



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 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, Ethan Newman, Suzanne Elger, Jack Burns, Mike Marriott, and Cindy Purcell representing Zion National Park

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

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Suzanne Elger to approve the agenda; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: The Parking Open House held last week was successful with approximately thirty to thirty-five participants. Mr. Dansie said the Town received a number of comments from the community which would be summarized and shared with the Parking Committee. The goal was to continually improve the program.

Sophie Frankenburg was introduced as the new Associate Planner. Ms. Frankenburg was familiar with resort communities and had experience in conservation. The Commission warmly welcomed her to the Town.

Mr. Dansie noted the Public Hearing for Stew Ferber's parking area DDR was noticed but would not be discussed until the Planning Commission regular meeting in October.

Ethan Newman arrived at 5:02pm

Action Items

1. Design/Development Review - Jon Michael Marriott, representing Zion Park Land, requests a DDR for a 112-space public parking area on parcel S-ZPH-3 (located adjacent to the Hampton Inn), continued from the August 15, 2018 meeting: Mr. Pitti said the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item during their August 15th meeting. A number of comment letters had been received which were entered into the record.

Mr. Marriott recused himself from this item. Ethan Newman would vote.

During the public hearing last month, Mr. Dansie said the community expressed concerns about traffic, impacts on the shuttle system, and impacts on Canyon Springs Road and residents. The Commission had questions about the amount of lot coverage that would remain for the development as a whole after this project was completed. Because a coverage analysis was not submitted with the application, the

Commission requested a continuance to allow the information to be submitted. Mr. Dansie indicated the applicant had submitted the updated coverage analysis.

The Town Attorney reviewed the analysis and found it generally acceptable. Since the Town and multiple property owners were impacted by the lot coverage analysis, it was recommended all parties sign off as a condition of approval. In addition, a notice would be sent to all entities indicating the remaining amount of lot coverage allowed for the settlement agreement lands.

It was reiterated that public comment letters raised concern about impacts on Canyon Springs road and residents, and the character of the community. Design alternatives were also suggested.

Mr. Marriott noted the proposed access road shown on page 2 of the drawings was not paved, therefore it was not included in the coverage calculations. He indicated roughly 123,000 square feet of total coverage remained.

Mr. Marriott wanted to fill in the project timeline not fully reflected in the record. He provided the following dates to the Commission to show the application was not last minute or under-handed:

- November 17, 2016 – the first project concept drawings were completed
- August 21, 2017 – the second project concept drawings were completed
- April 15, 2018 – the Switchback parking lot opened as a test case
- July 4, 2018 – the third project concept drawings were completed
- July 25, 2018 – Mr. Marriott met with Mr. Dansie to fully disclose the project and present drawings
- July 27, 2018 – staff report submitted indicating there may be a cap on parking

In summary, Mr. Marriott said the project had a long history and the Town was fully aware.

Mr. Pitti said the cap was driven by the Town Council's desire to get ahead of a proliferation of parking lots.

- Mr. Marriott said parking lots were limited to commercial zones and therefore restricted. A proliferation was a false reality.
- Mr. Pitti respectfully disagreed and said there was a legitimate concern.

Mr. Pitti questioned the discrepancy between the staff report and Mr. Marriott's assessment of the remaining lot coverage.

- Based on the August 22, 2018 coverage analysis document, Mr. Marriott said the net coverage remaining for future phases was 176,168 square feet; the proposed parking lot required 52,272 square feet. Therefore, after this project, 123,896 square feet of coverage would remain.
- Mr. Dansie noted there was 4,000 square feet of coverage transferred to the Switchback parcel. Additionally, approximately 6,500 square feet of coverage had been allotted to an access road, however Mr. Marriott testified this was not a proposed road. This created the approximately 10,000 square foot discrepancy.

Referencing the drawing for lot 5, Ms. Elger questioned why the two asphalt roads, gravel tank corral, pool and spa, and the bike path were not included in the coverage calculation.

- Mr. Marriott explained the roads were included with the Hampton. The bike path was part of an agreement with the Town and not included in the calculation. Pools were not counted in coverage, and to his knowledge the tank corral was never part of any coverage analysis either.

Referencing the drawing for lot 6, Ms. Elger asked why the concrete curb and flatwork and the walking trail were excluded.

- Mr. Marriott answered impervious pathways were not factored into the calculation. All of the roads were factored in the first density analysis. Moving forward the calculation included what was used.

Ms. Elger said 4,518 square feet of coverage for the Switchback needed to be added to the total.

- Mr. Marriott agreed.

Ms. Elger noted the lot number was called out as ZPH2 and ZPH3. She asked which it was.

