



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
ON WEDNESDAY JUNE 19, 2019 AT 5:00PM  
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

**Meeting convened at 5:01PM**

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

**EXCUSED:** Zion National Park representative Treacy Stone

**ABSENT:** Mike Marriott and Jack Burns

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Sophie Frankenburg, and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. Please see attached list for attendees signed in.

Ms. Elger opted for the Commission to skip the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Joe Pitti approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission discussion and announcements:** Mr. Dansie updated the Commission on the status of the Virgin River Management Plan. A Request for Proposal was being finalized to identify a technical consultant to help craft standards for future ordinances.

Ms. Carlson announced a "Meet the Candidates Night" was being scheduled for July 9<sup>th</sup> starting at 7:00pm. The event would be held at either the Canyon Community Center or Council Room in Town Hall.

**Action Items**

**1. Sign Permit – Sotelo’s Restaurant, located at 1101 Zion Park Boulevard in the VC zone – Ladis**

**Sotelo:** Ms. Frankenberg indicated this application was for a building-mounted sign and was reviewed as part of the master sign program on this property. The sign size was limited to twenty (20) square feet, would not contain illumination, and consist of brown and off-white lettering. Staff recommended the height of the sign be confirmed upon installation. The material of the sign would be wood.

Ladis Sotelo was in attendance to answer questions. He confirmed the dimensions of the sign would be nineteen and a half (19.5) square feet.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the sign permit for Sotelo’s Restaurant at 1101 Zion Park Boulevard. The Commission finds that after reviewing the following ordinances prior to the meeting, in reference to Chapter 10-24 Signage, the applicant is in compliance with the standards including sign area which will be reduced to below twenty (20) square feet, the location, illumination, materials and colors. With the conditions: 1) the applicant must reduce the total sign area to be within the twenty (20) square feet allowed; 2) and the applicant must verify the height of the sign is no more than fifteen-feet (15’) above the ground; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**2. Public Hearing – Preliminary Subdivision Plat: Canyon Cottonwoods, Amended Lot 2 (a nine-lot cottage housing subdivision on parcel S-CCWS-2, located immediately north of the Silver Bear Rock Shop) – Luke Wilson:**

Mr. Dansie explained the preliminary plat was the next step in the cottage housing process to subdivide the parcel. The general purpose was to ensure all lots in the subdivision met zoning standards and to verify infrastructure requirements were in compliance. Zoning standards for the subdivision were established as part of the CHD ordinance and the development agreement. Based on staff review, the plat met standards, however conditions were recommended if the Commission motioned to approve.

**Commission Questions to staff:** Mr. Young asked status of plans for rough vegetation on the upper section of the development.

- This suggested condition came from the hazard assessment prepared by the applicant's engineer. Vegetation was recommended on the upper terrace of the river bank to slow flood waters. This could be added as a condition of approval.

Ms. Elger asked if lot lines were drawn out.

- Mr. Dansie indicated individual building areas would be sold and the areas around the buildings would be common area.

Ms. Elger asked if an HOA was part of the CHD.

- The developer must submit CC&R's so Mr. Dansie said there was an indirect requirement.

Ms. Elger asked if the applicant was in compliance with the grading permit.

- The Town's code enforcement officer had a number of discussions with the applicant and the property was currently compliant. Mr. Dansie noted a few piles of dirt still needed to be dealt with

Mr. Pitti asked how flood hazards were communicated.

- The development agreement required a note be on the final subdivision plat and in the CC&R's. These documents were part of any closing and would notify potential buyers about flood hazards. Since the final plat and CC&R's were also recorded, they would come up in any title search.

**Public questions to staff:** None were asked.

**Summary presentation of proposal by the applicant:** Luke Wilson was in attendance to answer questions. He indicated the CC&R's would create a mechanism for ongoing maintenance and nuisances. The CC&R's would also provide access rights, easements for utilities, and limited common area. Mr. Wilson indicated the grading permit allowed for two-feet (2') of fill. Surveys were left at native grade so fill could be measured and referenced in the future. Buildings in the back would not have a second story since the height would be restricted due to the added fill dirt.

