



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY AUGUST 4, 2021 AT 5:00 PM**

AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.

Meeting convened at 5:00 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Barbara Bruno, Commissioners Ric Rioux, Jack Burns, Kyla Topham, Noel Benson, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park

REMOTE ATTENDANCE: Tom Kenaston

ABESNT: Dawn McComb

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

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Jack Burns to approve the agenda. Seconded by

Ric Rioux.

Topham: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Bruno asked what was happening with the construction at the school.

- Ms. Topham replied that it was likely slated to be a multi-purpose gym and cafeteria area.
- Mr. Dansie clarified that the school was governed by the County and was therefore exempt from Springdale land use standards.

A. Action Items

1. Design / Development Review: Improvements to the Zion Canyon Campground, 479 Zion Park Boulevard - Stew Ferber: After significant flood damage to the lobby and hotel buildings, the property owner was attempting to bring the property back into operation. The current proposal was to remove the two previous lobby buildings which had been damaged beyond repair and replace the structures with camping and RV-related improvements. The Hotel buildings would not be rebuilt for use as hotel lodging. The proposal included campground-related improvements on other portions of the property not related to the flood damage. The Town Council had approved a resolution following the recent flood events that directed the Commission to prioritize any development applications related to flood damage redevelopment. Many public comments had been received, specifically in regard to the site's non-conforming status, and all comments had been forwarded to the Commission for consideration. Staff had consulted with the Town attorney regarding expansion of the non-conforming use of the site who pointed to Town Code 10-21-1(B) which stated that any "non-conforming uses may continue on the property and may be expanded to occupy the entire parcel."

Ms. Bruno noted that the item was not a public hearing. The Council had directed the Commission to act quickly on proposals that involved redevelopment due to the flood. The Commission had read all public

Approved Minutes of the August 4, 2021 Planning Commission Special Meeting

1 |
Page

comment letters and had taken them into consideration, but the Commission was obligated to approve the application if it was found to be in compliance with the underlying zoning regulations and the Development Agreement.

Mr. Benson asked how many campsites were currently on the property.

- Stew Ferber stated there were currently 184 campsites. He was proposing to expand the number of campsites and RV sites to replace hotel rooms that had been destroyed. He planned to reduce the number of campsites that bordered Zion Shadows Circle from 15 to ten. There were 17 RV sites planned for the other side of the property. The campground originally had 205 sites, but the number of sites had been reduced over the years in response to congestion and in deference to the neighbors.

Mr. Benson was hoping for more clarification on what types of electrical uses were allowed for the proposed 'camping cabins' and wondered if AC units were included in the definition.

- The Council had discussed camping cabins and determined that they were only permitted to have "temporary electrical hook-ups, with no plumbing, and are not on permanent foundations," much like a traditional RV site.

Mr. Burns asked if the absence of hotel rooms would restore some viewshed for Zion Shadows residents.

- Mr. Ferber thought the Zion Shadows residents near Zion Park Blvd would experience a major restoration of viewshed.
- Mr. Burns commended Mr. Ferber's willingness to engage and work with his neighbors on Zion Shadows.

Motion made by Jack Burns that the Planning Commission approves the proposed campground improvements at 479 Zion Park Boulevard. This motion is based on the following findings: 1) The campground is a legal non-conforming use as of 1992. 2) Campsites may be placed anywhere on the property as it existed in 1992. 3) Campsites may not be added to property that has been added since 1992. 4) The Development Agreement recognizes parcel S-103-B-1 (previously used for employee housing) as part of the campground property. 5) The Town Council determined rustic cabins not permanently attached to the ground with limited amenities fall under the definition of camping. 6) The application conforms with the requirements of the property as a non-conforming use, Development Agreement, and applicable land use ordinances. 7) The proposed landscape and parking are compliant with Town ordinances based on conditions below. Conditions: 1) Parcel S-105 can be used for parking but not camping. 2) Parcel S-106-A can be used for transient lodging but only under a conditional use permit and is not part of this application. 3) Approval of appropriate camping units (tents, pre-placed RVs, and Rustic Cabins w/o kitchens or bathrooms) is permitted only in appropriate areas as summarized in the staff report chart. 4) Several parking spaces on parcel S-105 do not meet setback requirements and will need to be reconfigured or removed. 5) The detention basin on parcel S-105 will be abandoned and will need to be replaced on the property. This will be done under a different Design / Development Review. 6) The applicant is reminded that lighting on parcel S-105, which will be used for parking, is not allowed per the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit. 7) Trees will be planted along the fence line where new tent sites will be installed. Seconded by Barbara Bruno.

