



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

**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 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, Suzanne Elger, Jerry Giardina, Bill Dunn, Mike Marriott, and Cindy Purcell from Zion National Park

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 Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Mr. Dansie welcomed Bill Dunn as the Planning Commission alternate. In addition, the Town hired Jeff McKee as the new Code Enforcement Officer. One of his initial projects would be to undertake an analysis of outdoor lighting in Springdale to ensure properties were in compliance with the lighting ordinance.

Regarding paving progress, Mr. Dansie said the base course should be done early next week. The final wearing course, likely to be laid at night to minimize traffic impacts, was scheduled the first week in April. Downing of power poles, pavement markings, sidewalk work, and signage installation would continue through the end of May. The edge of the roadway would be cleaned and the existing grade tied into the street.

- Mr. Dansie indicated the Town was working toward an April 15th start date for the new parking program.

With shuttles now running, Ms. Purcell said cars could not drive up Zion Canyon Scenic Route unless they were guests of the Lodge. The Park planned a south entrance redesign in the future which would include another entrance station and automatic readers.

Action Items

Public Hearing – Ordinance Revision: Addition of Chapter 10-13F, Agricultural Public Parking Overlay Zone, which would allow public parking on agriculturally zoned properties through an

overlay zone process: Mr. Dansie said the Commission worked on this proposed overlay zone at the direction of the Town Council. This ordinance would add the ability for someone to apply for an overlay zone on agriculturally zoned property allowing public parking.

- Approval of an overlay zone was a legislative action and the Council would retain legislative discretion whether or not to grant the zone.
- If the ordinance was approved, the Council would retain authority whether to allow a zone change. The overlay zone should be used cautiously and only in instances where a need was demonstrated.

A public comment letter was received today from a Rockville resident (Attachment #1) which suggested the Town allow other parking processes to play out before permitting parking in an agricultural zone. The Commission reviewed the letter before proceeding.

Mr. Dunn indicated his wife worked at Trees Ranch (Sanctuary Ranch). Due to this possible conflict he would abstain from the conversation.

Council questions: None were asked.

Public questions: Brent Cook, Rockville resident, asked how long the zone change process took to approve.

- From the time someone submitted an application to the time the Council made a decision, Mr. Dansie indicated the process took approximately 2-1/2 months.

Paul Fischer, Rockville resident, asked if the Planning Commission had considered wildlife migration, security issues, lighting, restrooms, and other impacts.

- Mr. Pitti said a wildlife impact study was not part of the overlay zone, however the others issues were considered.

Mr. Fischer asked if current construction on the property was related to the proposed parking lot.

- Mr. Dansie said the construction was a guard house and was independent of a parking area.

Mary Fischer, Rockville resident, lived adjacent to Sanctuary Ranch and had a number of concerns including security, lighting, and noise. She asked how an informed decision could be made before these issues were considered.

- Mr. Dansie clarified the Planning Commission was only considering the ordinance amendment. There was no specific application. If the overlay zone was allowed, an analysis of impacts would then come into play.

The Sanctuary Ranch property had a CUP which allowed a restaurant in the market building. Parking was already allowed on the property for this use. The overlay zone would allow them to expand parking independent of the current restaurant operation.

Kim Cook, Rockville resident, asked when the restaurant might be developed. She referenced December meeting minutes whereby property representatives indicated they had asked the shuttle to extend to the ranch.

- Mr. Dansie said initial steps had been made to apply for the restaurant but it was up to the property owner how quickly they proceeded.

Paul Fischer asked about the Park's overflow parking next to the Visitor's Center and their plan for the future. He asked about the Park's acreage and how many parking lots could fit.

- Ms. Purcell said the dirt lot had been paved and now used for RV's and motorcycles. The Park did not plan more lots. They would manage existing parking and look at the source of the parking problem.
- Ms. Purcell indicated the Park analyzed the number of vehicles that could be accommodated in the main parking lot. They had rearranged shuttles and how crowds were moved. Ms. Purcell said the Park could not build or shuttle its way out of the parking problem. She indicated there were agreements between the Town and Park when the shuttle service started. The ability to run a Park-owned shuttle inside Springdale was tied parking as many cars as possible in Town while keeping it pedestrian and bike-friendly.
- Ms. Purcell estimated the Park could accommodate 400-450 cars. The overflow lot could accommodate approximately 80 RV's.

