



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

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

The meeting convened at 5:00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Liz West, Randy Taylor, Allan Staker, Cindy Purcell, Joe Pitti, and Jerry Giardina.

EXCUSED: Mike Marriott

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie and Deputy Town Clerk Katy Brown recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Liz West to approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

West: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Mr. Dansie announced that it would soon be time to formally appoint a Chair and Vice-Chair to the Planning Commission to replace Liz West and Randy Taylor and invited the Commission to start considering who they would want to fill those vacancies. He mentioned that the Mayor would be proposing the appointments of new Commissioners Suzanne Elger and Julie McKown to the Town Council at their meeting on January 10, 2018.

Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items:

Discussion of housing strategies and ordinances – Accessory Dwelling Units: Mr. Dansie reviewed the ordinance draft with the Commission and summarized the changes made based on their recommendations in past discussions. He asked the Commission to review the changes in the draft and provide their feedback.

Ms. West was in favor of removing the five-year waiting period for the use of ADU's constructed after the ordinance would take effect and felt it was too limiting.

- Mr. Staker agreed and felt that if the Planning Commission's goal was to find more affordable housing solutions then there shouldn't be a long waiting period that limits how a building can be used if ultimately it helps meet the need for housing.

Mr. Pitti felt the Commission could strike a balance by retaining some type of mechanism that would deter builders from constructing ADU-type buildings for purposes that would not immediately address the need for affordable long-term rentals.

Mr. Taylor suggested retaining a waiting period but changing it to two years instead of five.

Ms. West asked if any existing ADU's would be subject to the five-year waiting period.

- Mr. Dansie said that any buildings constructed prior to the adoption of the ordinance, providing they met all of the other standards for ADUs, would not be subject to the five-year waiting period and would be able to obtain an ADU permit immediately.

Ms. West asked how many properties in the VR zone were a half-acre or larger that would even be able to accommodate a building for use as an ADU.

- Mr. Dansie replied that without having the numbers in front of him he imagined that roughly 50-60 properties in Springdale met that criteria and offered to do a more in-depth analysis.

Mr. Staker felt that severely limiting the use of a building on someone's property would undermine the main goal that the Planning Commission was trying to tackle, which was trying to promote solutions for affordable housing.

Ms. West felt that the Commission was landing on different pages on the issue and suggested that the issue should be put forth for a Public Hearing to gain feedback from the Community.

The Commission agreed to move the ADU draft ordinance to a public hearing during the upcoming regular meeting on January 17, 2018.

Discussion of housing strategies and ordinances – Cottage Neighborhoods: Mr. Dansie summarized the suggested changes to the ordinance and asked the Commission to review.

Mr. Taylor asked if the existing grading ordinance would apply to Cottage Housing developments.

- Mr. Dansie replied that the current grading standards would most certainly apply to cottage neighborhood developments.

Mr. Staker referenced the Moenave development and didn't see many differences in the draft ordinance for Cottage Housing that would prevent that undesirable outcome again. Referencing section 10-13E-10 wherein terms such as "the development contains a high-quality living environment that meets the goals of the General Plan" and "creates no significant detriment to adjacent properties" were used. He felt the language was too subjective and would therefore be difficult to enforce. After crunching numbers, he also felt that the proposed requirements would make a cottage development fairly difficult to build.

Mr. Taylor felt that the draft ordinance was acceptable and that development guidelines should be available to any developer who wants to try a Cottage Housing Neighborhood.

Ms. West felt that the draft ordinance met the integrity of what the community should be according to the General Plan.

The Commission agreed to move forward with the draft ordinance as presented in the Regular meeting on January 17, 2018.

Discussion of Town Council direction to Planning Commission regarding agricultural residential and farm animal uses: Mr. Dansie reviewed the Council's guidance to the Commission regarding farm animal uses in the FR and VR zones. He felt it would be a good idea for the Commission to have an initial discussion and develop a plan for how to approach the issue.

Mr. Staker asked how many times a large farm animal had become a controversial issue in the FR/VR zones.

- Mr. Dansie responded that, to date, it had been an issue only once with a recent application that the Commission had reviewed for horses on Valley View Drive.

Mr. Taylor didn't feel that the ecology of the FR zones was a good fit for large animals like horses.

- Mr. Pitti suggested that the ordinance be retained as-is but the allowance in the FR zone could be stricken.

Ms. West felt that the ordinance as-is was very thorough but did understand the concern with large animals in the FR zones.

In regards to bee-keeping, Ms. West asked if some verbiage could be added about bait hives for swarm control.

- Mr. Taylor felt that encouraging honeybees was a positive thing.

Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission that as policy makers their task was to regulate certain types of uses but not necessarily dictate the details of how those uses should be carried out.

The Commission agreed to send the ordinance back to the Council with the findings that had been discussed.

Discussion of Town Council direction to Planning Commission regarding noisy commercial uses:

Mr. Dansie reported that the Council wished to see an overall noise control standard. The Council cited the existing night sky standard but felt that no standard existed to protect the tranquil, quiet nature of the Canyon. The Planning Commission was being tasked with developing an approach to noise regulation.

