



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15 2018, AT 5:00PM
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

Meeting convened at 5:00PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Joe Pitti, Allan Staker, Ethan Newman, Suzanne Elger, Jack Burns, and Mike Marriott

EXCUSED: Cindy Purcell

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the agenda; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Carlson announced the “Movies in the Park” series would feature the first film on Friday, August 17th in the ballfield starting at dark.

Mr. Dansie announced the Town would hold an Open House on September 12th starting at 6:00pm in the Canyon Community Center to take feedback from the community on the paid on-street parking program.

Action Items

1. Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision: Addition of section 10-22-16 to the Town Code prohibiting the long-term placement of storage containers on property in the Town: Mr. Dansie said the Town Council directed the Planning Commission to review standards for storage containers. After several work meeting discussions, rather than develop design standards the Commission determined the most effective option was to prohibit. Storage containers would be allowed under a temporary use permit for use during development.

Public comment expressed a strong desire for existing containers to remain as legal non-complying. Mr. Dansie indicated this was inherit with any land use regulation unless there was an amortization process added, which was not contemplated for this ordinance revision. Therefore, existing containers would be automatic grandfathered.

If a change was made to an existing container, Mr. Pitti asked if it would need to come into compliance.

- Mr. Dansie answered they would lose the legal non-complying status and the container would have to be removed.

Commission questions to staff: None were asked.

Public questions to staff: Tyler Young asked what issues prompted the Town’s concern with storage containers.

- Since containers were easy to bring onto property it was difficult for the Town to monitor and ensure compliance with standards. Although storage containers were economical they were not

compatible with village atmosphere as promoted in the General Plan. Adding design standards might mitigate impacts, however financial efficiencies were lost given the extent of the requirements.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to open public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Based on Mr. Dansie's explanation Tyler Young understood existing containers would be grandfathered. He commented there was value in containers being used by businesses and also asked the Commission to continue to allow storage in sheds or structures without permanent foundation.

Tyler Topham felt containers did not need to be so regulated if out-of-sight. Storage containers were a great option for affordable housing and this was being taken away. Mr. Topham did not feel a blanket prohibition was the way to pursue this issue.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to close public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott:

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Marriott felt the negative aspects outweighed the need. Requiring adjustments no longer made them cost-effective.

Mr. Pitti said the Commission had done a lot of research and design standards for storage containers were incongruent with other design standards in Town. As drafted, the ordinance provided protection for those who already had a container.

Ms. Elger said the Commission spent time considering containers for habitation but, from a structural standpoint, the architectural integrity was compromised.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to recommend the ordinance revision with the addition of section 10-22-16 of the Town Code prohibiting the long-term placement of storage containers on property in the Town. With a key finding that these containers are inherently incompatible with the architectural standards and design guidelines found in Chapter 10-16 of Town Code; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision: Changes to section 10-23-10 of the Town Code revising the development standards for public parking lots and placing a cap on the total number of off-street public parking spaces that can be developed in the Town: Mr. Marriott declared a potential conflict of interest due to his parking lot development application. After consideration however, Mr. Marriott felt recusing himself could also be perceived as a conflict and indicated he could vote on the agenda item.

- Mr. Pitti encouraged him to reconsider. If there was a potential benefit from an ordinance it was in the best interest of the Commission, and for the optics of the community, for Mr. Marriott to recuse himself.

Mr. Dansie explained conflict of interest was when a decision maker could directly benefit from an item under consideration. It wasn't the intention of the vote; simply participating in deliberation on an item with potential financial impact was the conflict.

- Mr. Burns and Ms. Elger agreed. They felt Mr. Marriott should recuse himself.
- Mr. Marriott said the decision only impacted him if voted to ban or uphold a cap. If he did not uphold the ban he did not see a conflict.
- Regardless of the direction of his vote, Mr. Newman felt Mr. Marriott had influence and therefore a conflict.
- Mr. Pitti felt recusal would actually protect Mr. Marriott.

