commercial structure intended as a transient lodging facility with three units. The property was being developed in conjunction with the adjacent parcel S-47-A. Even though it was a coordinated development, both developments were on their own parcel and required to comply with all land use standards independently. A lot line adjustment was needed between the two properties for the proposal to be compliant with the land use regulations. The applicant provided a document stating the required legal documents that would be recorded to effectuate that lot line adjustment. A common parking agreement was required because of a shared access driveway between the two parcels (S-48 and S-47-A). The applicant had provided updated information regarding the outdoor lighting and lumen count, which complied with the standards. An updated grading plan showing the 30% and larger grades on the property was also provided. If the Commission were to approve the proposal, they would need to make it conditional on those 30% or greater grades not being disturbed.

Commission Questions to Staff:

Ms. Topham confirmed the security light had been removed to comply with the lumen cap.

Mr. Benson asked if a lot line adjustment would impact the lot creation date.

- To the best of his knowledge, Mr. Dansie stated that it would not impact the lot creation date since only an adjustment was made.

Ms. Inghram asked if two separate business licenses needed to be issued since the units were now split.

- Ms. Carlson stated they only needed one Business License since they intended on operating the business as one entity, and it was on the same property.
- Dusty Wright clarified the intent was to operate as one rental but provided separation so the family could have privacy from other relatives if needed.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Presentation from applicant:

Dusty Wright clarified their intention was for the development to include three suites but be rented as one unit. Each of the suites had its own bathroom, and there was a bathroom off of each of the main living areas to ensure easy access for guests or children.

Commission Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on why the downstairs needed a full kitchen if it was intended to be rented as one unit.

- The kitchen downstairs was intended to be a kitchenette, added for convenience. The kitchen on the main floor was envisioned as the family gathering area.

If the development was intended to be rented as one unit, Mr. Benson wondered why there was an exterior door with stairs from the upper level.

- Mainly for privacy reasons if another family from the same party stayed on the lower level. Also, in the event of an economic shift, they could request a change in their application to rent as separate units.

Mr. Benson asked why the guest bathroom on the main level was a full bathroom rather than a half bathroom.

- It was for comfort and convenience.

Expressing concern about the number of bathrooms and kitchens, Ms. Topham asked the applicant to confirm that this would be advertised as one three-bedroom unit.

- That was correct; they would not be rented as separate units.

Questions by the public to the Applicant: None were asked.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

Mr. Benson voiced concern about the number of bathrooms and kitchens and the potential for the development to be rented as three separate units. He was opposed to the proposal.

The remaining Commissioners discussed that since the lumen count and grading issues were resolved, the proposal was compliant with the standards in the Ordinance.

Motion made by Pam Inghram that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Design/Development Review for 1082 Zion Park Boulevard S-48 as discussed in the Commission meeting on May 18, 2022. This motion is with the following conditions:

1. The parcel must be combined with parcel S-47-A before issuing a building permit, with the lot line adjustment.

2. The property owner must complete a common parking agreement with the owner of parcel S-47-A to allow the parking access drive to be located straddling the mutual property line.

Topham: Aye

Benson: No

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed 4:1.

2. Public Hearing – Design/Development Review: Chance Wright requests a DDR for a three-unit transient lodging facility and retail space at 1066 Zion Park Boulevard in the VC zone. This was the companion parcel to the previous item. This was a Design/Development Review for a proposed development that included one two-bedroom unit and one single-bedroom unit intended to be used as transient lodging units with two retail spaces. A lot line adjustment and parking agreement with the adjacent parcel should be required as conditions if approved. The applicants provided clarifying information regarding lighting and grading on the property.

Commission Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Presentation from applicant:

Chance and Brooke Wright presented that there would be two separate lodging units. One was a two-bedroom, and the other was a single-bedroom unit with two Commercial retail spaces. They addressed that since most guests traveled in families, they wanted to provide additional privacy, so the proposed development included an additional bathroom per unit.

