

I would like to offer some feedback on the agenda items below. Thank you for sharing.

Jonathan Zambella
[REDACTED]

2. **Public Hearing - Zone Change:** Request to apply the Transient Lodging Overlay (TLO) to parcel S-14-B-1(approximately 933 Zion Park Boulevard, in the CC zone) to allow the development of four new transient lodging units on the property. Applicant: Laura Doty. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie.

I like what Laura is trying to do here and appreciate that the existing residential housing and retail building stay on the property. This integration of small TLUs makes sense if the density and DDR align. The building design is reasonable and will not detract from the adjacent view sheds. This is the type of project the town could benefit from.

3. **Public Hearing - Zone Change:** Request to apply the Transient Lodging Overlay (TLO) to parcel S-MMIS-1(approximately 975 Zion Park Boulevard, in the CC zone) to allow the development of eight new transient lodging units on the property. Applicant: Matt Rayner. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie.

Canyon Vista's current TLUs have minimal impact on the neighboring properties and are quiet and well kept.

I have two contentions with this application:

1) What appears to be the only viable green-space on the property will turn into a parking lot and push the parking toward the street, which seems counter to the town general plan to have parking behind buildings or obscured. The addition of two long term rentals does not seem enough of a benefit even if they were deeded as only EMPLOYEE housing to offset the significant impact of turning the only green space in the central commercial zone into a parking lot.

2) The town is trying to differentiate development from just TLUs , and in this application, a perfectly habitable restaurant space, although abandoned, would be converted into lodging. This also seems counter to the goals and objectives of the general plan. There is plenty of financial opportunity to keep and better utilize the former Flying Monkey restaurant space.

4. **Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision:** Changes to several sections of Title 10 of the Town Code (the Land Use Ordinance) revising the regulations and requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

[including allowing external ADUs in the FR zone, as well as revisions to the regulations for guesthouses.](#)
[Staff contact: Thomas](#)

As a property owner, I am full support of external ADUs being allowed in all zones. I am suspicious of the jump from 1500 to 2500 sq ft, which seems inordinate. 2500 sq ft is enough space to build a 4 bedroom home. This would easily qualify many as primary home sizes and if future applicants can afford the size, many will and essentially double the number of houses on lots. This may not happen, but looking at trends in Springdale, it is likely. Then we are back pedaling again on another ordinance change like we had to do on the Cottage overlay Zone and the many iterations of the TLO Zone. Is there anyway to just keep it at 1500 sq ft?

“10-22-9-D.5 It must be visually apparent that the lot where the ADU is located is developed as a single family residence with an accessory dwelling, and not as two separate single family residences.”

And

“10-22-9-E-2.b The structure containing the ADU shall be limited in area to the greater of: 1) 50% of the building area of the primary dwelling on the property up to a maximum of 2,500 square feet, or 2) 1,000 square feet.”

Can we have verbiage combining D.5 and E.2.b such that “the accessory dwelling unit must be no more than 50% the size of the EXISTING single family residence or 1500 sq ft max, whichever is lesser.”