



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING  
ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2018, AT 5:00PM  
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

**Meeting convened at 5:01PM**

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

**EXCUSED:** Cindy Purcell

**ABSENT:** Mike Marriott

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

**Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Suzanne Elger to approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Newman: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission discussion and announcements:** The Commission considered future meeting dates to avoid upcoming holidays. The December work and regular meeting would be consolidated into one and held on December 5<sup>th</sup>. The first meeting in November would be determined once conflicts were worked out.

**Discussion/Non-Action Items**

**1. Continued discussion of revisions to transient lodging regulations:** Based on previous meeting discussions, Mr. Dansie drafted proposed language. He provided a brief overview of the changes in the ordinance draft:

- Definitions for short-term rental, hostel and transient lodging unit were added.
- The types of transient lodging facilities allowed in Town were defined. Mr. Dansie commented it would be important for the Commission to develop specific standards and regulations for each.
- Standards to determine the number of transient lodging units by type was defined which could impact density and parking.
- Design standards were added which focused on parkitecture as the preferred, primary theme. These standards would apply to all newly developed or remodeled transient lodging facilities.
- Sign design standards were clarified.
- Options related to the mix of housing and lodging units were considered, including incentives for property owners to develop rental housing units.

Mr. Staker asked if any hostels were being developed in Town.

- Mr. Dansie indicated there were two. He said there was a resurgence of interest in this type of lodging. Currently the Town did not have standards for hostels. Hostel rentals would be 30 days or less.

Sections 10-9A-14 and 10-9B-13 standardized the minimum rental time period for dwellings in the FR and VR zones to not less than ninety days.

Mr. Pitti recommended the word 'Inn' be included with the category Hotel/Motel.

Mr. Staker asked if any changes for a Bed and Breakfast (B&B) were needed if breakfast was no longer served.

- Mr. Pitti indicated at present only one B&B served breakfast, the others provided a voucher.
- Mr. Dansie suggested the current standards and regulations for B&B's be reviewed to represent current operational trends.

The Commission discussed transient lodging unit counts by type. Establishing a transient lodging unit equivalency would help the Town regulate types more evenly and 'level the playing field'.

- Mr. Dansie explained that currently a vacation rental was counted as one unit regardless of the number of bedrooms. Changes in how a unit count was calculated would impact parking requirements.

There were approximately four rental units for every residential unit in Town.

- Mr. Burns questioned if this was the desired ratio to maintain.
- Mr. Dansie commented the current standard did not have to be adopted as the desired future state.

The Commission discussed transient lodging facility design standards and developing a more consistent look that would tie in with the National Park architecture. Height standards relative to distance from SR-9 were considered and would apply to newly constructed or remodeled structures.

- Mr. Dansie noted that much of the existing built heritage would not be allowed given the current zoning ordinances. This was ironic given the fact these buildings tended to give the Town its village character.
- Under this section, Mr. Newman suggested the words 'guest rooms' be changed to 'transient lodging units'.
- Mr. Staker mentioned that parkitecture was specifically suggested in the General Plan.

The Commission discussed the housing/lodging mix. At present there were roughly 1,200 transient lodging units and 300 housing units representing a 4:1 ratio.

- Mr. Staker commented this was not by design, but a result of current conditions. He felt there were sufficient controls in place and did not see a reason to impose limitations.
- Mr. Newman disagreed and felt it was important to protect residential units. The number of rentals in Town were dwindling which made it more difficult for employees to find housing in the area. Mr. Newman said employee housing directly and indirectly benefitted the community so it was important to protect.

If a residential unit went away in the commercial zone, Ms. Elger said there was no incentive to replace it in another zone. She asked how many more units could be developed through settlement agreements.

- Mr. Dansie said 100-200 units could be built on the Palmer property, but was unsure how regulation may affect the timing of a development.

Mr. Burns questioned what a gateway community to a national park should look like. A cap on hotel rooms would put a level of control, even in the commercial zones, of what the make-up of the Town would look like.

Mr. Pitti said the idea was to curb tourists from using space that could be used for residential living. Residents had indicated this was more important than hotel rooms. He understood the financial incentive of short-term rentals, but felt the Commission should try and stay ahead of the curve and develop legislative language to protect residential units.

Mr. Burns asked what was being done to address affordable housing besides the impact of short-term rentals.

