



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING  
ON WEDNESDAY JULY 3, 2019 AT 5:00PM  
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

**Meeting convened at 5:00 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Mike Marriott, Suzanne Elger, Allan Staker, Joe Pitti, Jack Burns, Tyler Young, and J. Treacy Stone Representing 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 the Agenda: Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the agenda; seconded by Suzanne Elger.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Dansie announced the Independence Day festivities on July 4<sup>th</sup>, starting with the Annual Lion's Club Pancake Breakfast at 7:30 AM on the Springdale Elementary lawn. The parade would then begin at 9:00 AM.

Ms. Brown announced that "Meet the Candidates Night – Primary Election Edition" would take place on Tuesday July 9<sup>th</sup> from 7-8:30 PM. The Candidates would have a chance to introduce their platforms and answer questions from the public. The event would be held at the Canyon Community Center and light refreshments would be served.

**A. Information/Discussion/Non-Action Items**

**1. Twenty-minute open Commission discussion:** Mr. Pitti asked if the parking program was due for a review since its implementation.

- Mr. Dansie said that the Parking Committee had hosted a Community feedback session in 2018 following the first full season of the parking program. The feedback from that meeting was instrumental in implementing changes to the parking program such as a revised rate structure and meter enforcement ending at 5:00 pm rather than 6:00 pm. It was the Town Council's intent to continually review the program and makes changes as necessary

Mr. Marriott asked if the paid parking located at the Subway restaurant was permitted.

- During a time period when the Subway restaurant was closed, the business owner received the proper permit and license to use their excess parking spots as paid parking. When the Subway restaurant opened again, the business owner would need to adhere to the ordinance in regard to how many parking spots would be required for Subway patrons and employees, essentially limiting the number of paid parking spots they could offer. Town staff had spent a considerable amount of time working with the business owner to help clarify regulations and bring them into compliance.

Mr. Pitti asked about the status of the light screening devices for the SR-9 street lights.

- The first batch of twenty lights was in production and would hopefully be delivered soon.

Mr. Marriott asked if there would be a public hearing for the proposed Noise Ordinance the Town Council had been working on .

- Since the Noise Ordinance was not a Land Use ordinance, a public hearing was not required. Accordingly, there was not a formal public hearing scheduled but the Council could choose to accept comments from the Community regarding the proposed Noise Ordinance in their next meeting.

Mr. Pitti reported that there was running water on Winderland Lane and asked if that had been addressed.

- Public Works had been informed and determined that a swimming pool had been drained and the water had run onto Winderland Lane. Residents had been asked to refrain from draining pools into the sewer system.

Ms. Elger said that a resident had recently received a letter from the Town suggesting that their property was eligible for re-zoning to the Cottage Housing Overlay zone. She asked if Town Staff had composed the letter.

- Mr. Dansie said he had heard of another occurrence of the letter and attested that Town Staff had not composed or sent any letters to property owners claiming eligibility for a zone change. He was unsure of the author of such a letter.

**2. Outdoor Lighting Regulation revisions:** The Commission had discussed revisions to the ordinance governing outdoor lighting in the last work meeting. In the latest revision, staff had included the portions that had received positive feedback from the Commission, such as full cut-off fixtures, a color standard, and a total lumen allowance. The Commission was generally not in favor of any regulations on string lighting and staff had therefore taken that language out of the draft.

The Commission first discussed the definition of a “full cut-off fixture.” Staff had added language that would require the lens to be recessed two inches into the fixture to reduce glare. This would discourage flush mount light fixtures (the lens being flush with the edge of the fixture) which created an abundance of glare.

Mr. Marriott asked what the rationale was for light to be recessed two inches into the fixture. He didn't want to create an impossible task for a property owner to find the kind of fixture that would be allowed by the ordinance.

- Interestingly, Staff had set out to find fixtures with bulbs that were recessed five or six inches into the fixture but found that available stock with those specifications was extremely limited. Staff settled on two inches due to the broader availability of fixtures that would meet that requirement.

Mr. Staker reiterated a previous idea that a requirement for recessed lighting was overkill if the fixture height fell below eye level, e.g. lights illuminating a walkway. He also asked if there was a list of suppliers that the Town could provide to assist people in finding approved light fixtures.

- Staff struck language that dealt with light cutoff considerations for fixtures less than 18” because it had caused a great deal of confusion in the past. The Commission was free to suggest adding that language back in. Staff would also be happy to compile a list of suppliers with approved lighting options.

Mr. Pitti said the ordinance wasn't going to be a one-size-fits all solution but he generally agreed with the overall philosophy. If the Commission was concerned about light affecting the night sky, then looking at total lumen output was an obvious way to evaluate impacts from light spill and output.

Mr. Burns felt that the ordinance was a great start. If no standard was set then the impacts they were observing would only continue.

