



118 Lion Blvd PO Box 187 Springdale UT 84767 \* 435-772-3434 fax 435-772-3952

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2016,  
AT THE SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.  
THE MEETING BEGAN AT 5:00 PM.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Jack Archer, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor, Liz West, Mike Marriott, Scott Taylor and Jack Burns from Zion National Park

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

Mr. Archer indicated tonight would be a public hearing regarding the revision of the General Plan. The community will have an opportunity to provide feedback. After the public input the Planning Commission would deliberate on the information gathered.

**Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Liz West to approve the agenda; seconded by Mike Marriott.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission discussion and announcements:** None were made.

**Action Items**

**Public Hearing – General Plan Update – Public comment and consideration of proposed revisions to all chapters of the General Plan:** Mr. Dansie said during the previous work meeting Commissioners reviewed the final General Plan draft. All comments and changes were made and links to the chapters were provided on the Town’s website for the community to review.

- Mr. Dansie corrected a previous comment regarding the need for changes in Chapter 2 and said they were actually in Chapter 3. These changes dealt with strategies promoting smaller scale lodging establishments and boutique hotels to keep with the Town’s village character.
- Mr. Dansie recommended tonight’s meeting goals should include the taking of comments and feedback from the community; deliberation on any changes that should be made based on the input received; and, discussion about prioritization of items in the General Plan. Mr. Dansie said the General Plan had more strategies than could be realistically accomplished within the next five years, therefore prioritization was important.

In the next Planning Commission meeting Mr. Dansie would present a polished version of the General plan to recommend to the Town Council.

**Public questions:** Billy Hughes suggested the Commission consider a reduction in setbacks for awnings, porches and balconies in situations where the property packed up to a parking lot, driveway or utility easement.

Gene Gerstner questioned the projected growth of hotel rooms and private dwellings. He asked if the data included the development already underway or approved.

- Mr. Dansie said future projections for lodging and housing were done years ago. They are not a hard cap but represent an estimate based on an analysis of trends, zoning, natural constraints and economic factors. There could be more or less development based on what was projected.

Gene Gerstner said in many of the implementation sections words such as ‘encourage’, ‘advise’ and ‘prompt’ were often used. He asked if the Planning Commission intended to make more specific directives to follow up on these General Plan ideas. There were many ‘carrots’ in the General Plan but Mr. Gerstner asked if there were also ‘sticks’ to ensure ideas were followed.

- Mr. Dansie replied ‘carrots’ are easier to implement while ‘sticks’ – the laws and ordinances of the Town - are more effective. He said the Commission implemented an educational strategy to more widely publicize these ideas so they would be more effective.

**Motion made by Mike Marriott to open public hearing; seconded by Liz West.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public comment:** Sharon Nawara referenced section 5.2.5.c and 5.2.5.d and asked if there was a list of benefits for neighbors and the Town if renters were allowed to rent. She also asked what the rules, regulations and enforcement would be for rentals.

Karla Player asked who was driving the housing issue especially as it related to affordable housing. If residents with guest homes were allowed to rent were increased densities and use of infrastructure taken into consideration. Ms. Player understood the goal for making housing available but questioned why it was the Town and tax payer responsibility to provide. The onus should be placed on businesses. Ms. Player said some may not want a renter living next to them. She wanted the Planning Commission to look for more answers.

Darci Carlson briefly recused herself as Town Clerk and spoke as a future resident. She read a prepared statement from her and her husband Jeff Carlson (Attachment #1) which expressed support for ADU’s in the Valley Residential, Village Commercial and Central Commercial zones. They believed ADU’s should be exempted from the Foothills Residential areas.

Betina Lindsey asked the Commission to put people first, not automobiles. She wanted to make the Town more walkable and safer for pedestrians. Ms. Lindsey also recommended hotel developments were required to build employee housing before issued a building permit. This was similar to what was done in Park City.

Julie McKown asked the maximum length of time renters were allowed to rent.

- Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission had drafted an ordinance about ADU’s prior to the General Plan update but it was tabled by the Town Council. In this ordinance the specified minimum ADU rental period was 90 days. If the Planning Commission pursues this topic again this term may be different.

Sarah Stratton urged the Town to provide additional recreational opportunities for biking, hiking and pet use. She wanted to encourage more partnerships with neighborhoods to provide trails.

**Motion made by Liz West to close public hearing; seconded by Randy Taylor.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Archer said the main issue, based on the evening's public comment, was ADU's. He said the Planning Commission recommended an ordinance about a year ago concerning ADU's and cottage neighborhoods per the recommendations of the Housing Committee. At that time the Commission conducted a public hearing and heard from homeowner associations in the Foothills Residential areas. They were unanimously against ADU's and the ordinance excluded them in these areas. If the ordinance was revisited there would be another public hearing to get community input.

Mr. Archer suggested language in the General Plan update about ADU's be changed to exclude the Foothills Residential zone.

- Mr. S. Taylor agreed given the fire danger in this zone and the small roads to exit.
- Ms. West also agreed. She said ADU's were needed but in the right situation and right area. Ms. West understood the need for housing options. She asked about the Park's ability to provide housing.
  - Mr. Burns said the Park Service was trying to get out of the housing business but acknowledged it was a major problem. Currently there was a moratorium on expanding the footprint within National Park Service units. Any new housing or parking expansions need Director approval. During winter, housing for Park employees was sufficient however not during the summer.

Commissioners discussed how language in section 5.2.5.c should be addressed.