- Mr. Dansie said one suggestion was to incentivize developers to build more housing units dedicated to renters and not employees.

- Mr. Staker said the Cottage Housing Development Overlay Zone was one solution to potentially provide long-term rentals, however other Commissioners commented there was no guarantee units would be used in this way.

Mr. Burns felt the Town should be part of the mix. He did not feel the burden of affordable housing should be solely on private property owners.

- Given the cost of property and construction, Mr. Staker said low cost housing was not possible in Springdale. He did not believe in government mandated rent control and felt a property owner should charge what they wanted for rent.
- Mr. Newman said it was not an issue of high rents but an issue of no place to rent.
- Mr. Pitti agreed with the concept of incentivizing developers but did not believe it was the Town's responsibility to provide housing.

It was noted a number of developers had included employee housing on their property because they needed to regardless of the incentives. In order to keep employees, providing housing was often a necessity.

Mr. Dansie acknowledged discussion of housing was important and complex. He recommended the Commission dedicate a future work meeting to the subject. Since this proposed ordinance focused on lodging he would refine the draft based on the Commissioner's discussion. It would be reviewed again in a work meeting.

**2. Discussion of changes to section 10-24 regulating sign standards:** This ordinance would entirely replace what was currently in code. Mr. Dansie explained the catalyst was a Supreme Court ruling regarding content-based regulation. Signs were a form of speech; therefore, they were protected by the Constitution and content could not be regulated. Municipalities could only regulate the time, place and manner in which signs were displayed. A sign could not be regulated differently because of what it said or the message it displayed.

Mr. Newman asked if permanent signs were treated the same as temporary signs.

- Mr. Dansie answered 'no' since the Town could regulate signs based on time.

Mr. Dansie provided an overview of what changed in the ordinance and how it impacted sign regulation throughout Town. Revisions focused on content regulation. The Town attorney generally kept sign ordinance standards intact.

Under prohibited signs, Mr. Pitti wanted to be sure A-frame/sandwich board signs would be listed.

One major change in the commercial zones affected tertiary signs which allowed changeable copy. The ordinance draft allowed only one tertiary sign two square feet in size. This would take away current allowances and impact menu boards, theater marquees or gas station signs.

Any commercial establishment could display a ten square foot temporary sign for three days; however, the successive periods should be better defined.

Banners were allowed only in the Central Commercial or Village Commercial Zones and a permit would be issued by property not by business.

Signs would not be permitted in the public use zone, however there was a blanket exemption for signs installed by the Town of Springdale, Washington County School District, the state of Utah, or Zion National Park.

- Ms. Elger noted the ordinance should be adjusted to include any Washington County government agency.

There were now seven exempted signs based on a physical aspect rather than content.

The substitution clause permitted noncommercial messages to be substituted on any sign.

Mr. Pitti commented much of the changes were driven by law. From his perspective, sign regulations had worked in the community and contributed to village character.

- Commissioners agreed the ordinance was fairly straight forward. A public hearing would be scheduled.

The Planning Commission agreed to discuss the polygon concept of measuring sign area in a future work meeting.

**3. Discussion of changes to section 10-15C pertaining to holiday lighting dates:** This proposed change was requested by the Mayor and would allow holiday lighting to extend a month earlier to accommodate Halloween.

Mr. Pitti felt the Town had worked hard on the lighting ordinance and was not in favor of this change.

- Mr. Burns commented people looked at holiday lighting as mood setting.
- Mr. Staker did not see an issue with festive lighting.
- Ms. Elger questioned how holiday lighting would be managed to avoid it getting out of hand.

The Commission considered specific start and stop times for specific holiday lights.

- Mr. Pitti was reluctant to open the door on this and commented the community at-large had not requested the change. It was an unfair burden to enforcement to add Halloween lights.

Mr. Pitti conducted a straw poll.

- Mr. Staker was in favor of extending.
- Ms. Elger was in favor of leaving it the way it was.
- Mr. Pitti was in favor of leaving it the way it was.
- Mr. Burns said it was a non-issue for him.
- Mr. Newman said it was a non-issue for him.

Given the input it was decided to leave the ordinance as currently written. The proposed change would not be pushed forth to a public hearing.

**Motion to adjourn at 6:56pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Suzanne Elger**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**



Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  DATE: 10.17.18

**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](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 10/3/18

LISA ZUMPTI  
Name (please print)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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