- Mr. Dansie clarified it was ZPH3.

The parking lot drawing indicated 70,227 square feet, but the parking lot was only covering 52,272 square feet. Ms. Elger asked for explanation.

- Mr. Marriott said the road was not factored into the coverage because it was previously counted.
- Mr. Dansie said the 70,227 was the entire parcel area.

Ms. Elger asked if the potential buildings were in the 52,272 square foot calculation.

- Mr. Marriott indicated they were.

Mr. Pitti asked about the accuracy of the landscape design.

- Mr. Marriott said the drawing did not capture the scale of the trees but would grow to be large. The intent was to create continuity with the existing landscape.

Ms. Elger confirmed an application could be submitted without a storm water management plan since it would be reviewed during the construction phase.

- Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission considered the land use regulations. The Town would conduct a technical review for fire code and civil engineering standards.
- Mr. Marriott indicated they intended to engage an appropriate hydrologist to provide guidance on the storm water management plan.

In light of the fact parking lots were not filled, Mr. Pitti asked the motivation especially since there had been so much opposition to a lot of this size.

- The test location at the Switchback indicated there was opportunity. Mr. Marriott said they continued to explore the ramifications of the development. They also considered other amenities to enhance the area in general. He said this would be the closest parking lot to the center of Town and potentially benefit the Central Commercial Zone.

Mr. Burns asked why the settlement agreement specified certain permitted uses.

- Mr. Marriott said the settlement agreement allowed specific uses regardless of what may be allowed in Town. Anything not mentioned, defaulted to the underlying zone. The specific uses listed were not intended to be the only ones that could be developed.

Ms. Elger asked about consideration of a permeable surface.

- Mr. Marriott said these were not being proposed but could be explored. If used, a permeable surface would modify the coverage calculation.
- Ms. Elger commented many in the community were not happy about this development and the project could have considered changes as an olive branch. In particular, Ms. Elger referenced the suggestions made in Susan Hoover's letter (Attachment #1).

Ms. Elger addressed coverage and questioned if enough remained for roads.

- Mr. Marriott said they were comfortable with the remaining balance. He could not speak to specific design elements of a future project.

If the project was not developed, Ms. Elger asked if the coverage came back into play.

- Mr. Dansie said coverage was physical not theoretical.

The Commission considered the design standards in the application.

Ms. Elger did not think the drawing adequately captured the landscape requirements.

- Mr. Dansie agreed the landscape plan was conceptual. A more thorough plan should be submitted to show greater detail.

Mr. Burns remained concerned about the impact this parking lot would have on the shuttle stop. This shuttle stop was already overwhelmed during certain times of the day and week. He said it was short-sighted to not have more consideration of the impact to the primary tool that moved people through Town.

- Mr. Marriott said they would be happy to explore but this was not part of the approval process for a parking lot.
- Mr. Burns said future lots should include an analysis of adjacent shuttle stops. It was not good or responsible planning.

Mr. Pitti expressed that many messages had come from the deliberation and public comments. He knew Mr. Marriott cared about the Town because of his service on the Commission for many years. Although standards had been met there was a lot of input from Canyon Springs subdivision residents, the greater community, the Planning Commission and Town Council. It was hoped Mr. Marriott would take concerns related to congestion, size, heat islands, design, and landscape into consideration as the project moved forward.

- Mr. Marriott committed they would look at every comment and integrate some of the ideas.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the DDR for a 112-space parking lot for Jon Michael Marriott representing Zion Park Land on parcel S-ZHP-3 located adjacent to the Hampton Inn. With the findings that it meets the requirements of the code 10-11B for the Village Commercial Zone as well as the conditions under the Zion Resort Settlement Agreement, with the exception of some items that will be outlined within the conditions attached. It meets the setbacks, landscape requirements with a follow up in the conditions, lot coverage with a follow up in the conditions, grading as part of the follow up as well, storm drainage as part of the follow up, access, lighting, colors and materials and other requirements that are part of 10-23-10 of the code requiring a parking lot owner to provide trash receptacles in the parking area. The Commission attaches the following conditions: 1) the Town engineer must review and approve the plans for storm water management prior to a permit being issued for the parking area; 2) the applicant must submit a more detailed landscape plan for the property including a plan to ensure the required landscape of the parking area is irrigated until it becomes established as in 10-18-6(C) of the landscape design for parking areas; 3) exhibit A that all property owners impacted by the 2010 amendment to the settlement agreement will sign the lot coverage analysis; 4) the transfer of the lot coverage involved with the Switchback expansion will be included in the lot coverage analysis; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Newman: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Determination of View Obstructing Lot – Canyon Springs Lot 10 – Ed Box: This proposed development was at the end of River Bend Circle which was in the Foothill Residential Zone. Although lot 10 was not a high visual impact lot it may be considered a view obstructing lot. As defined by code, a view obstructing lot could interrupt the view of the vertical cliff faces of the Navajo sandstone from any point on an adjacent lot within 350 feet. The lot to the south could be affected, however the impact was minimal. Based on his findings and conclusions, Mr. Dansie did not believe lot 10 was a view obstructing lot however he asked the Commission to make a formal conclusion.