Mr. Wilson asked if it was typical for lot lines to extend a bit beyond the building pad.

- Mr. Dansie said the Town did not have a preference but recommended the footprint allow some 'wobble room'.
- Mr. Wilson said they would likely bump out the lot line three-feet (3').

**Commission questions to applicant:** Mr. Pitti asked where trash cans would go.

- Mr. Wilson did not know but would seek guidance.

Mr. Young asked about the inclusion of vegetation on the upper terrace.

- Mr. Wilson was uncertain what specific plants comprised 'rough vegetation' but anticipated including something for this area in the landscape plan.

**Public questions to applicant:** No questions were asked.

**Motion made by Tyler Young to open public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comments:** No public comments were made.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to close public hearing; seconded by Tyler Young.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission deliberation:** Mr. Pitti said there did not appear to be any deviation from the original application. Additionally, staff analysis of unit count, zoning standards, landscape, setbacks, and cottage footprints seemed to indicate requirements were met. The recommended conditions were good to attach to the motion.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti that the Commission recommends approval of the preliminary subdivision plat for the Cottage Housing Development on Lot 2 of the Canyon Cottonwoods subdivision. The Commission has determined that the subdivision meets all required zoning standards as they relate to the proposed preliminary plat for compliance with: 1) The requirements for preliminary plats in section 10-14-7;**

**2) The development standards for cottage housing developments in sections 10-13F-9, 11, and 12;**

**3) The restrictions of the development agreement approved as part of the zone change.**

**The Commission recommends the following conditions: 1) As recommended in the Hazard Assessment, vegetation must be planted on the upper terrace of the river as a flood protection measure.**

**2) Grading activities on the property must remain in compliance with the approved grading permit.**

**3) The final plat for the project must contain the following plat notes: a. A warning to future owners about flood hazards. b. A notice regarding the responsibility of future land owners to maintain the flood hazard mitigation infrastructure in the subdivision. c. A prohibition on using the cottages for commercial purposes or transient lodging. d. A restriction on the size (850 square foot footprint, max) and height (single story, 15') of any cottage within 50 feet for the SR9 right-of-way.**

**4) The final plat will not be approved without formal approval from UDOT for the new access on the south side of the property, as shown in the proposed preliminary plat.**

**5) The applicant makes a concession for trash placement on the property for the subdivision; seconded by Allan Staker.**

Ms. Elger indicated she had additional conditions to add to the motion.

**Motion amended by Suzanne Elger to add the following additional conditions: 1) Construct the rock rip rap erosion protection improvements; 2) Have the footing for buildings constructed between the sewer easement and the river should extend a minimum of five-feet (5') below the top of the existing ground and be reinforced to withstand flooding up to one-foot (1') above the**

**finished grade; 3) No disturbances allowed within the regulatory flood way, existing stream banks, wet stream, or riparian way; seconded by Joe Pitti.**

**Vote on the full motion including the additional amended conditions.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**3. Public Hearing – Design/Development Review: Terry & Michelle Kruschke request a Design/Development review of a Casita at 108 Canyon Cove, located in the Foothill Residential zone:** Ms. Frankenberg indicated this was a high visual impact lot. The proposal added an attached casita and area behind the house. The application included attaching the main house to the garage, and the garage to the casita. This would increase the total size of the residence to 4,801 square feet including all covered functional areas.

The plan included a limited amount of down-directed, shielded lighting fixtures located only in functional areas. Colors and materials would match the existing house.

**Commission Questions to staff:** Mr. Pitti asked for clarifications how the garage was attached to the house.

- Ms. Frankenberg said it was attached by a trellis-type attachment. The pool also had a shade structure covering the area.

**Public questions to staff:** None were asked.

**Summary presentation of proposal by the applicant:** Terry Kruschke was in attendance to answer questions. He had no additional information to present.