After considering the input of the Commissioners, Mr. Marriott withdrew.

Mr. Dansie continued that as parking evolved, more off-street parking areas had developed. While these provided a service there was concern a proliferation did not promote village atmosphere. This proposed ordinance added and clarified standards, in addition to placing a cap on the total number of off-street public parking spaces. The proposed cap, which was open for discussion, was 550. Currently there were approximately 450 off-street public parking spaces.

Commission questions to staff: Mr. Staker asked how many parking spaces the Town controlled.

- Mr. Dansie answered there were also about 450 spaces.

Mr. Pitti asked if all the spaces available were being used.

- Mr. Dansie said parking capacity was exceeded during peak weekends. On a typical summer day, neither on-street parking or off-street parking was maximized.

Mr. Staker asked where the cap of 550 originated.

- Mr. Dansie said this recognized the current 450 spaces with an allowance for some development and growth, but could be adjusted. As drafted in the ordinance, the cap was required to be revisited every five years or sooner.

Mr. Staker asked if there were any other industries in Town that were limited by number and why a cap was being considered for this service.

- Mr. Dansie said currently there were not any limits on an industry. If left uncontrolled, parking would have an impact on village atmosphere. It could limit available land for other commercial uses, impact aesthetics, and impact environmental aspects such as heat islands and storm water run-off.

Public questions to staff: Tyler Young asked Mr. Dansie to define heat island.

- Mr. Dansie indicated a heat island was a large asphalt area that soaked up solar radiation. The stored heat then radiated out and increased the local ambient temperature.

Once developed, Mr. Young asked if the parking lot could be converted to another use.

- Mr. Dansie said a commercial piece of property could always change to another permitted commercial use.

Mr. Young asked if the Commission had legislative authority.

- For ordinance revisions, Mr. Dansie indicated the Planning Commission was a recommending body to the legislative authority which was the Town Council.

Diana Dokos thanked the Commission for efforts preserving the village atmosphere as this was a community concern. She asked how a parking cap could potentially affect future development of affordable housing and the need for parking for that use.

- Mr. Dansie said the cap was for off-street public parking only.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to open public hearing; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Tyler Young commented Springdale needed to be more than a parking lot for the National Park. He suggested the Town work with the Park to ascertain their plans for more parking. In an effort to preserve the village atmosphere, Mr. Young cautioned about becoming too urbanized by increasing asphalt areas and creating a negative environmental effect. He suggested parking lots be constructed with surfaces that reflected light away. Mr. Young felt a cap on public parking was reasonable.

Compared to last year, Luke Wilson felt the organization of parking in Town was good. He noted the demand for parking on weekends was greater than the week. His parking lot often had occupancy and he saw the same at other lots in Town.

Brant Warner recalled the Town wanted to observe on-street and off-street parking to assess capacity and profitability. This 'wait and see' approach would avoid a proliferation of parking lots before finding out they were not needed.

Tyler Topham said if the public's ability to have parking lots was limited then so should the Town's. Any limits should be equal.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to close public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker:

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Pitti appreciated public comments; they helped Commissioners move the discussion forward. In addition to environmental impacts, the Commission was concerned with a proliferation of off-street parking lots that might not be occupied most of the time. Mr. Pitti expressed interest in revisiting the cap given comments about capacity.

As new parking lots came on line, Mr. Burns felt it important to see how things played out. He expressed concern over the lack of analysis regarding the need, size, location, impact to congestion, or over-burdening effect on shuttles before a piece of land was developed into a parking lot. Mr. Burns said it was important to recognize the planning effort the Park was undergoing and that the Visitor Use Management Plan capacity number would not increase visitation. He acknowledged residents concern about the impact to village character and recommended parking be capped at current levels until the Park revealed its plan.