Mr. Young arrived at 5:28 PM

In regard to light curfews, Mr. Pitti asked if hotels would be required to shut down their exterior light at night even, if they were open 24 hours.

- Exceptions to the curfew were sign illumination, walkway lighting, and lighting to illuminate entrances to the establishment.

Mr. Stone suggested specifically addressing vending machines and felt they presented a considerable lighting impact. He also felt the exemption for holiday lighting had the potential to create huge impacts that would be in direct conflict with the rest of the ordinance.

- Mr. Pitti noted that there were actually cash prizes for the biggest and best holiday light displays. Springdale residents seemed to value the opportunity to display holiday lighting and décor with little restrictions for a temporary time period.

Mr. Burns asked about the language stating that spotlights on motion sensors shall be directed at a 45-degree angle or less. He asked who would monitor and enforce that standard.

- Enforcement for such a minimal issue was unlikely. Mr. Dansie supported the Commission if they wanted to strike the standard.

Mr. Marriott asked about architectural lighting and why it was removed from the draft.

- Mr. Dansie said there were other portions of the code covering architectural and sign illumination. For consistency, staff struck illumination of water features to be in-keeping with the prohibition on illuminating other landscaping such as rocks or tress. The Commission was free to leave the language in if they chose.

Mr. Burns asked about how the draft addressed the illumination of flags.

- The draft included a curfew exemption for the Flag code. Although it was not officially a law or statute, the Flag code was a recognized code to show respect for the United States flag. The Town did not want to create an ordinance that would prevent residents from complying with the Flag code which stated that the National Flag should be illuminated in the dark.

Ms. Frankenburg informed the Commission about specialty light fixtures available for flag poles. They were made to mount at the top of the pole and provide down-directed light.

Mr. Dansie conceded that the lighting curfew and the flag code were at odds with each other. Oftentimes in planning discussions the Commission would have to choose between competing interests. Ultimately, he cautioned against passing an ordinance that would limit showing respect to the flag as condoned in the Flag code.

Mr. Pitti agreed with Mr. Burns but understood the competing interests. He was interested in discussing top-mounted flag pole lighting options further.

Ms. Elger asked how staff determined 30,000 lumens/acre as the allowance.

- Mr. Dansie reported that staff had consulted what was considered the “gold standard” in Night Sky ordinances by researching how Flagstaff, AZ had addressed the issue. Staff had arrived at the 30,000 lumens/acre allowance from some of the guidance in those ordinances. Lumen counts were relatively easy to obtain by checking manufacturing specifications for lumens per bulb and multiplying that by the total number of fixtures. Flagstaff had divided their community into zones with commercial zones getting a higher lumen/acre allowance and more rural areas having a lower allowance of lumens/acre. He noted that sign illumination would not be included in the lumen count. Additionally, for lighting that was shielded by 10 feet or more of a structural overhang, those lumens would only be counted at 25% of their total lumen output. This incentivized the owner to include shielded lighting into their design.

Mr. Young asked if existing properties would be subject to the new ordinance.

- Mr. Dansie felt it would be next to impossible to bring existing exterior lighting into compliance. If approved, the new outdoor lighting ordinance would apply to new developments only.
- Mr. Stone suggested also applying the ordinance to cases where the property owner was renovating or rebuilding more than 50% of their property. The Commission liked the idea.

Mr. Marriott thought it would be beneficial to have a reference by way of modeling or real-life examples to help the Commission conceptualize how much 30,000 lumens would be.

- On average, most single bulb fixtures were 1,000 lumens. It was easy then to imagine 30 sconces, canned lighting fixtures, etc., equaling 30,000 lumens. Parking lot lights on the other hand were an average of 3,000 lumens per light. With a 30,000 allowance, 10 parking lot lights would be allowed. Many existing commercial properties were likely well over 30,000, but the intent of the ordinance was not to further regulate existing lighting. Instead, it would pull back the current standards and apply to new developments only.

Mr. Pitti felt that the amortization period to bring Town properties into compliance had yielded a positive effect on overall lighting issues in Springdale.

Mr. Young suggested honoring compliant businesses with an award that they could display proudly to their patrons.

Mr. Dansie said the 30,000-lumen allowance was a starting point for discussion only. Staff was happy to provide further analysis and modeling on different types of lighting fixtures and the lumen output they would produce.

Mr. Marriott asked why pathway lighting had been stricken from the draft.

- Mr. Dansie reiterated that in the past the standard had proven to be more confusing than what was intended. There had been misunderstandings surrounding when and how the exemption could be claimed. Staff would leave the language in for the Commission's next review.

The Commission directed staff to revise the drafted ordinance in accordance with their discussion for another review before it would move to a public hearing.

**3. Sign and Grading Permit Approval revisions:** The Commission had expressed an interest in providing a more efficient and timely review of sign and grading applications in addition to creating more consistency in Title 10. The revision would allow signage and grading to be reviewed at a staff level. Ms. Frankenburg summarized the changes to the ordinance and asked the Commission to review and discuss.