Topham: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

1. Ordinance Revision: Changes to the standards for Home Occupation Permits: In the last work meeting the Commission discussed revisions to the standards for home occupation permits. Staff prepared draft ordinance revisions based on that discussion. One issue that was not included in the proposed language was the definition of 'number of visits' that would be allowed per day to the Home Occupation. The Commission needed to discuss whether that should be defined.

Ms. Bruno felt number of visits could be defined as 'one person coming to the home, one time.' The Commission agreed.

The Commission was in favor of striking 10-22-9-E(6), regarding not generating additional vehicular or pedestrian traffic, and felt that it would ultimately be too difficult to enforce.

Ms. Topham had concerns about restricting Accessory Dwelling Units from obtaining a Home Occupation permit and used an example of an artist studio.

- Mr. Dansie replied that Town Code allowed artist studios as a permitted use in residential zones, so a Home Occupation Permit would not be required for an artist studio.

The Commission was happy with the proposed revisions and directed staff to incorporate the revisions discussed and schedule a public hearing for the item.

2. Ordinance Revision: Changes to the standards for Open Air Display (OAD) Permits: The Town Council had requested that the Commission take a look at potential ordinance revisions for the OAD Permit process. The current code required OADs to be setback one-half the distance further from the setback already required by the zone. That had proven to be problematic due to different setback standards in each zone and also non-conforming properties with differing setbacks. The Council had directed the Commission to discuss a better way to regulate setbacks for OADs.

Ms. Bruno had drafted an alternate version of the ordinance which removed the permit requirement entirely. She had attended a Council meeting where the OAD setback issue had been discussed and the Council had considered a five-foot setback from the sidewalks. In cases where no sidewalk was present, she wondered if a 15 ft. setback from the roadway would be reasonable. She was unsure why there was a provision currently that prohibited an employee from being permanently posted outside with the merchandise and taking payments outside.

- Mr. Dansie provided some history on why the provision was included. In the past, there had been a proposal from a business owner who sought an OAD permit to vend mobile goods on the front of another business owner's property. The provision was added to be consistent with other parts of the code that prohibited temporary vending businesses.

Ms. Bruno invited a few business owners to speak on the matter.

Greg Worthington spoke on his experience with the business owner across the street who had leased business space for an outdoor ebike rental area. He did not believe that the secondary ebike business owner who was leasing outside space from the primary business owner was meeting setbacks. He was also generally displeased with the increase in congestion.

Laura Doty felt that requiring a larger setback for OADs would jam all the retail products toward the building and would be visually more chaotic.

Mr. Burns wondered if setbacks needed to be determined on a case-by-case basis since every property was different.

- Ms. Bruno felt the direction from the Council was to simplify and standardize the setbacks for OADs.
- Mr. Dansie said that the Council had directed the Commission to make the OAD permit process more standardized and less case-by-case. If the Commission wanted the application process to remain a staff-level approval, they would need to set very clear and definite guidelines to aid staff when making determinations on applications.
- Mr. Burns and Ms. Topham wondered if putting the burden on the applicant to prove circulation and proper ingress/egress with a site plan could help staff in their review of applications.

Ms. Doty had witnessed that a prominent center walkway cutting through the OAD area helped disperse pedestrian traffic. OADs were an integral part of the tourist experience and the Town needed to find a way to make it work.