Mr. Pitti did not feel it was obstructing, but in an effort to be transparent he wanted to give the community and neighboring property owner an opportunity to respond. There had not been any negative reaction.

- Mr. Staker noted a nearby cottonwood tree obliterated more than the house would.

Mr. Newman said it did not appear to be view obstructing. Mr. Marriott agreed and said the views were unobstructed.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the residential DDR for Canyon Springs Estates Lot 10 for Ed Box. The Commission has determined that although the lot is in the Foothill Residential Zone the small percentage of view obstruction was not severe enough to affect the neighboring properties and that we have determined it to be a non-view obstructing lot; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Burns: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

3. Sign Permit: Revision to existing freestanding sign at La Quinta Inn and Suites, 792 Zion Park Boulevard – Jonathan Zambella: Business centers were allowed one free-standing sign which could be double-sided. This proposal complied with Town Code but Mr. Dansie recommended the Commission verified colors in the logo were compliant.

Jonathon Zambella was in attendance to answer questions. He indicated the sign would be constructed using colors within the color palette and would submit a sample prior to construction.

Mr. Zambella explained sintra material was similar to PVC. It was shapeable, paintable and non-reflective and was a material used on a number of signs in Town.

- The sign would be externally illuminated and therefore allowed to use white lettering.

Mr. Marriott felt the application was compliant with the code, with verification of colors.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the sign permit for Zion Guru and La Quinta. The Commission finds it is compliant with sign height, size, location, illumination, materials and color. With the requirement that the actual color samples be verified to meet the Town's color palette; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye
Elger: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Burns: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Zambella asked about the volume relationship between business parking in Springdale and shuttle carrying capacity.

- Mr. Burns said carrying capacity was public information and an excellent planning tool.

Mr. Zambella asked about the timeline of the Park's Visitor Use Management Plan.

- Mr. Burns indicated the public review draft may be released sometime in December/January followed by a FONSI and decision document. Implementation would be done in phases.

Consent agenda:

Mr. Pitti proposed a change to the August 15th minutes on page 11. After the motion to close public hearing. He asked to replace the following: *'Mr. Pitti did not have confidence in understanding the settlement agreement. He felt the applicant was allowed to have a parking lot. His concern was coverage. He wanted to table to get more information and have a better understanding'* with *'Mr. Pitti felt uncomfortable interpreting the terms of the settlement agreement; however, felt a key component was missing for the Commission to make an informed decision. Specifically, the omission of Addendum B which states that the applicant must provide an updated coverage analysis with each new phase of development as part of the settlement agreement.'*

Ms. Elger proposed changes to the August 15th, 2018 minutes.

Under Item 2 Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision: Changes to section 10-23-10 of the Town Code the following addition was requested: *'Due to Mr. Marriott's recusal, Ethan Newman was the voting Commissioner for this agenda item.'*

In the deliberation section of this item under Mr. Burns' comments the following addition was requested: *'He indicated the draft VUMP will be released in 4th quarter 2018.'*

Under Item 4 Public Hearing: Zone Change Request for Luke Wilson, under the Commission questions to applicant section, the following edit was requested: *'Ms. Elger asked why the fifteen-foot (15') setback was requested. Mr. Wilson said it was intended to protect the river. Ms. Elger asked what was the impact of a thirty-foot (30') setback. Mr. Wilson said a thirty-foot (30') setback might require two less units.'*

Under Item 5 Public Hearing: Design/Development Review under the introduction section Ms. Elger requested the statement *'Ms. Elger expressed frustration the Commission had been discussing a long-term parking ordinance for a while and was not informed about this parking proposal'* be replaced with *'Ms. Elger reviewed the three dates June 5, July 3, and July 27 that the Planning Commission had either discussed or received information on changes to parking lot ordinances including a potential cap. She asked when the application was submitted. Mr. Dansie indicated the application was submitted on July 31.'*

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the minutes August 15th and September 4th with the additional changes; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn at 6:24pm made by Mike Marriott; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ DATE: _____

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.