Ms. Elger agreed driving through Town was better because the parking in place was tidy and worked. She felt there was enough parking since lots were empty on a daily basis. Ms. Elger noted the Town got little from parking lot businesses. Heat and storm water run-off were also concerning and she supported a cap at the current levels.

Mr. Newman agreed the Park proposal could greatly affect parking needs and should be taken under consideration. Parking lots added an important service but it appeared the need was generally met except for four weekends a year.

Mr. Staker felt on-street parking was a much bigger influence on the village atmosphere than off-street parking. He was a firm believer in property rights and the free market system, therefore if a property was zoned for a particular use, owners had the right to develop it accordingly. Lots would cease to develop when prices declined. Mr. Staker had a problem with the Town controlling 450 spaces yet limited others. This was a huge red flag. He noted the Town required paved lots and restrooms but didn't require this of themselves. Regarding the Park, he wanted an indication of what they intended to do since it would influence action of the Town.

Mr. Burns stated the Park was clear they could not park or shuttle their way out of the situation. There was no intention to add more parking at present and this had been relayed at numerous public events. The Park intended to establish a daily capacity. Referencing the strip mall-type commercial development in other gateway cities such as Jackson Hole and Estes Park, Mr. Burns felt this wasn't a property rights issue but a good planning issue.

Mr. Staker felt it would be good to have parking next to a shuttle stop.

- Mr. Pitti said over-burdening shuttle stops was problematic. The Commission shouldn't establish a plan to solve the Park's problem put rather one that was Springdale-centric.

Mr. Dansie suggested he conduct a more detailed analysis of off-street parking spaces to determine a more precise number.

Motion made by Joe Pitti that the Planning Commission recommends changes to section 10-23-10 of the Town Code revising the development standards for public parking lots and placing a cap on the total number of off-street public parking spaces that can be developed in Town. With the findings that the Commission is concerned about the proliferation of parking spaces in Town that we feel the number of spaces already developed in Town meet the demands of the community and that we recommend the cap be based on the existing number of spaces as verified by the DCD; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: No

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed.

3. Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision: Addition of section 10-22-17 to the Town Code regulating the operation of food trucks in the Town: Mr. Dansie explained the Town currently prohibited sales from any mobile or temporary vendor, however the state legislature recently adopted law requiring the Town make provisions for food trucks. This ordinance outlined specific standards how food trucks could operate in Springdale.

Mr. Dansie indicated the Town could not require a written authorization from a property owner for a food truck to operate on their property. Also, the Utah League of Cities and Town recommended the Commission make findings regarding the allowance of only one food truck at a time on a property.

Commission questions to staff: Ms. Elger asked if a food truck could 'property-hop' in order to avoid the ten-hour limit per week.

- Mr. Dansie answered 'yes', but the only additional regulation tied to the ten hour per week time limit was to provide a site plan and access to restrooms.

Mr. Pitti asked about regulation of waste water.

- Mr. Dansie was unsure. This was likely part of licensing with the Health Department.

Public questions to staff: Leslie Smith asked if access to restroom facilities only applied to food trucks located on a property for more than ten hours a week.

- Mr. Dansie said the ordinance only required an agreement if over ten hours.

- Ms. Smith suggested food trucks be required to have a relationship with an adjacent business so staff had restroom and hand-washing facilities available.

Diana Dokos commented food trucks contributed to the village character and provided affordable food options. She asked why food trucks had been prohibited and what would be the ideal for them to contribute.

- Mr. Dansie explained Town Code had a general prohibition on temporary vendors which predated the modern food truck movement. The intent was to have more control over the appearance of the community.

Tyler Young asked if the state's intention was to allow all local vending or was specific to food.

- Mr. Dansie said the state law was specifically tailored to food trucks.

Motion made by Mike Marriott open public hearing; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Luke Wilson asked the Commission to consider the signage on food trucks, since they could be absurd.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to close public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Marriott asked how the restroom rule applied if a food truck was in a vacant lot.

- The Commission suggested the verbiage be revised to indicate a food truck must have arrangements with a neighboring property owner within one-hundred feet (100').

