



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

**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 2018, AT 5:00PM
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

Meeting convened at 5:01 PM

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 Deputy Town Clerk Katy Brown 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 reminded the Commission of the upcoming Public Officials Training on April 13, 2018 from 9:30 – 2:00 pm at the Community Center.

He also reminded the Commission that the regular meeting for April would take place on the fourth Wednesday in April which fell on the 25th.

Mr. Marriott sought clarification on the new resident parking permit program.

- Mr. Dansie said residents could register for a virtual permit at www.Springdaleparking.com by entering the license plate numbers of up to two vehicles per household. With the permit, residents would be allowed to park anywhere on the street for up to two consecutive hours free of charge. Any additional time exceeding two hours would be subject to regular meter rates.
- Ms. Purcell asked if a resident could park somewhere for two hours, then move their vehicle to a different location for another two-hour time block.
- Mr. Dansie replied that the two-hour allotment for residents was a total per day throughout all of Springdale.

Discussion/Non-Action Items

Discussion of possible revisions to regulations on gated access into subdivisions: Mr. Dansie reviewed the ordinance that the Commission had been working on through the past several meetings. He re-stated the Council's desire to have the Planning Commission remove the ambiguity that accompanied the phrase which required the demonstration of a "compelling need" in order to approve gated access. Mr. Dansie had broadened the criteria for demonstrating a compelling need that the Commission had requested in a prior meeting and asked for their review and discussion.

Ms. Elger felt it would be less of a regulatory burden to simply determine if gates were permitted or prohibited rather than continue to discuss possible compelling needs for gated access. She was generally not in favor of gated access to communities but felt the discussion could be simplified.

Mr. Staker agreed with Ms. Elger and felt that the Commission could save a lot of time and discussion by just deciding to allow or prohibit gated access to communities. He asked what the legal definition of subdivision was.

- Mr. Dansie replied that a subdivision was a division of land into two or more parcels that had been through the Town's subdivision process and had an existing recorded subdivision plat.

Mr. Marriott spoke on 10-14-9C(4)(e) that would require a turnaround point outside the gate. He felt the requirement would potentially have a huge impact by creating major traffic constraints.

- Mr. Dunn agreed and felt that it didn't belong unless there were more specific standards on how far from the gate the turnaround point should be and minimum square footage of the turnaround area.

Mr. Pitti stated that although he was strongly opposed to the allowance of gates, the proposed requirement for turnaround space was a good idea. He used the entrance to Anasazi Plateau as an example and raised concerns over safety if a vehicle had to turn around at that location. Without a designated turnaround point the vehicle would be forced to navigate a turnaround while competing with oncoming SR-9 traffic.

Mr. Staker felt that 10-14-9C (4)(c)(d) were also problematic and lacked specifics on how emergency vehicles would gain access through gates. He generally felt that the entire issue was a property rights issue and discouraged any action that would intrude on that right.

Mr. Giardina felt that the Commission had spent an inordinate amount of time on an unlikely hypothetical situation and suggested sending it back to the Council.

Mr. Dansie stated that typically the Commission was the recommending body for the Council. If they were stuck on how to define "compelling need," he recommended coming to a conclusion as a Commission on simply whether or not gates should be allowed and forward their response to the Council as a recommendation.

The Commission took a straw poll on where each of them stood regarding recommending the allowance of gated access to communities.

Staker: Yes

Elger: No

Pitti: No

Giardina: Yes

Marriott: Yes

The Commission decided to table the discussion for another work meeting so they could develop the language to advance to the Council regarding the results of their straw poll and final recommendations.

Mr. Dansie suggested to each Commissioner to further explore paragraph 4 which had come up in discussion as needing further refining and email their ideas to him. This would assist him in drafting some preliminary language for the Commission to discuss in their next work meeting.

Discussion on possible standards for impound lots: Mr. Dansie reviewed that there would likely be an increased need for impound lots. He had added the Commission's recommendations from the last discussion to the ordinance and asked them to discuss and refine.

Ms. Elger asked about the rationale for impound areas to be 150 ft. away from residential areas.

- Mr. Dansie replied that was a suggestion to protect the impacts on residential zones but the number was fluid and could be determined by the Commission.

Mr. Dunn asked the difference between a car parking in the lot versus car being impounded there. He felt it would be hard to determine a discernable difference through observation alone.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission could clarify the definition of impound in the ordinance to remove any confusion. The ordinance was drafted in such a way as to avoid impacts that would affect adjacent residential properties if someone were to develop the infrastructure associated with an impound lot i.e.; noise impacts associated with towing activity.

Mr. Staker questioned why screening would be needed. He surmised that the cars being towed to the impound area were not likely to be junky, inoperable vehicles; they would most likely be vehicles just like any other car in Town.

- Mr. Marriott replied that screening standards were more consistent with conditions for state approved impound lots.

Mr. Pitti suggested not allowing state approved impound lots at all and defining an impound lot as primarily used for parking related violations.

- Mr. Staker suggested having categories or levels of infractions to define.

Ms. Purcell suggested allowing any established parking lot to have a temporary holding space for parking related violations, not necessarily just impound lots.

Mr. Dansie summarized the Commission's discussion and offered to revise the ordinance accordingly:

- 1) The Commission wanted to allow non police-involved parking infractions to be towed and temporarily held in any established parking lot in Town.
- 2) The Commission wanted to designate a percentage of the lot required for impound.
- 3) The Commission wanted to do away with the screening requirement.

Mr. Pitti suggested revisiting impound lots in a future meeting so the Commission could focus on defining the terms under which cars would be put in impound. The Commission agreed that they would like to see 20% of the lot designated for impound rather than requiring 2400 sq. ft. of impound space.

Discussion of possible design standards and other regulations for storage containers: Mr. Dansie stated that the Town Council had directed the Planning Commission to develop specific standards for the placement of storage containers on properties in Springdale. The Council asked the Commission to propose design standards for storage containers consistent with the Town's village character.

Mr. Marriott felt that a simple approach would be best and voted to prohibit the use of containers entirely other than for storage in the construction phase.

Mr. Pitti felt that the Town had upheld stringent design standards for residences to be in keeping with village character. If the Town wanted to allow alternative uses for storage containers, such as use as a residence, then the Town should continue to require the same stringent standards to be congruent with the General Plan. He also raised concerns about the visual impact to surrounding neighbors if a resident were to purchase a storage container to place on their property for use as transient lodging.

Mr. Dunn reiterated the Council's charge for the Commission to identify and propose design standards for storage containers. He suggested that the Commission look at the sample photos provided in the packet materials to help them visually identify what components were congruent with the General Plan and what would be appropriate to incorporate into possible design standards.

Mr. Pitti suggested that the Commission continue the discussion on design standards in a subsequent meeting. The Commission agreed.

Discussion of possible revisions to the Town's regulation of prohibited uses: Mr. Dansie reviewed the Commission's lengthy process to identify all possible prohibited uses. He suggested trying to pare the list down by identifying objectional uses specifically by zone.

Mr. Marriott saw an opportunity to further define certain uses like shopping malls, arcades, and bowling alleys.

The Commission agreed to move the list found under 10-22-3 "Uses Prohibited" to 10-7A-5 to be grouped with permitted uses. They would also proceed with the process of identifying objectionable uses by zone and further refine the current list of prohibited uses. They would continue the discussion in a subsequent meeting.

Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn at 7:00 pm made by Mike Marriott seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Giardina: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.



Katy Brown, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____



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.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Work mtg Date 4/4/18

Rosemarie MARTIN
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

LAURA SINK
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Tina Duff
Name (please print)

Name (please print)