**Commission questions to applicant:** None were asked.

**Public questions to applicant:** None were asked.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to open public hearing; seconded by Tyler Young.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comments:** No public comments were made.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to close public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission deliberation:** Ms. Elger said it was straightforward and the applicant had done a nice job meeting the requirements. The height was well below the maximum allowable for a high visual impact lot. Mr. Young agreed.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the Design/Development Review for Canyon Springs lot 20 casita. The Commission finds the application complies with the chapters and codes of Chapter 10-9A Foothill Residential Zone, and Chapter 10-15 Design/Development Review. The**

**Commission also finds that the lot area, setbacks, building size, building height including the high visual impact lot portion of it, and the lighting, landscaping, and colors and materials are all in compliance; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**4. Public Hearing – Design/Development Review: Stan Smith requests a Design/Development Review for a seven-car garage on parcel S-12-E, located in the Central Commercial zone:** This parcel was approximately 7.7 acres and currently there was a single-family home under construction on this property. Four other residential homes surrounded the property and would benefit from the proposed garage. The building was intended for residential use. Ms. Frankenberg indicated the building would be 3,150 square feet and twenty-feet (20') at its highest point. The applicant indicated there would not be any external lights. Color and materials would match the existing Bumbleberry Inn.

**Commission Questions to staff:** Mr. Pitti noted there were eight (8) garage doors.

- Ms. Frankenberg indicated the original plan had eight (8) but it had been reduced to seven (7).

Mr. Young asked how the garage would benefit the four other homes.

- Ms. Frankenberg said all the property off Bumbleberry Lane was owned by the applicant. Therefore, the garage would benefit all the residents.

**Public questions to staff:** None were asked.

**Summary presentation of proposal by the applicant:** Stan Smith was in attendance to answer questions. In total he owned fifteen (15) acres; the front five (5) contained the business and the back ten (10) contained the residences. Mr. Smith indicated the garage would house tractors, lawn mowers and cars used by the family and the business; currently they were stored outside. He indicated the purpose of the side door was to provide garage access from both sides.

The garage design was cut-in on the ends to provide easier access and make the lines of the structure more interesting. Mr. Smith reiterated no outdoor lighting was planned.

**Commission questions to applicant:** Mr. Young asked about the setbacks.

- Mr. Smith said they were in excess of ten-feet (10').

With the reduction of one door, Ms. Elger asked if the size was changing.

- Mr. Smith answered the size was reduced to eighty-two (82') feet. The coloring would be like Bumbleberry with stucco and asphalt shingles.

**Public questions to applicant:** None were asked.

**Motion made by Tyler Young to open public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comments:** None were asked.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to close public hearing; seconded by Tyler Young.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission deliberation:** Ms. Elger raised concern that the information presented verbally about the project was significantly different from that reflected in the legal record. She indicated drawing should be resubmitted to better reflect the design intention.

Mr. Pitti had no issues with the garage, use or location. However, he did have concern what was being presented differed from what would be built. Mr. Pitti referenced code sections 10-16-4 and 10-11A-14 related to design standards indicating building mass should be broken up using good architectural elements. He suggested the design could be improved with the addition of bigger overhangs to create shadow lines, or small dormers. Mr. Staker agreed design improvements could be made.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to table the Design/Development Review for S-12-E Bumbleberry Lane garage. The Commission would like to see a resubmitted plan with accurate representation of what the design elements might be as discussed this evening by the applicant in the introduction of the designs, as well as some ways to break up the mass of the building and add some shadow lines as it relates to the design standards in 10-11A-14 and 10-16-4; seconded by Suzanne Elger.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**5. Public Hearing – Ordinance Revision: Changes to multiple sections of Title 10 of the Springdale Town Code removing a variety of development incentives, and repealing Chapter 10-15E: Parking Structure Overlay Zone:**

The Commission had worked on this item during previous meetings. Essentially it removed development incentives as a means to encourage developers to provide an amenity. However, incentives were found to be problematic, inefficient and not necessarily accomplishing goals as originally intended.