The Commission discussed allowing only one food truck on a property. They determined up to three allowed for vibrancy without the accumulation of garbage, noise and traffic congestion.

Mr. Marriott asked about the sale of secondary merchandise from a food truck.

- The code required retailing be conducted in a closed building.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to recommend the addition of section 10-22-17 to the Town Code regulating the operation of food trucks in the Town. With the following two adjustments: 1) Restrooms must be required within 100 feet of a food truck; 2) The number of food trucks permitted at any one location cannot exceed three; with the finding that this number allows for a certain amount of critical mass while at the same time reducing the impacts and fitting better into the village scale of Springdale; seconded by Joe Pitti.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a brief break. The meeting reconvened at 6:47pm.

4. Public Hearing: Zone Change Request - Luke Wilson requests a zone change from Valley Residential (VR) to Valley Residential-Cottage Housing Development Overlay on parcel S-CCWS-2 (1775 Zion Park Boulevard, located adjacent to Silver Bear) for the purpose of building a 9-unit cottage neighborhood development: In order to grant a zone change, one of three criteria must affirmatively be met. These criteria included: the zone change promoted the goals and objectives of the General Plan; the zone change accommodated a substantial change in conditions; the zone change corrected a manifest error.

Mr. Dansie explained the Cottage Housing Development Overlay zone allowed more, but smaller, units than the Valley Residential zone. Units were restricted in size and height, setbacks could be reduced, and a common area was required. The applicant included a proposed site plan which showed how the property could be developed.

Commission questions for staff: Mr. Pitti questioned the nine units plus a common building.

- Mr. Dansie clarified the overlay zone for this 1-1/2-acre property allowed nine dwelling units and an additional common building.

Ms. Elger asked if the common building was in the flood plain.

- Development was allowed in the flood hazard area but not the floodway as long as the flood hazard area was elevated above base flood elevation.

Mr. Burns asked about the wildlife corridor.

- There was an area identified on the map as being a wildlife corridor/pedestrian access to the river.

Mr. Burns asked about adjacent properties.

- Mr. Dansie indicated: Silver Bear, which was split VC/VR zone, was to the south; the apartment fourplex in the VC zone was to the north; the Town River Park and the Paiute property was across the river; and, the Clark subdivision, which was VR/Planned Development Overlay zone, was across SR-9.

Public questions for staff: Burt Chamberlain said this property adjoined his. He noted the original apartment fourplex proposal included three more fourplex units however the Town stopped that development. He questioned why the Town would now allow nine units in the same area and pointed out aesthetics along the highway were a big complaint with the previous development proposal. Mr. Chamberlain was unhappy how the proposed buildings would be sandwiched on the property considering it wasn't allowed before.

Diana Dokos asked the purpose for cottage housing.

- Mr. Pitti said it was meant to be another housing option for people in Springdale. They could not be used for transient lodging.

Tyler Young asked how much authority the Town had to regulate exterior appearance and feel.

- Mr. Dansie explained the Town had base design guidelines and the overlay zone had additional standards. With a zone change request, the Town retained more discretion.

Mr. Young asked if architectural styles and colors were considered.

- Mr. Pitti indicated the cottage overlay zone ordinance contained various elements and colors that would lend themselves to the village atmosphere.

Mr. Young asked if the General Plan specified a desire for affordable housing. He asked if this development would be more affordable for local residents.

- Mr. Dansie said the General Plan encouraged more affordable options for those who worked and lived in the community. The Town could not specify a certain price point or income qualifications.

Commission questions for applicant: Luke Wilson was in attendance to answer Commission questions.

Mr. Burns asked about the square footage and questioned whether it fit within the definition.

- Mr. Wilson said they were drawn to the maximum size allowed.

Regarding the wildlife corridor, Mr. Burns asked if a conservation easement would be entertained to insure long-term protection. He said access to the river was critical to animals.