Commission Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Topham asked what was planned for the retail components.

- They were unsure but currently researching to add to the community.

Questions by the public to the Applicant: None were asked.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Kyla Topham. Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

The Commission discussed that since the applicant provided additional lighting and grading information, the proposal was compliant with the standards in the Ordinance, as long as the lot line adjustment and the shared parking agreement were created.

Motion made by Kyla Topham that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Design/Development Review for 1066 Zion Park Boulevard as discussed in the May 18, 2022, Planning Commission meeting. The motion is based on the following findings. 1. The application meets all land use Ordinances outlined in the Springdale Town Code. The following conditions apply:

1. **The lot line adjustment with parcel S-48 must be completed before issuing a building permit.**
2. **The property owner must complete a common parking agreement with the owner of parcel S-48 to allow the parking access drive to be located straddling the mutual property line.**

Seconded by Noel Benson.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

3. **Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision:** Changes to Title 10 of the Springdale Town Code related to the regulation of transient lodging facilities.

Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission of the four public comment letters received regarding this item and introduced Hans Dunzinger and Teresa Silcox to present the findings from the Transient Lodging Task Force.

Commission Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Hans Dunzinger introduced the members of the Transient Lodging task force. He stated that this effort started in January when the Town Council put the six-month moratorium on any new transient lodging facilities in the Town of Springdale, which was set to expire on July 12, 2022. The task force's purpose was to craft an ordinance that addressed the impacts of transient lodging units in Springdale that remained consistent with the General Plan and preserved the Commercial diversity. They met every other week with the task of researching practices placed in other communities.

Teresa Silcox presented the concepts of type one and type two transient lodging. Type one transient lodging replaced the CUP process with a permit and standards in the VC and CC zones. Type two

transient lodging was proposed to implement an overlay zone added in place of the CUP. Both types were required to have a multi-use component to the development. Specifically for type two, there was additionally a location requirement that created a buffer zone to eliminate the proliferation in one specific geographical area. The distance of the buffer zone was dependent on the zone. The task force decided to review all types of transient lodging standards to ensure a single group was not targeted.

Commission Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Inghram inquired about the discussions the task force had that led them to conclude that only transient lodging type two units would be included in the calculation of the buffer zone.

- They focused on the current development trend of type two transient lodging units to preserve as much village atmosphere. Creating a buffer zone could help eliminate some transient lodging.

Mr. Campbell asked how it would be handled if someone wanted their mixed-use to be a business not on the approved list.

- Businesses on the list encouraged the village atmosphere, and while it would not be prohibited, it would not count toward meeting their mixed-use component.

Mr. Campbell asked for clarification on the standards outlined in the CUP process that would be kept.

- Because the CUP process was being removed, they did not want to lose the standards by which the CUPs had to abide by. A set of standards for type one and similar standards for type two outlined that if a municipal service cannot be provided for a transient lodging facility, the Town would not approve the application.

Ms. Topham asked if the nuisance and complaint system was envisioned to be handled by the transient lodging owner or if the Town would be required to monitor it.

- The task force recognized that it was a critical issue and wanted to implement it but had not worked out all the details.

In the event a mixed-use business failed, Ms. Topham wondered if the applicant would be required to return to the Planning Commission to approve another mixed-use.

- Mr. Dansie stated the property owner would be required to show compliance with all Ordinances during the Business License renewal process, including the multi-use.

Questions by the public to the Applicant: None were asked.

Motion made by Pam Inghram to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: None were made.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

Ms. Inghram recommended revising the definition of 'Residential Hosting' to clarify that the owner or manager must occupy it.

Ms. Inghram suggested clarifying the definition of 'Short Term Rentals' to state that they were not required to have onsite staff.

Ms. Inghram proposed revising the chart in the permitted uses section since it reflected inaccurate information about Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) not being permitted in the FR zone.

Mr. Dansie presented the items the task force did not have time to address but listed as a high priority if the Commissioners had suggestions on how they could address the issues.