Tina Fairlamb currently used her entire setback as OAD for her art gallery. There was a difference between a sculpture garden and a rack full of ebikes in terms of the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Bruno wondered if the burden of a larger setback should be greater for businesses that relied on outside storage of merchandise, such as rock shops and bike shops. Perhaps more lenience should be given to galleries who used OADs primarily to offer a pedestrian experience rather than storage. She asked if it would be too onerous for the applicant or for staff for the Town to require an applicant to provide a site plan that would depict merchandise placement and foot traffic circulation.

- Mr. Dansie replied that more clearly-defined standards not only made the process easier for an applicant and staff, they were more defensible as well.

Ms. Bruno was inclined to set a standard distance from the road to regulate OADs. She was in favor of a more generous distance when defining setbacks from sidewalk or roads.

- Mr. Dansie suggested perhaps tying distance to display height. For displays closer to a roadway or sidewalk, the setback would be greater. Displays that fell further away from the roadway or sidewalk would require less of a setback.

The Commission considered making bike businesses comply with a greater setback, and any other business types who used outdoor space primarily as storage. They were also not in favor of business owners using the OAD Permit as a mechanism to sublet outdoor space to a secondary business owner.

The Commission asked staff to revise the OAD language to require a one-foot setback from the inside (property side) of the sidewalk. For business who used their OAD Permit primarily for storage, such as rock shops, plant shops, and bike shops, a 10-foot setback would be required if no sidewalk was present. If a sidewalk was present, a five-foot setback would be required for those business types.

Staff would distill the Commission's discussion into revisions that they would have a chance to review in their next work meeting.

3. Ordinance Revision: SR9 Building Design Guidelines: In their last meeting, the Commission had reviewed SR9 Building Design standards within a larger package of ordinance revisions that had been prompted by recent state legislation. They chose to withhold action on the revisions that affected the SR9 Corridor Design standards to allow more time for consideration of the public comment they had received.

Mr. Burns touched on the general comments from the public hearing that some felt parkitecture was too cost-prohibitive and hard to understand. Of all the recommended parkitecture elements that were listed as recommendations in the current ordinance, he felt the most important ones were exposed rafters and covered porches. From his experience, those two elements were architectural design features that served as hallmarks of historic national park structures.

Mr. Rioux suggested compiling some renderings and photographs of buildings that were constructed in the style of what the Commission was looking for.

- Rob McQuay was a key architect who had been consulting on the ordinance revisions and had offered to produce graphics to aid the applicant in their understanding of what type of parkitecture elements the ordinance was calling for.

Mr. Benson felt that of all the recommended parkitecture elements, stone-based columns had the greatest potential of being cost prohibitive. He also felt that the requirement to break a 50-ft roofline with a dormer or other visual element was too long. He felt it should be revised to 40-ft.

Ms. Topham looked at the ordinance through the eyes of her neighbors. She worried about those who were facing renovation on outdated, legacy properties who may face cost-prohibitive circumstances with the new requirements in the ordinance.

- Mr. Burns felt that if the Commission was going to achieve the goals and objectives in the General Plan, then they couldn't make decisions based on what development costs might be in the future because it was an uncertain factor. It would be a hired contractor and architect's job to advise and help mitigate that concern for their clients. He felt the Commission should stay focused on trying to achieve an architectural integrity through development regulations that would be harmonious with the surrounding location.

The Commission wanted to retain the requirement for covered entryways and stone-faced columns.

Staff would revise the draft ordinance accordingly and the ordinance revision would be scheduled for a public hearing.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 7:03 pm made by Jack Burns. Seconded by Ric Rioux.

Topham: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Benson: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Katy Brown

Katy Brown, Attending Clerk

APPROVAL: Barbara Bruns DATE: 8-18-21

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 Date 8/4/21

IN PERSON ATTENDEES:

REMOTE ATTENDEES:
(Clerk will complete)

Stewart Ferber
Name (please print)

Diane Warriner
Name (please print)

Guy [unclear]
Name (please print)

Kelly McKean
Name (please print)

Tina R Fairlamb
Name (please print)

Barb Graves
Name (please print)

Irish Rioux
Name (please print)

Nancy Neithercut
Name (please print)

Laura Doty
Name (please print)

Maria McNeal
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Trans Barney
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Erin Tyler
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Diana Scardilli
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Rick Wixom
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)