Mr. Young asked if staff could still refer applications to the Commission as the need arose.

- Staff would refer applications to the Commission as needed.
- Mr. Young asked if an applicant could appeal to the Commission if staff denied their application for any reason.
- If any applicant was ever aggrieved by any action from any land use body, their avenue for relief was to request a hearing with the Town's designated Appeal Authority.

Mr. Pitti suggested adding language that an applicant would be referred to the Planning Commission if the application failed to meet standards.

The Commission agreed to hold a public hearing on the revised ordinance.

**4. Transient Lodging revisions:** After working on this issue for a year, Mr. Dansie posed two main questions for the Commission to answer:

***Had there been a change in conditions related to the amount of lodging development in Springdale that created undesirable impacts?***

- Mr. Burns answered yes. Furthermore, he had heard the same consensus in speaking with residents about lodging impacts.
- Mr. Young answered yes. As an appointed member of the Commission representing the residents in Springdale, he had asked many residents the same questions and the answer was that the Town needed to do something to mitigate the perceived negative impacts that Lodging had on the Community.

- Mr. Pitti answered yes. The amount of lodging development has been disproportionate to residential development in the community.
- Mr. Marriott answered no. He was interested in the nature of the questions and felt they were possibly leading. Lodging allowed people to stay in the evenings and shop at the other types of businesses. Of all the undesirable changes, he was hesitant to place the blame fully on lodging. He liked the good things that lodging provided in town.
- Ms. Elger answered yes. She liked that the Commission was using the term “lodging” to refer to all types of over-night stay facilities. She noted that lodging business ventures were most likely more profitable than non-lodging business types.
- Mr. Staker felt there had been a change in conditions but did not deem the impacts as undesirable. He felt the changes were dramatic but he liked them. He couldn’t see how limiting lodging would stem the tide of people who wanted to visit Springdale.

Mr. Burns said it was a question of balance and ensuring that there wasn’t one particular use that was dominating the Town. The Commission should consider when there was too much of a good thing.

Ms. Elger noted that the Planning Commission was starting to see more challenges to underlying zones in the form of zone change applications.

- Mr. Staker pointed to the composition of the original question about a “significant change in conditions.” He also noted that a “significant change in conditions” was the same language used as criteria for an applicant to make a compelling case for a zone change.
- Mr. Dansie felt it was an excellent point and clarified that the Commission should determine if there had been a significant change in conditions enough to warrant making a change to zoning regulations.

Mr. Burns said that with visitation at 13,000-17,000 people a day he was incredulous that anyone would support building-out Springdale to its maximum potential to accommodate that demand. He understood the argument for inherent property rights but he felt the Commission’s most important task was making recommendations for responsible development.

Mr. Young noted that four out of six members agreed that there had been a change in conditions related to the amount of lodging development in Springdale that had created undesirable impacts. He suggested moving to the second question posed by Mr. Dansie:

***Are changes to the Town’s current land use standards regulating the amount of lodging allowed in the Town necessary to mitigate the undesirable impacts?***

- Mr. Burns answered yes. He didn’t think the current standards were sufficient in regulating uses that could be a detriment to the town and the topic needed the Commission’s attention.
- Mr. Young answered yes. He spoke to the impacts of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
- Mr. Pitti answered yes. He felt the standards for creating boutique hotels was worth another look to help create village character in Town. Part of the undesirable effects created by lodging development was that lodging establishments were not contributing to the Community in ways that would benefit the residents. Hotels could be required to offer an amenity for residents such as including a restaurant, retail space, or employee housing. He felt the Commission could spend some more time on the land use standards with those concepts in mind.
- Mr. Marriott felt the money generated from lodging developments had positively impacted the residents and used the new water treatment plant as an example. He didn’t feel that the case was strong enough to blame lodging for negative impacts to the community.
- Ms. Elger mentioned a recent purchase of the 20-acre parcel of land adjacent to Town Hall. The new land owner was proposing a 100-unit development. If the Commission had passed a unit cap and few months ago, they could have discouraged that type of large scale-development.
- Mr. Staker didn’t think anyone was actually proposing to accommodate the entire visitation population that come to Springdale in any given day. He maintained that Springdale was no longer a small rural residential community and the Commission needed to face that reality.
- Mr. Burns summarized that Springdale should be a community that would be more than a lodging community.

The Commission had considered both questions and found that the majority of members believed that conditions related to the amount of lodging development in Springdale had created undesirable impacts. The majority of Commissioners also believed that changes to the Town's current land use standards regulating the amount of lodging allowed in the Town were necessary to mitigate the undesirable impacts.

The Commission would continue the discussion in another work meeting.

**Motion to adjourn at 6:48 pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Suzanne Elger.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: 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](mailto:springdale@infowest.com) for more information.**