- The details of the good neighbor policy.
- The viability of the mixed-uses and possible revisions to the development standards in the VC and CC zones about Commercial development to ensure the success of those mixed uses.
- Whether employee housing satisfied the mixed-use requirement for a transient lodging facility.

Mr. Dansie added in the VC zone, the maximum building size was 5,000 square feet, and for a type one transient lodging facility with more than 20 units, the minimum required mixed-use area was also 5,000 square feet. He suggested that the Commission allow for a buffer in size.

Mr. Benson asked why there was a concern about having employee housing meet the mixed-use requirement. Whether it was listed at market rate should be up to the owner and should meet the condition since it was a need in the Town.

- The task force had not resolved if employee housing was more of a public benefit or strictly a benefit to the business owner.
- Hans Dunzinger stated that the intention of adding the mixed-use requirement was to mitigate the proliferation of transient lodging and increase the diversity in non-lodging businesses throughout the Town. He said that he felt a percentage of that should count toward the mixed-use requirement since there was some public benefit.

Mr. Hyatt agreed, stating that adding diversity and a place for Town employees to live was within the Town's goals.

Ms. Topham stated that if an employee loses their job, the situation should be remedied between the employee and employer, and the Town did not need to be involved.

Ms. Topham suggested implementing a link on the Town's website that directed someone to a google document to fill out the good neighbor reporting policy. She liked having it standardized throughout the Town, and it was something that the staff would monitor.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the revised ordinance provided by the Transient Lodging Taskforce to help regulate lodging in the Village Commercial and Central Commercial zones. With the revisions to the language in the definition section regarding 'Residential Hosting' and 'Short Term Rentals,' and revising the chart in the permitted use section that addresses ADUs to ensure clarity. We support the use of standards for Type 1 lodging and the use of an Overlay zone to allow a targeted expansion of Type 2 lodging in Town. We find that the mixed-use requirement will help encourage added diversity of business uses and services provided to both our residents and our visitors. We find that the ordinance will foster the type of development desired by the community and help better achieve the goals as envisioned in the Springdale General Plan. The Commission supports the strategies provided. The Commission recommends approval of the ordinance to the Town Council.

This motion is based on the following findings:

1. Rapid growth in transient lodging in Springdale has led to several negative consequences over the last several years. Many of these negative consequences are related to the conversion of properties in the Commercial zones from a non-lodging use to a lodging use.

A) A decrease in the amount of long-term housing and an acute shortage of housing to accommodate our local workforce.

B) There is a growing lack of diversity of business uses and services in the community.

C) An increase in the density and intensity of development on properties near residential areas.

D) Increased conversion of non-dwelling Commercial properties into nightly rentals, affecting the village character.

2. The Town Council appointed a transient lodging task force to study these issues and recommend strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of transient lodging. The task force has proposed an ordinance that classifies transient lodging into two different types: Type 1 and Type 2 lodging.

A) Type 1 Lodging: 1. Has a continuously staffed front desk or concierge desk to provide information education and orientation to guests. 2. Provides routine support services. 3. It is contained in a purposefully built structure for lodging that cannot be easily converted to another use. 4. Includes hotels and motels.

B) Type 2 Lodging: 1. No full-time onsite staff dedicated to assisting guests. 2. Typically does not offer routine support services. 3. It is contained in a structure that can often be easily converted into another use. 4. Includes bed and breakfasts, hostels, residential hosting, and short-term rentals.

3. The task force found that Type 1 lodging impacts the Town differently than Type 2 and should be regulated differently.

A) Type 1 transient lodging can best be regulated through an administrative process that includes enhanced standards and requirements that are designed to protect and promote the Town's village character, enhance the quality of a visitor's experience in the Zion region and preserve and improve the quality of life for the Town's residents.