From: Susan Hoover
To: [Tom C. Dansie](#); [Darci Carlson](#); planner@infowest.com
Subject: Comments for Public Hearing on August 15, 2018, Action Item #5
Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 3:39:25 PM

To: Tom Dansie, Darci Carlson, and Members of the Springdale Planning Commission
Re: Comments for Public Hearing on August 15, 2018, Action Item #5

A Public Hearing is scheduled for August 15, 2018, with a number of items on the agenda. As I am unable to attend this Public Hearing in person, in this email I have provided my comments on Action Item #5 for you to consider. I would appreciate my comments being addressed during the Public Hearing and included in the recorded meeting minutes.

Action Item #5. Public Hearing: Design/Development Review - Jon Michael Marriott, representing Zion Park Land, requests a DDR for a 112-space public parking area on parcel S-ZPH-3 (located adjacent to the Hampton Inn)

I am opposed to the submitted proposal for a public parking area. My concerns are specific to both the Settlement Agreement and the Town Ordinance pertaining to off street parking areas. Two sections of the Settlement agreement pertain to the proposal to which the current design falls short.

Section 2 of the Settlement Agreement pertains to Commercial Development, and specifically Section 2.b.iii (page 3) states “The parking area(s) serving commercial development must be separated from all portions of the building(s) housing the commercial development by a landscape buffer at least five feet in width.” The site of the “Future Buildings” show in the drawing submitted with the proposed public parking area does not comply with this part of the Settlement Agreement as one building is completely surrounded by concrete, another building has concrete on 3 sides and the last building attached to the public restroom structure has concrete on 2 sides. Even though those buildings are not under consideration at this time, there must be adequate space allowed in the design of the public parking area to comply with the Settlement Agreement.

Section 6 of the Settlement Agreement (page 4) states “Open Space located along the Virgin River and Highway SR-9, substantially similar to that depicted on the attached Exhibit A, will be preserved in any development plans submitted by ZPR.” I believe that the placement of the Future Buildings at the corner of SR-9 and Canyon Springs Road, shown in the proposed parking area plan, is not in compliance with the Settlement Agreement as approximately one-third of the SR-9 frontage of the parking lot is covered by a large concrete area and future buildings. I suggest that more green space should be placed between SR-9 and the concrete patio surrounding the future buildings, with just a path providing access from the patio to the shuttle stop on SR-9, in order to fulfill the spirit of Section 6 of the Settlement Agreement.

Next, I call your attention to the purpose of the existing **Code Ordinance for Off Street Parking Requirements and Standards, Chapter 10-23-1(A)**. I have concerns specific to each

of these stated purposes where Mr. Marriott's proposed public parking lot design falls short. I have copied the text of the Ordinance Purpose in **bold** text, followed by my concerns in *italics*.

10-23-1(A) Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to provide standards for off street parking that:

1. Promote traffic and pedestrian safety and efficiency, alleviate traffic congestion, and promote pedestrian travel.

- a. Pedestrian Safety: I commend the design for including a walkway through the parking lot from the Hampton Inn and designated crosswalks across Canyon Springs Road and Desert Springs Road. However, the sidewalk along the north side of Canyon Springs Road stops before reaching Zion Park Blvd (SR 9), forcing pedestrians either to enter the parking lot space by the restroom building or cross the street towards the Switchback. Many people will choose to walk in the roadway of Canyon Springs at this point (going to The Bit & Spur across SR 9 or to the northbound shuttle stop), endangering themselves needlessly.*
- b. Traffic congestion: I anticipate that vehicles exiting the parking lot onto Canyon Springs Road at the end of the day will back up past the parking lot entrance, with visitors waiting to turn left onto SR 9. Since there is only one exit from this massive parking lot, visitors wanting to turn right on SR-9 will be blocked in. Canyon Springs Road is not wide enough to allow a separate left turn lane. Frustrated drivers will give up, turn around, and look for another way out, eventually finding Desert Springs Road to Big Springs Road, an unintended consequence of this oversized parking lot.*

2. Provide sufficient parking for proposed uses.

- a. There are no proposed uses for the Future Buildings 1, 2, & 3, located in the southwest corner of the proposed parking lot. A portion of one is designated as a Public Restroom. Presumably, any future use of those buildings would require parking spaces based on square footage and a supply loading/unloading area. The proposed layout appears to lend itself to using Canyon Springs Road as a supply loading/unloading area. This is totally unacceptable and will only add further congestion to Canyon Springs Road.*

3. Minimize rainwater runoff and the disturbance of natural vegetation.

- a. Currently, the entire area is permeable. Granted, work to install the box culvert has already disturbed a portion of the area. However, the proposed parking lot and future buildings will result in approximately 90% of this area being paved over. Without a designated drainage system, all surface water will run out of the parking lot entrance and flow down Canyon Springs Road, toward the Virgin River. This is not an acceptable solution to minimize rainwater runoff. A better solution is to reduce the number of parking spaces so that more green space can absorb rainwater.*

4. Promote innovative parking area design that helps retain the village character, scenic vistas, and natural beauty of the Town.