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

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Brent Cook, Rockville resident, said this was the last agriculture area in Springdale. It would be a shame to turn it into a parking lot. He urged the Commission to wait until the whole UDOT plan, and other transportation options, played out. Mr. Cook reiterated there were a large number of impacts to consider.

Kim Cook, Rockville resident, questioned the need. She wanted the Commission to consider what would be lost. It would be tragic to ruin the area with a parking lot. Ms. Cook felt there were better alternatives.

Rick Praetzel, Springdale resident, acknowledged the pressures and changes keeping up with visitation. He said this taxed the planning process and developing an ordinance left to the discretion of the Council was simply giving up on planning. The unintended consequences that arrived by writing an ordinance which allowed someone to be awarded a parking lot, while someone else declined, was not an ordinance. Mr. Praetzel asked the Planning Commission not to pass an ordinance that was not objective.

Motion made by Allan Staker to close public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott:

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Council deliberation: Mr. Pitti said public comments were succinct and well-thought out. He stressed the Commission assess the impacts and advantages of this proposal.

Mr. Marriott said if the Town valued an agricultural zone, then it should be protected. He asked if that zone was still viable or something of the past. Mr. Marriott felt the language in 10-13F(1) regarding appropriate locations was not well defined. He also raised concern setbacks were too generous. Mr. Marriott suggested the ordinance tie a quantity of vehicles to a parcel size.

Mr. Pitti agreed. With an overlay zone the Town would have more discretion, however there were a number of transportation options coming on line. He questioned if this was premature.

Ms. Elger raised concern this was a way to back into conditional use permits again. Someone could request a zone change to agricultural to get parking.

Mr. Staker said it was still unknown what the parking needs would be and recommended the Town hold off on this. Previously the Town considered four CUP applications for parking and only one was approved. This happened under the more objective umbrella whereby if conditions were met a use was granted. This ordinance amendment would be even more subjective and at the whim of the Council. Because of this Mr. Staker did not favor the ordinance. He felt it was totally subjective and could not be measured.

Mr. Giardina wanted to see if parking availability reached a saturation level and therefore this was unnecessary. He preferred waiting to see what flushed out and what issues remained unresolved.

Mr. Pitti commended the Commission for looking at parking in general and talking through standards. He felt the Town should assess on-street parking before applicability of this ordinance amendment was revisited.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to table the ordinance revision 10-13F; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye
Giardina: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Design/Development Review: Moenave Subdivision, Multi-Family 6-Plex Buildings on Lots 11-14 – Mountain Vista Development: Mr. Dansie said the Commission reviewed concept drawings for the 6-plex units in their December meeting. Based on feedback the applicant completed the DDR submittal including details on lighting, landscaping, building height and storm drainage.

Mr. Dansie indicated the submittal requirements appeared to be compliant with code. He mentioned as part of the subdivision approval of at least six units had to be affordable as regulated by Town code. A restrictive covenant would be recorded against the lots to guarantee the affordability component.

The landscape plan showed large portions of native soil. Mr. Dansie said these areas had been heavily disturbed during the development process. Per Town standard, these areas needed to be re-vegetated or re-seeded with a native desert seed mix.

Tyler Kukahiko with Mountain Vista Development was in attendance to answer questions.

Mr. Staker appreciated the details of the development but was concerned about the affordability component.

- Mr. Kukahiko explained there were six units per building; the two end units would be designated as affordable units. They were only required to designate a total of six units as affordable however they were not opposed to designating all eight units as affordable housing.

Mr. Staker asked if the units would be for sale or rent.

- Mr. Kukahiko was unsure if they would be sold or rented.

Mr. Dansie reminded Commissioners they were approving the DDR tonight. He said the ordinance required at least six units were income restricted and currently units were set up as rentals because each was placed on an individual lot. Conveyance could change in the future.

- From an affordability standpoint, the rental or sales price was determined by the Washington County area median income, family size, and requirement the monthly payment could not be more than 30% of monthly income. The ordinance required the units be affordable for 25 years if sold, or 99 years if rented. These restrictions would be written into the restrictive covenant. The price of other units would be dictated by market forces.

Mr. Kukahiko confirmed the heavily disturbed areas would be reseeded.

Mr. Pitti agreed the buildings were nicely designed. He hoped the Town would oversee compliance of the affordable units. This development offered alternative housing options.