- Mr. Wilson said they intended to maintain the wildlife corridor.

Mr. Pitti asked about perimeter fencing and the purpose for the common building.

- Mr. Wilson said the old farm fencing would be taken down. The common building would be used for recreation and gatherings.

Mr. Pitti asked what was intended in the riparian area and about the mature trees.

- Mr. Wilson clarified they did not own all the way to the river but this area would remain open and natural. The large trees would remain.

Ms. Elger asked about the requested fifteen-foot (15') setback.

- Mr. Wilson said a thirty-foot (30') setback might require two less units.

Ms. Elger questioned the common building square footage.

- Mr. Wilson believed the ordinance allowed for an accommodation for storage so the building size could be larger than one-thousand square feet (1000').

Mr. Dansie said the submitted concept plan configuration was subject to change. Through the zone change process, the Commission was granting entitlements.

Mr. Burns questioned how this preserved village character when nine buildings were being built on 1-1/2-acres fifteen feet (15') from the road.

Public questions for applicant: Tyler Young asked the standard price range of these cottages.

- Given the construction quality, Mr. Wilson answered high two-hundreds, low three-hundreds, but could not be held to this price.

Mr. Young asked about amenities for young families.

- Mr. Wilson suggested there could be improvements down by the river, but he was unsure owners would be young families.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to open public comment: seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Tyler Young commented he generally did not support new developments, however he was surprised in a positive way with this concept. The central common area could provide a village feel. He felt a thirty-foot (30') setback was preferable. Mr. Young felt this development might detract and impact the business next door. He said the Commission should approach this development with great caution and ensure it wasn't cheaply built.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to close public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: With this being the first application for the cottage overlay zone, Mr. Pitti wanted the Commission to be careful about precedent and be sure the concept was well-executed.

- Ms. Elger was excited but had concerns. Although protecting the river, the setback was detracting to the road.
- Mr. Staker felt the proposal fit the parameters and was in favor of the concept. He agreed the Commission should proceed cautiously.

Mr. Burns stated he could not support the project density or setback. He did not agree with the ordinance or how a cottage was being defined.

Mr. Marriott had concerns with the setback, the size of the units, and how the common area was shared.

The Commission liked the concept of a cottage neighborhood in this area but wanted the applicant to consider adjustments as discussed.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to table the zone change request for Valley Residential (VR) to Valley Residential-Cottage Housing Development Overlay on parcel S-CCWS-2, 1775 Zion Park Boulevard, for the purpose of building a 9-unit cottage neighborhood development to allow the applicant to re-submit a concept plan that addresses the findings of the Planning Commission over concerns with the 30' setback, better delineation of common space and ensure the project meets the design standards as outlined in the cottage overlay zone; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

5. Public Hearing: Design/Development Review - Jon Michael Marriott, representing Zion Park Land, requests a DDR for a 112-space public parking area on parcel S-ZPH-3 (located adjacent to the Hampton Inn): Mr. Marriott was the applicant; therefore, Ethan Newman was the voting Commissioner for this agenda item. The Planning Commission would act as the final approval authority and would determine if the project met standards in Town Code and the Zion Park Resort Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Dansie recommended the Commission review the lot coverage for the entire piece of property, preservation of open space along SR-9, and asphalt parking lot standards.

There was quite a bit of public comment submitted. Many of the concerns raised had to do with traffic congestion and impact.

Commission questions for staff: Mr. Burns asked about the relationship between a cap for off-street parking and this application.

- Mr. Dansie was not prepared to answer.

Mr. Burns asked if this agenda item could be tabled until a final decision was made concerning an off-street parking cap.

- There was a timeline to act, however the Commission could continue to explore how the ordinance interacted with this application.

Mr. Staker said the application had been filed and the proposed ordinance not enacted.

- Mr. Dansie agreed that the timing of the application and the Town's action was important to consider. Generally, an application vested with the ordinance in place when it was submitted, however there were some limitations. There was nothing in the settlement agreement that gave explicit rights to develop a parking lot.