Mr. Giardina noted that it would be hard to enforce a decibel limit if that was going to be one of the considerations on the table.

Mr. Pitti felt that the noise was becoming a problem in the downtown area but didn't think that decibel levels were the way to approach the solution. He cited leaf blowers, power washers, radios from parked cars at the gas station, long RV chains, and loud music coming from restaurant speakers. He felt that if a business owner was trying to create an ambiance for their patrons they should do it at such a decibel that doesn't detract from someone else's experience a block away.

Mr. Dansie thought that an "hour-of-day" standard could work well. He noted that the Council was particularly concerned about noise from live events such as outdoor bands and wedding DJs.

- Ms. West thought perhaps a decibel limit could be set for DJ's specifically since they have the equipment to measure decibels.

Mr. Pitti recommended a time of day cut-off. He felt that it was very important to communicate to residents and visitors through ordinance that the Town had placed a high priority on the peace and quiet that the canyon naturally offers.

Ms. Purcell suggested launching a campaign for natural sounds and offered to share the Park's Soundscape Plan with the Commission to offer some relevant guidance.

- Ms. West liked the idea of a dedicated campaign and felt it could be a more palatable approach than tightening restrictions on types of noise and hours.
- Mr. Pitti noted that it would help business owners to have a standard to fall back on and invoke to guests who might present unnecessary noise issues.
- Mr. Staker agreed and thought that the residents and business owners could be easily trained with a campaign.

Ms. West felt the Commission had a good start to the discussion.

Discussion of Town Council direction to Planning Commission regarding impound lots: Mr. Dansie mentioned that the Town currently prohibited salvage lots and junkyards, but impound lots were not addressed in the Town Code. With the increase of parking enforcement efforts, there would be an increased need for a place to house towed vehicles. The Council had tasked the Commission with developing regulation for impound lots.

Mr. Pitti asked where towed cars were currently being held.

- Mr. Dansie responded that currently vehicles were being towed to an already existing lot in the commercial zone on Lion Blvd but there was a need to formalize the Code and make it more official.

Mr. Giardina wondered how frequently cars were towed.

- Offering observations from the Park, Ms. Purcell mentioned that they saw cars towed on average at least once a day.

Ms. West asked if there were different types of tows for different purposes.

- Mr. Dansie responded that anytime a vehicle was towed in conjunction with a police case (i.e.; DUI or traffic accident), those vehicles must be stored at a State impound lot. The closest State impound lot was located in Hurricane.

The Commission found consensus that a state impound lot style was not compatible with Springdale's lighting standards or other components of the General Plan.

Mr. Staker had heard that a portion of the privately-owned parking lot on Lion Blvd had already been designated for future use as an impound lot.

- Mr. Dansie affirmed that the lot was currently being used informally as a holding place for towed vehicles. The owner had applied and was seeking approval for wood fencing which would satisfy the Town requirements.

Mr. Dansie recommended to the Commission that they present the Council with the idea of officially recognizing impound lots as an approved use and regulate the standards from there such as maximum size, lighting and fencing standards, maximum vehicle count, etc.

The Commission formed the idea of allowing existing approved parking lots to seek approval for converting a portion of their lot for impound use, providing they would meet all of the standards yet to be determined and adopted into ordinance.

Ms. Purcell had a number of suggestions for components that should be considered for regulation including deciding on a maximum amount of time a vehicle would be held, possible requirement for on-site security, vehicle condition i.e.; must be movable and free of mechanical problems/must not be disabled (for ease of removal).

The Commission felt that the discussion was a great start and would continue defining standards in subsequent meetings.

Discussion of Town Council direction to Planning Commission regarding prohibited uses: Mr. Dansie reviewed that the Commission had removed all conditional uses from the Code and instead determined each use to be either permitted or prohibited. He noted that there was language in the Code stating that any use which was not specifically listed was therefore prohibited. Due to recent court cases, there seemed to be an increasing need for municipalities to address prohibited uses in a more specific way. He asked the Commission to start thinking about the most likely foreseeable uses that they believed would negatively impact the character of Springdale or that would be incongruous with the General Plan and make a list.

- Ms. West suggested as a starting point reviewing the existing list of permitted uses in 10-7A-2 and marking any uses left blank as prohibited.

Mr. Pitti asked if businesses such as smoke shops and adult stores could legally be prohibited.

- Mr. Dansie said there were indeed certain types of business that were protected and therefore could not be prohibited, although their impact could be offset using a conditional use process.
- Ms. West felt it would be helpful to have a list of the types of businesses that were protected.

Mr. Dansie updated the Commission that as the Council was reviewing the list of all conditional uses which had been removed by the Commission, they planned on retaining a conditional use permit process and requirement for transient lodging in the VC zone.

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 7:18 PM made by Allan Staker; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
Taylor: Aye
West: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Giardina: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.



Katy Brown, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  _____ DATE: 1-17-2017

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk's office. Please call 435-772-3434 or email 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 Work Meeting Date 1/3/18

Ris Bump
Name (please print)

Name (please print)