- Mr. R. Taylor suggested the wording 'all zones' be changed to 'appropriate zones' to not specify and leave open for discussion.
- Mr. Archer felt verbiage should identify what was intended.
- Mr. Staker stated there was a need for more housing and this should be specifically determined by the future ordinance. In the meantime Mr. Staker thought language in the General Plan should be left broadly open.
- Ms. West felt the General Plan should back the ordinance and therefore specifically mention which zones would be implicated.
- Mr. Marriott was unsure if ADU's in the Foothills Residential zone were good or bad. He suggested the General Plan language remain flexible. Mr. Marriott was an advocate of a phased-in, trial period for ADU's town-wide.
- Mr. R. Taylor said specifics could be flushed out when the Commission had a full discussion about the ordinance. It wasn't necessary now in the context of talking about the General Plan.

Commissioners determined the words 'in all zones' should be removed under section 5.2.5.c. Further conversation about specific zones would be continued during construction of the ordinance.

Ms. West commented she was surprised with everything in the General Plan that nothing else was addressed by the public.

Commissioners did not have any additional General Plan comments.

Mr. Dansie recommended Commissioners focus on priorities to recommend to the Town Council.

- Mr. Archer said the Commission should address boutique hotels. Also, based on the feedback, ADU's and cottage neighborhoods were important. Trails, pathways and walkways could be addressed with the SR-9 reconstruction.
- Ms. West wanted to revisit the sign ordinance. Mr. S. Taylor agreed and felt some signs were way too big.
  - Mr. Burns mentioned there were good examples of signage in Town for reference.
- Parking and continued focus on the transit route from St. George were also identified as priorities.

**No action was required.**

**Public Hearing: Ordinance Amendment – Changes to section 10-3-3 making provision for reconsideration of variance decisions under certain circumstances:** Mr. Dansie said this proposed ordinance amendment impacted the process for reconsideration of a variance decision. Currently an applicant must wait a year to reapply after a decision had been made. Given a recent situation however, the Council determined if additional information was available which may have affected the decision,

reconsideration would be permissible. Once the Council interprets an ordinance it becomes the policy of the Town. This proposed ordinance simply codified the existing policy.

Ms. West asked if there was a Utah law for appeals or if it was handled city by city.

- Mr. Dansie answered the state appeal process was separate from this policy.

Mr. Dansie indicated the Commission had previously considered this provision but the required notice for a public hearing was not given. Therefore the Commission was considering it again for the purpose of gathering feedback from the community.

**Public questions:** None were asked.

**Motion made by Jack Archer to open public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion made by Liz West to close public hearing; seconded by Randy Taylor.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

There was no additional Planning Commission deliberation.

**Motion made by Randy Taylor to recommend to the Town Council revision to section 10-3-3 making allowances for reconsideration of variance decisions under certain circumstances; seconded by Liz West.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Consent agenda**

**Motion made by Liz West to approve the consent agenda and minutes from January 19<sup>th</sup> and February 2<sup>nd</sup>; seconded by Allan Staker.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Adjourn**

**Motion to adjourn at 5:56pm made by Jack Archer; seconded by Mike Marriott.**

**Staker: Aye**

**R. Taylor: Aye**

**Archer: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

*Darci Carlson*

Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:

*[Handwritten Signature]*

DATE:

*3-15-16*

February 16, 2016

To the Springdale Planning Commission:

We are writing to express our support of accessory dwelling rental units in the Valley Residential, Village Commercial and Central Commercial zones of Springdale. We believe however, that the Foothills Residential zone should be exempted from ADU's due to the strong and justifiable reasons repeatedly communicated.

As everyone is aware, there is a shortage of lower to moderate income housing in our community. Units of this type would support the needs of seasonal and year round employees. Currently, many employees commute up the hill bringing increased traffic and pressure to SR-9. If more people who work in Springdale live here too, these roadway issues are likely to lessen. Renters in the VR, VC and CC zones would live close to their place of employment and apt to walk, ride a bike or take the shuttle to get around. Also, with the continued commercial development in Town, the need for employees will only rise. Springdale cannot wait for the Town to develop affordable housing or hope prized commercial property will develop into apartments. Housing solutions are needed immediately.

If affordable long-term rental housing is not available, the probability businesses can secure good, reliable personnel diminishes. In many ways, these people are the backbone of our community. They positively contribute to the local economy and bring diversity to Springdale – both of which are consistently expressed as important local objectives.

The general goal of the Housing chapter is “to assure that housing in Town is sufficient in number and type to serve adequately the needs of its permanent and seasonal populations”. Accessory dwelling units would accomplish this. If Springdale seeks to provide diverse housing stock that meets the housing needs of a population with varied income levels, allowing ADU's would accomplish this.

Implementation strategy 5.2.5.c in the General Plan calls for an allowance of “accessory dwelling units, which are guest houses and auxiliary apartments rented on a long term basis in all zones, with appropriate standards to mitigate impacts on neighborhoods”. We believe the verbiage of this strategy should be amended slightly to omit the Foothills Residential zone. Ultimately however, the key is to establish reasonable standards that safeguard neighborhoods while promoting lower cost housing options throughout Town.

It is vital that the Planning Commission remain committed to supporting the housing goals, objectives and strategies as written in the updated language of the General Plan. Then, once adopted, it will also be important for the Commission to move forward in recommending ordinances consistent with the housing needs of the community.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Jeff and Darci Carlson  
103 Wanda Lane