- Mr. Marriott said the project appeared to meet the standards. Mr. Staker liked the buildings and landscape.

Ms. Elger asked about the location of the retention basin.

- Mr. Kukahiko indicated it was at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Dunn asked if the cultured stone was approved.

- Mr. Kukahiko confirmed they would utilize the same stone as on the single-family homes.

At some point the developer would need to identify which units were affordable. Mr. Staker asked who would determine the affordability.

- Mr. Dansie said the Town did not have the expertise to be an affordable housing regulator. The restrictive covenant would identify a third-party to manage the analysis and verification process.
- Mr. Kukahiko confirmed the affordable units would be explicit when marketed.

Mr. Marriott asked how the affordable units would be phased in.

- Mr. Kukahiko was unsure if the 6-plex units would be built all at the same time or individually.

Motion made by Mike Marriott that the Planning Commission approve the Design/Development Review for the Moenave Subdivision, multi-family 6-plex buildings on lots 11-14, the Mountain Vista Development. Whereas we find the development is in compliance with building height, setback, grading, landscaping, lighting, colors, parking and storm water management. With the following conditions: 1) the applicant must identify the six units that will be dedicated as affordable housing per the requirements of the Town code, and the property owner must record a restrictive covenant against the properties where the affordable units are located stipulating terms and requirements of the affordable units consistent with the affordable housing requirements in Town code prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued for any of the development authorized by this DDR approval; 2) all portions of each lot that have been disturbed in the subdivision development which are not built upon must either be landscaped in accordance with the landscape plan or reseeded with native seed mix; 3) should in the future the applicant wish to light the parking lot the outdoor lighting plan for that be submitted and reviewed by the Town; seconded by Joe Pitti.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Sign Permit: Mild to Wild Rhino Tours, Inc., 445 Zion Park Boulevard – Buddy James: Buddy James was in attendance to answer questions. Mr. Dansie provided the color sample submitted by the applicant. The 'Mild to Wild' and 'Tours' sign would be combined into one.

Mr. Dansie explained each business was allowed one building-mounted sign. Therefore, two signs were allowed. The previously approved 'Parking' sign would be installed 15' off the ground. The 'Mild to Wild Tours' sign would be installed underneath. Each sign could be 20 square feet. This proposed sign was 18.5 square feet based on the submittal.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the sign permit for Mild to Wild Tours at 445 Zion Park Boulevard. The Commission has determined that the sign meets the applicable standards of the Sign Ordinance with condition the applicant review the placement of the sign on the building for approval with the Town; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

The Commission requested better drawings in the future so review and approval went easier. Commissioners wanted to support the Director of Community Development and acknowledged it was difficult to get all applicants to understand the process and provide what was needed.

Mr. Staker asked if Trees Ranch (Sanctuary Ranch) was a gated community. He noted there was a gate on the property and multiple people lived there.

Consent agenda:

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the consent agenda and minutes from February 21st and March 7th; seconded by Jerry Giardina.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn:
Motion to adjourn at 6:40pm made by Joe Pitti seconded by Mike Marriott.
Staker: Aye
Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Giardina: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson

Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: Joe Pitti DATE: 4.25.18

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 3/21/18

<u>PAUL + MARY FISCHER</u> Name (please print)	_____ Name (please print)
<u>LISA ZUMPF</u> Name (please print)	_____ Name (please print)
<u>Brent Cook</u> Name (please print)	_____ Name (please print)
<u>Kim Cook</u> Name (please print)	_____ Name (please print)
<u>Buddy James</u> Name (please print)	_____ Name (please print)
<u>Tyler Kukahiko</u> 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)

Darci Carlson

From: Tom Dansie <dcd@infowest.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 2:30 PM
To: 'Joe Pitti'; 'Mike Marriott'; 'Suzanne Elger'; 'Guy G. (Jerry) Giardina'; 'Allan Staker'; Cindy_Purcell@nps.gov
Cc: Darci Carlson
Subject: FW: Parking at Trees/Sanctuary Ranch

Commissioners-

See the comment on the Agricultural Parking Overlay zone below.

Thanks!