Ms. Elger said the first amendment of the settlement agreement addressed the type of commercial development that could occur.

- Mr. Dansie explained a public parking area was not listed as a use allowed in the settlement agreement. However, under the Village Commercial zone, this property was eligible for a parking area.

Referencing the Zion Park Resort Agreement page 8, Mr. Pitti indicated an updated coverage analysis had not been submitted with the application.

Mr. Pitti asked what triggered a traffic impact study.

- The Transportation Master Plan stipulated a traffic study was triggered when one-hundred (100) peak hour trips went in to or out of a development, or, for a local problem area identified as having congestion and poor circulation. Mr. Dansie indicated a traffic impact study had not been done in this area. 1:20

Public questions for staff: Tyler Young asked why the settlement agreement had to be considered.

- Mr. Dansie said it was a settlement to a lawsuit and it was binding on the town and property owner as to how the land was developed in the future.

Commission questions to applicant: Mr. Pitti asked about updated proposed coverage. Mr. Marriott said this document was being worked on by their attorney. It would show they had lots of coverage available. Permeable surfaces were being explored

Mr. Marriott said permeable surfaces were being explored that could affect coverage.

Mr. Pitti asked about the open space along the front. Mr. Marriott said it ran along the entire project and they tried to be consistent. Settlement agreement to maintain open space component along the road.

Mr. Pitti asked the necessity for 112 spaces. Mr. Marriott said the number of spaces was actually cut down to get islands and get tree coverage. It was critical that it be tied in as much as possible to the existing landscape.

Mr. Pitti asked about road. Mr. Marriott said there was an easement for Canyon Springs and there was a maintenance provision but it was owned by ZPR.

Since the parking lot was not a vested use, and the residential subdivision was, and not enough coverage. This was a situation the Commission was trying to avoid. Mr. Marriott said based on the material choice could affect the coverage.

Ms. Elger said June 5th

On July 3rd had a discussion about parking. Proposed ord discussed at Aug 1st meeting. Packets received July 27th. She asked when the application was received.

Application was received on July 31st. He said the project had been worked on for a long time.

Ms. Elger said he participated in the discussions and meeting without mention of the project.

Mr. Burns asked if he was concerned about impact to the shuttle, rider capacity on one shuttle was 31 and can fit another 12 if jam. 43/bus 4 shuttles ten minutes apart. Mr. Burns said look at cumulative impacts of how developments affect other systems. This needed to be considered.

Public questions to the applicant: Tyler Young asked for clarification of the map and the location of SR-9.

Brant Warner referenced the settlement agreement which noted street would be maintained by He asked if the master agreement had been

Entered into record but was a private affair and not an issue the Town was a party to.

Motion to open public hearing by Suzanne Elger; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye
Newman: Aye
Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Burns: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Luke Wilson said

Brant Warner said Canyon Springs was a deeded and impact was already overburdening. Road was torn up for the box drain and impact of heavy equipment. There should be a community association and there was a conflict between the old agreement and the new agreement. Square footage analysis or traffic impact study had not been done. He felt the proposal overburdened the property. If approved, parcel 3 would The original settlement agreement contained approved uses and a parking lot was not one of them. He felt it was out of character for the Town of Springdale.

Motion to close public hearing by Suzanne Elger; seconded by Ethan Newman.

Staker: Aye
Newman: Aye
Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Burns: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Pitti did not have confidence in understanding the settlement agreement. He felt the applicant was allowed to have a parking lot. His concern was coverage. He wanted to table to get more information and have a better understanding.

Mr. Burns understood the importance of property rights. But part of their responsibility was to look at how it benefited the community as a whole.

Felt it was important for PC to hear back from TC and should be part of the larger discussion.

Ms. Elger noted the need for coverage before moving forward.