- a. The parking area design has a dead end lane in the middle of the lot. When these*

spaces are all full, there is no way for a vehicle to get out of the lane. This is a poor design that endangers pedestrians, may result in damaged vehicles and create excessive congestion. The parking lot design would be better served by sacrificing 15-20 parking spaces and replacing the dead end lane with a green space along the southeast side of the walkway to the Hampton Inn.

- b. The parking lot design does not seem to include designated handicapped parking spaces or handicapped access to the adjacent shuttle stop. Given the proximity of this parking lot to the shuttle top, it would be innovative to allow for easy wheelchair access from the shuttle stop to designated handicapped parking spots.*

5. Minimize impacts to neighboring properties.

- a. The only way to minimize the impacts of this parking lot to neighboring properties is to reduce the number of spaces. Given that the surrounding hotels are already covered with asphalt parking lots, one might think "what harm is there to having a large parking lot"? Parking lots are attractive to criminals due to the lower level of activity at certain times of the day or night. The larger a parking lot is, the more attractive for criminals, due to both the increased number of potential targets and the increased number of hiding places afforded by more vehicles.*
- b. Consideration must be given to residents of Canyon Springs Estates as a neighboring property. With the proposed entrance to the parking lot on Canyon Springs Road, the increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic encountered while entering and exiting the neighborhood is undeniable. And that is on top of the most recent hotel addition of Springhill Suites, which has already added an abundance of traffic on Canyon Springs Road.*

6. Require landscaping to avoid the creation of "heat islands" and to minimize visual impacts. (Ord. 2012-02, 3-14-2012)

- a. A parking lot that has 90% of the area covered with impervious surface must be the definition of a "heat island". No amount of greenery on the remaining 10% of the area can escape that, especially given that the proposed parking lot is already completely surrounded by asphalt in the form of adjacent streets and hotel parking lots. Even doubling the amount of green space on this lot would probably not alleviate the effect of all that asphalt.*
- b. Mr. Dansie's Memorandum dated August 10, 2018, indicates that landscape area requirements do not apply to the property. However, the Settlement Agreement does limit the amount of impervious material coverage. Based on the preliminary numbers supplied by Mr. Dansie, the total of existing buildings plus proposed parking area would be 360,664 sq. ft. leaving only 85,587 sq. ft. (that is less than 2 acres) available for the future single-family development of up to 18 lots at the north end of Desert Springs Road. Without allowing for any roads (which we all know cannot be done), that would result in lot sizes less than 5,000 sq. ft.*

In summary, I am 100% opposed to Mr. Marriott's Public Parking Area proposal on Parcel S-

ZPH-2. With 3 large hotels and 3 restaurants (soon to be 4) surrounding the intersection of Zion Park Blvd and Canyon Springs Road, this area is already prone to excessive traffic. The addition of a giant parking area here will only compound the problem and destroy what little village atmosphere may still exist.

The parking layout on this site is designed to squeeze every last parking space into the available area. I anticipate that for at least 4 months of the year, the lot will remain completely empty. An empty parking lot most certainly does not enhance the neighborhood and village atmosphere.

However, since it is highly likely that some form of parking lot will eventually appear on this parcel, I submit the following design changes for consideration by Mr. Marriott and the Town of Springdale Planning Commission:

- Relocate and redesign the concrete patios surrounding the Future Buildings to comply with the Settlement Agreement
- Extend the sidewalk on the north side of Canyon Springs Road all the way to Zion Park Blvd (SR 9) to provide safe pedestrian access without entering the public parking area
- Reduce the number of parking spaces to a maximum of 60
- Increase in green space (permeable surface) by at least a factor of 2
- Minimize runoff from the proposed parking area onto Canyon Springs Road, documented in a formal storm water management plan
- Designate handicapped parking spaces and design an accessible pathway from the parking lot to the adjacent shuttle stop
- Incorporate a designated loading/unloading zone into the proposed parking area design for use by the Future Buildings so that Canyon Springs Road does not become a de facto loading dock

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Susan Hoover

[REDACTED]

Springdale



Virus-free. www.avast.com