In summary, the ordinance removed density bonuses for developers providing employee/affordable housing; removed allowances for larger building sizes in commercial zones; removed allowances for reduced set backs in the commercial zones under certain circumstances; removed height increases in central commercial for employee/affordable housing or underground parking; removed height increases in the VC zone based on building elevation with respect to the elevation of SR-9, removed landscape reductions in CC for developers who provided public parking; removed density increases available in the planned development overlay zone; removed the parking structure overlay zone in its entirety.

**Commission Questions to staff:** Mr. Young asked if Town Council was legally compelled to put Commission ordinance recommendations on their agenda or if they could be ignored.

- Mr. Dansie said in practice the Council always looked at land use recommendations coming from the Commission. He could not recall a circumstance in the past when the Council did not consider a recommendation. Staff would further research the question.

**Public questions to staff:** Hans Dunzinger asked if any employee housing had been built on-site by a business within the last decade.

- Mr. Dansie said Cable Mountain Lodge, Zion Canyon Lodge, and the Best Western. Many developers purchased or developed off-site employee housing in Town.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to open public hearing; seconded by Tyler Young.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comments:** Hans Dunzinger believed incentives for on-premise employee housing was good and brought more residents to the Town. Mr. Dunzinger did acknowledge it was tricky to have employees living on the same property where they worked and interacted with guests. If the incentive was gone the motivation to develop this housing would be taken away.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to close public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission deliberation:** Mr. Pitti said the Commission looked hard at the pluses and minuses related to incentives but there was consensus there was more of a negative impact than positive. Recalling their discussions, if the Town wanted to allow development to be a certain height and size, then ordinances should be written that way.

Mr. Pitti said more businesses are purchasing housing facilities in Town for employees. Generally, Mr. Pitti said incentivizing was counter-intuitive to what the Town wanted. He liked the ordinance changes.

Mr. Young did not like the broad-handed approach to an across-the-board elimination of incentives. He liked incentivizing development of public restrooms and employee/affordable housing. He was disappointed other business owners were not in attendance to comment.

Ms. Elger said many of the incentives were building-scale related which the Commission seemed to agree should be removed. In order to consider new concepts, it was important to discuss what had not worked. There would certainly be more discussion related to affordable housing and housing diversity.

Mr. Staker felt affordable housing was a big enough issue it should be tackled on its own. Additionally, if the Town wanted to encourage sandstone then it should be a design standard. Incentives were not working or accomplishing what the Town wanted.

Mr. Young expressed it was lazy policy to simply cut and not come up with new ideas.

- Mr. Pitti did not feel it was a lazy approach. The conversation was about the effectiveness of incentives related to building size, which were not working. Removing incentives for employee housing did not mean it was not important; this issue would still be addressed. Mr. Pitti said public restrooms were problematic.

Ms. Elger reiterated this was not the end of the discussion and issues would be discussed outside incentivizing them.

Mr. Staker recognized Mr. Dunzinger's observations and acknowledged employee housing was a two-edged sword. He did not see how incentivizing employee housing was a huge success to date.

- Employers knew housing was an issue and tried to solve the problem on their own.

**Motion made by Joe Pitti that the Planning Commission recommend the ordinance revisions: Changes to multiple sections of Title 10 of the Springdale Town Code removing a variety of development incentives, and repealing Chapter 10-15E: Parking Structure Overlay Zone; seconded by Suzanne Elger.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: No**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed.**

**Consent Agenda:**

**Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the minutes dated May 15<sup>th</sup> and June 5<sup>th</sup>; seconded by Tyler Young.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion to adjourn at 6:41pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Suzanne Elger**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Young: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Carlson, Town 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](mailto: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 Date 6/19/19

STAN SMITH  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)

HANS DUNZINGER  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)