B) Based on recent trends in the kind of transient lodging being developed in the Town, Type 2 lodging presents a more significant threat to converting non-lodging uses in the commercial zones. This has a more substantial impact on the community. Therefore, there is a need to be more precise and careful about regulation. For this reason, a Transient Lodging Overlay zone is to be established to allow for a targeted expansion of Type 2 lodging. The overlay zone is intended to permit Type 2 lodging to protect and promote the Town's Village Character while enhancing the quality of a visitor's experience in the region.

4. There will be a mixed-use requirement for all new transient lodging. No property may be developed with exclusive use of transient lodging. This will help ensure a continued growing diversity of business uses and services available to the community.

5. Location Standards: This standard is intended to prevent an over-concentration of Type 2 facilities within a given geographic area.

6. Finally, this ordinance is consistent with several objectives in the Springdale General Plan:

2.1 To observe and enhance the unique village atmosphere.

2.1.2 Protect residential neighborhoods located next to Commercial areas.

3.1.1 Managing growth to ensure the village atmosphere is preserved.

3.2.2 Ensure retention of residential uses and open spaces along SR-9.

4.2.3 Enhance the visitor's experience in Springdale.

5.1.4 Encourage housing in mixed-use Commercial zones.
8.3 Provide convenient and adequate restrooms in Springdale.
Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Aye
Benson: No
Rioux: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Motion passed 4:1.

B. Consent Agenda

Motion by Pam Inghram to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Kyla Topham.
Topham: Aye
Benson: Aye
Rioux: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 07:04 pm made by Kyla Topham Seconded by Tom Kenaston.
Topham: Aye
Benson: Aye
Rioux: Aye
Kenaston: Aye
Inghram: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.



Aren Emerson

Aren Emerson, Deputy Clerk

Rae Rioux

DATE: 6/15/2022

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.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING Date 05/18/2022

IN PERSON ATTENDEES:

REMOTE ATTENDEES:
(Clerk will complete)

Robert Carlton
Name (please print)

PASSEK
Name (please print)

Rebecca Lieberg
Name (please print)

RYAN LEE
Name (please print)

Brooke Wright
Name (please print)

Trista Rayner
Name (please print)

Chance Wright
Name (please print)

E. Cutler
Name (please print)

Bitna Lindsay
Name (please print)

Robin
Name (please print)

Barbara Bruno
Name (please print)

Riley
Name (please print)

Jim Zupp
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Helen McMahan
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)

From: **Tori Spainhower** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, May 16, 2022 at 12:43 PM
Subject: Short Term Rentals
To: Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Hi Tom,

Looking over the committee notes for changes to Transient Housing. All short term rentals are not the same just as all hotels are not the same.

1. For the past 13 years I have met every guest personally when they check in to the property. The hand full of times I couldn't be there I had someone else meet them. There is not a key box or a code.

2. I communicate with the guest on average 4 times before they arrive and several times while they are staying. Every guest is referred to local businesses in Springdale.

3. The two properties were both built as vacation rentals. Zoning and compliance with town was done before they were built. Business licences have always been current. Sales and Transient room taxes have been paid since the first guest.

4. The typical guest is an extended family that wants to spend time together.

Thank you

Tori Spainhower

Tori Spainhower
Integra Realty



From: Terry Kruschke [REDACTED]
Date: Tue, May 17, 2022 at 7:26 PM
Subject: Re: 05/18/2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda & Packet Materials
To: Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov>

Springdale town clerk,

I am a town resident and I may not be able to attend this meeting to provide comments on agenda item #3 below. Therefore I am sending this email with my comments.

Regarding: Transient Lodging Taskforce Recommendations to the Planning Commission

First I want to let the commission and town council know I support this effort. I am especially in favor of the mixed use requirements. We have lost too many other land uses in commercial zones to transient-lodging-only type facilities. Please move forward with this effort to ensure the completion of this ordinance in a form similar to that described in the memo.

There are a few things I don't see covered in this proposed ordinance. I don't know if they are covered elsewhere in town ordinances. If so, then I am satisfied.