Tom

From: Kim [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 2:03 PM
To: dcd@infowest.com
Subject: Parking at Trees/Sanctuary Ranch

Mayor Smith, Director Dansie, Commissioners, and concerned residents of Springdale and Zion Canyon:

I am writing regarding the proposed new parking lot at Trees/Sanctuary Ranch. I am opposed to granting any such permissions, as I think that until conclusions have been reached by UDOT regarding its Recreational Hotspot spending, and the NPS has made recommendations and changes via its management review process, there is no need to commit to this particular project, which would destroy the only remaining agricultural land in the city of Springdale.

The pressures of intense visitation have created an environment in which our local towns are extremely anxious to solve everything, and fast! These issues are significant, and affect our towns over the long term. Let's take our time, considering all the options—*particularly those that protect the flavor of our towns and communities.*

There has been much discussion about parking, with some remedies already being undertaken. One of the biggest additional remedies would be the proposed transit system from St. George to Springdale: this would serve to take many hundreds of cars off our streets during any given month. I attended the recent UDOT meeting in Springdale, and came away with the understanding that the Transportation group is inclined towards a transportation corridor option. Let's allow that UDOT Recreational Hotspot discovery and funding process to conclude (comments are still being accepted). From there we will have more numbers to work with, and more information regarding what will be actually needed, going forward.

In addition, the National Park Service has concluded its Visitor Use Management review process. Perhaps it will result in some measures that will encourage alternatives to driving around and looking for a place to park, as well as potentially restrict the number of people allowed to visit the park or hike on popular trails such as Angels Landing and the Narrows. If the park ends up restricting entry into the park (which seems likely) the overall visitation to Springdale would also be lessened, thereby making this lot an unnecessary blight.

There is also the new lot at Balanced Rock, the proposed parking at Whiptail, the existing parking at ZAC and a potential 500-car park and ride lot just west of Rockville.

Darci Carlson

From: Tom Dansie <dcd@infowest.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 10:22 AM
To: 'Joe Pitti'; 'Mike Marriott'; 'Allan Staker'; 'Suzanne Elger'; 'Guy G. (Jerry) Giardina'; Cindy_Purcell@nps.gov
Cc: Darci Carlson
Subject: FW: We are AGAINST gated communities

Commissioners-

Please see the email below with comments on gated access to subdivisions.

Thanks!

Tom

From: Cynthia Tuthill [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 9:19 PM
To: dcd@infowest.com
Cc: Joe Pitti <joepitti@msn.com>; Mike Alltucker <malltucker@infowest.com>; Adrian Player <adrnplay@infowest.com>; [REDACTED]
Subject: We are AGAINST gated communities

Dear Mr Dansie,

We are writing as concerned citizens about a zoning topic; we would appreciate your forwarding this letter to the commissioners so that our concerns can be heard.

It has come to our notice that some residents on the Anasazi Plateau, where we live, have suggested that they would like this neighborhood to become a gated community. We **STRONGLY** disagree with this idea. Gates are anathema to the very idea of a small town; they are a mark of division and can only **BREAK DOWN** the cohesiveness that we strive for in our community. We do **NOT** believe in adopting measures that will lead to civil strife. Those of us who live on this beautiful and wild Anasazi plateau are extremely fortunate; it makes no sense at all to prevent other persons from enjoying the bountiful hiking on the BLM and Chinle Trails.

While it is true that we have deteriorating roads up on the plateau, this is **NOT** from tourists or locals parking for hiking; it is from poorly built roads and the large, heavy vehicles used for house-building construction, propane deliveries, and garbage collection. Addition of a gate will **NOT** assist this issue in any way.

We would be happy to discuss this issue further; we feel **VERY** strongly about keeping our neighborhood an inclusive part of the delightful small town of Springdale. As we previously stated in an email dated April 8, 2008 on this topic, we believe neighborhood entrance gates are exclusionary, elitist, unfriendly and unsupportive and we will strive to defeat any proposition in support of gating our community.

Warm regards,

Cynthia and Jim

Cynthia Tuthill, PhD; James Orr

[REDACTED]
Springdale, UT 84767

Teach InfoWest Spam Trap if this mail is spam:

REMEMBER: Never give out your account information, password, or other personal information over e-mail.

NOTE: This message was trained as non-spam. If this is wrong, please correct the training as soon as possible.

Teach InfoWest Spam Trap if this mail is spam:

[Spam](#)

[Not spam](#)

[Forget previous vote](#)

REMEMBER: Never give out your account information, password, or other personal information over e-mail.