Mr. Staker felt specific numbers in general there was plenty of coverage left but specific

Mr. Newman, if decide, should have precise numbers to make decision. Their job as Commissioners went beyond being property rights and looking at the bigger picture.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to table the discussion of the Design/Development Review for the 112-space public parking area on parcel S-ZPH-3, located adjacent to the Hampton Inn, until we receive the coverage analysis that is required when a development application is submitted as required by section 4e of the settlement agreement and also section 15d of the settlement agreement. Once the calculation is received we can evaluate the project as a whole; seconded by

Jack Burns.
Staker: Aye
Newman: Aye
Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Burns: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Marriott was excused from the meeting.

6. Sign Permit: 2501 Zion Park Boulevard, Rosita's Santa Fe Kitchen – Leslie Smith: Mr. Dansie said the applicant submitted and issues were resolved.

One building mounted sign and free-standing sign. Commissioners felt the sign met all the requirements

Motion made by Joe Pitti approve the sign permit for 2501 Zion Park Boulevard for Rosita's Santa Fe Kitchen. The Commission finds the free-standing sign meets the provisions of the ordinance related to height, area, and colors are in compliance. The building mounted sign also met and this motion reflects the material updated material brought to us at the meeting; 1); seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

7. Excavation Permit: 358 Zion Park Boulevard (the parking area located at Balanced Rock Road and SR-9) – Luke Wilson: Mr. Dansie said there was little grading but more an installation of a storm drain. The intent was to mitigate an issue highlighted during recent storms. There would be disturbance on a slope grader than a 30% slope. The Commission needed to determine if allowable or if applicant needed to submit a variance request.

Mr. Wilson said the erosion had increased with recent storms. He wanted to install a culvert to handle the water from above. It was necessary for the project to access the slope.

Mr. Dansie explained the 30% slope regulation. Visual aspect and slope stability were the focus of the ordinance.

Mr. Wilson explained he would be cleaning the channel, adding the pipe and covering it up.

Ms. Elger questioned the history and precedence.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the excavation permit for 358 Zion Park Boulevard the motion is based on findings the PC determined the work could be classified as a natural disturbance and repairing of the ravine will improve flow onto the applicants property and SR-9 and solve an issue that could be potentially dangerous. Condition revegetate the are 10-15B of the towncode and the applicante will make repairs to the ravine without the equipment encroaching onto the face of the slope; seconded by Ethan Newman.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

If can't be done then applicant will need to come back.

8. Excavation Permit: 1775 Zion Park Boulevard (area adjacent to Silver Bear) – Luke Wilson: Mr. Dansie said this was on the property considered
Put fill in back area. Minor amount of grading. Required a flood plain development permit was required. Fill was not allowed in the flood way. In anticipation for future development, create a benchmark so future building height could be monitored in the future.

Mr. Pitti asked how the Town could follow through. Mr. Dansie had an enforcement office to monitor construction project routinely.

Mr. Pitti asked if still relevant. Mr. Wilson said the lot was a mess and wanted to clean up in anticipation of development. It was helpful for him to have the ability to park fill from other projects he had.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the excavation permit for 1775 Zion Park Boulevard. The commission determined meets 10-15B and section 10-15B9 and 10-13 with condition no fill allowed in floodway and submit a permit as designated as the cross-hatch and establish a benchmark which may be measured by height compliance; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Consent agenda:

Mr. Pitti proposed a clarification to the August 1st minutes. Under the long-range parking policies agenda item he Range parking policies. Did not accurately reflect.

Disclosed and he will not be participating in the discussion as it relates to this item.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to approve the consent agenda and minutes from July 18th and correction to the August 1st with the change and dismissing himself from the discussion; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn at 9:28pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Newman: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.



Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____



DATE: _____

9.18.18

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 for more information.



TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Date 8/15/18

Tyler Topham
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Leslie Smith
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

But L. Chamberlain
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Diana H. Dorcas
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Tyler Young
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Luke Wilson
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Don Elger
Name (please print)

Name (please print)