1 - I don't see any lot coverage requirements. It seems to me we should require some minimum amount of open space (not covered by buildings, parking lots, etc.)

2 - I don't see any requirements regarding sidewalks. We should ensure sidewalks are included and meet minimum standards.

3 - I don't see any parking space requirements. We should require sufficient parking to accommodate the expected guests.

4 - There is nothing about signage for either the lodging or non-lodging businesses. Are the lodging and non-lodging business required to have separate signage, combined signage, or whatever the business chooses? Do we require the public non-lodging business be signed or visible such that passersby in front of the facility are able to identify and locate the non-lodging business. I think we would want to make sure the mixed-use businesses are prominent and visible.

5 - I could not tell from the ordinance wording if the public non-lodging business must be operated by the same owner as the lodging business. Or if the owner can lease the public non-lodging facility to another business owner. I am not sure if the ordinance would need to address the possibility of creating a number of empty non-lodging business facilities if owners are not interested in running the non-lodging business themselves and are unable to find a non-lodging business to lease the non-lodging facilities to. The purpose of the ordinance is to maintain a good ratio of active on-going non-lodging businesses, not create more closed or empty business facilities.

Thank you for your consideration,
Terry Kruschke
[REDACTED]

From: Patricia [REDACTED]

Date: Sun, May 15, 2022 at 6:11 PM

Subject: Planning Commission Meeting 5/18/22

To: <tkenaston@springdale.utah.gov>, <rrioux@springdale.utah.gov>, <ktopham@springdale.utah.gov>, <nbenson@springdale.utah.gov>, <pinghram@springdale.utah.gov>, <pcampbell@springdale.utah.gov>, <ahyatt@springdale.utah.gov>, <susan_mcpartland@nps.gov>, <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

It is clear that the taskforce worked really hard and thought through many issues and details, and then came up with an excellent plan. The Planning Commission asked the right questions. And I think that the proposed ordinance should now be approved.

We have needed this ordinance for a long time. I especially like the mixed-use requirement because it involves giving back to the community.

I have stayed in Airbnbs around the country and when there isn't a staff member who will answer a call (and there often isn't), it can be a disaster. Requiring 24-hour on-call staff is extremely important.

The location standards are also very important. Over-concentration of transient lodging in a relatively small area would be unsightly and a problem with transportation.

Thank everyone very much for their hard work. This is going to be very positive for Springdale.

Patricia Vail-Blackett

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

From: **Matt Rayner** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, May 18, 2022 at 1:20 PM

Subject: Vacation Rental Ordinance

To: Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Hello, I am asking you to consider the implications of the new vacation rental ordinance. I will illustrate this point by what I believe is at stake for me.

A few years ago I spoke with Tom about adding more vacation rentals to my property. I wanted to hurry and get approval to protect my ability to develop my property before a moratorium on vacation rentals was enacted. He said the town had looked at a moratorium and the town attorney said it would not be legal. Unfortunately I waited to have the design work done until I was ready. This new ordinance takes two things from me.

1. I am currently in the process of subdividing the vacation rentals on my lot onto a separate parcel. This would allow me to acquire a residential mortgage for them. Residential rates are typically better than commercial and fixed. One of the, perhaps, unintended consequences of this new ordinance would render my subdivision non-conforming. Thus, not possible as I understand it.
2. My option to add more vacation rentals to my Central Commercial property will be eliminated. This is because of its proximity to other commercial properties that have vacation rentals. Although my property is not adjacent to any of them, my property fails the proximity test because of two properties that are greater than 300 feet and one that is greater 500 feet from SR 9, a property on another street not on SR9 and two properties across SR 9. All of these other properties would be non-conforming under the new ordinance. Mine would be conforming in every way except proximity. I feel the proximity requirements are unfair and arbitrary.

This ordinance, as it is written, has incredibly large and long term financial implications for my family. Thank you.

Matt Rayner