



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 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, Jack Burns, and Mike Marriott

EXCUSED: Ethan Newman and Cindy Purcell

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 Mike Marriott to approve the agenda; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Meeting schedules for the remainder of the year had changed slightly. The Commission would meet again on November 13th for their work meeting; packet materials would be distributed shortly. The December 5th meeting would be a combined regular and work meeting. During the December meeting the Commission would recommend a Chair and Vice Chair for 2019.

Action Items

1. Public Hearing: Development Agreement – The Historic Preservation Commission has requested a development agreement between the Town of Springdale and the owners of the Best Western Hotel (668 Zion Park Boulevard). The agreement would transfer ownership of a historic building and the property on which it sits to the Town and would allow the construction of 10 additional transient lodging units on the Best Western property: This agreement had been proposed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The intent was to preserve the historic structure on the Best Western property and convert its use to a Town museum/history center.

Development agreements were allowed in Town Code and were intended to provide development incentives in exchange for community amenities or benefits. Any recommendation from the Planning Commission would be forwarded to the Town Council who would ultimately decide whether to enter into the development agreement.

Mr. Dansie noted some secondary aspects of the donated property would need to be worked out in the development agreement. These issues included rezoning to Public Use, lot width, parking, and setbacks. He reiterated the main focus for the Commission tonight was to determine if the general concept made sense.

One public comment letter had been received which expressed support for preservation of the structure but expressed concern about the nature of the incentive.

Mr. Marriott declared a potential conflict due to expressing interest to staff several weeks earlier about being part of a Town museum project. Mr. Marriott also acknowledged having spoken with Jeff Carlson before the meeting regarding this proposal.

- Mr. Staker indicated he too spoke with Mr. Carlson before the meeting.

Commission questions to staff: If rezoned Public Use, Mr. Burns noted retail sales was a prohibited use.

- Mr. Dansie agreed a stand-alone retail establishment would not be allowed. However, a gift shop was traditionally considered an ancillary use for a museum.

Ms. Elger asked about administrative office use in the Public Use zone.

- Mr. Dansie indicated government offices were allowed in the Public Use zone.

Mr. Pitti said it was difficult to separate the secondary aspects from the general concept.

- Assuming the Commission agreed the concept had merit, Mr. Dansie suggested other development difficulties - such as setbacks, parking reductions, or landscape area reductions - could be addressed through tools in the development agreement process.

Mr. Dansie reiterated the HPC was driving the process but the property owner was a willing partner. Any legal fees associated with crafting the development agreement would be the responsibility of the Town.

Mr. Staker asked if there was an attempt to evaluate the economics of the deal.

- Mr. Dansie said the HPC had looked extensively at the financial impact of running a museum from an operational standpoint. He was unsure the market value of the property versus the income from ten additional rooms. Since the Town did not operate as a business, Mr. Dansie suggested the key for the Planning Commission to consider was the intrinsic value of this benefit versus the impact of the development. The Best Western was maxed out on the number of allowable hotels units. If this agreement was approved the only concession to the Best Western property was the allowance for ten additional hotel units.

If a museum didn't work out, Mr. Burns asked about other potential uses for the building if the property was rezoned Public Use.

- Mr. Dansie said the Public Use zone allowed government facilities, clinics, post offices, or visitor centers.
- Mr. Burns raised concern that certain elements of the structure, such as lack of parking, may not be feasible to support any public facility.

Public questions to staff: Mark Chambers asked the mechanism in Town Code to reduce the minimum lot size.

- Mr. Dansie said the Public Use zone did not have a minimum lot size per code section 10-12-3(A). Setback standards could be reduced through a development agreement.

Mr. Chambers asked how the Town defined a landmark. Additionally, since the Best Western did not tear the building down, he asked about other uses.

- Mr. Dansie indicated there was no definition at this point. Early in the development of the hotel, the HPC reached out to property owners who voluntarily agreed to preserve the building.

Mr. Chambers questioned the costs to bring the building up to standard.

- Mr. Dansie indicated the Historic Preservation Commission had done a lot of investigation regarding this and Mr. Carlson was prepared to provide information.

Kathleen Kavarra-Corr asked if the Town could buy a piece of property for a museum or move this building to a site already owned.

- Mr. Dansie did not think the Town had the resources to either acquire or relocate. Both would be cost prohibitive.

Commission questions to applicant: Jeff Carlson, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, was in attendance to answer questions. Mr. Carlson elaborated key points concerning the request. He said the HPC charter to preserve, protect and promote historic assets in Town was consistent with the General Plan. It was important for residents and visitors to have a place where the heritage of the community could be shared. At the outset a primary objective was to create an opportunity without the Town writing a big check.

Conversations with the Canyon Ranch ownership went through a number of iterations. There had been a lot of research done concerning building rehabilitation, creating an operating plan, budgeting, and future fundraising. If there were secondary development issues identified, the HPC wanted to work with the Planning Commission to find ways to collaborate and solve them.

Mr. Burns commented it had been a challenge to get people to step up and be part of the HPC. Therefore, he questioned leadership into the future and if there was the foundation needed to support a museum.

- Assuming this proposal worked for the Town, Mr. Carlson acknowledged it would take months to get through the decision-making process. It was difficult to get people involved when discussing concepts however a Town survey indicated people would get involved with a tangible project. A historic society could also be established to help fill the gaps. The HPC did see the need to recruit more people to help.

Mr. Pitti had read through HPC minutes and was a believer in historic preservation. He raised concern that no historic information about this particular building had been presented.

- As part of the SR-9 reconstruction project, UDOT hired a consultant to conduct an Intensive Level Survey to authenticate and document the history of local buildings with the potential to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. The report would be completed soon.
- During an earlier Reconnaissance Level Survey this building was identified as having significant historic value and could be a candidate for the Register.

Mr. Pitti agreed with Mr. Burns' assessment concerning the energy needed to pull off this project.

- Mr. Carlson said a bigger group and history society was needed to support the tasks and activities of a museum.

Mr. Pitti asked about materials to fill the museum.

- There were a number of artifacts and collections in Town but until there was a tangible location there was no place to display. Mr. Carlson explained successful modern museums emphasized graphic displays and created a story for the visitor.

Mr. Marriott asked if the HPC solicited input from the Town on the type of museum they would like. He questioned the size of the building and how much display space would exist.

- The overall building size was approximately 1350 square feet. There was display, administrative and storage space. Responses from the HPC survey indicated people were interested in oral histories and photographs.

Mr. Marriott asked what the HPC had done to consider other preferred sites in Town in terms of museum operation.

- In their investigation, other sites were either too expensive or the property owners were unreasonable to deal with. Therefore, the Best Western location became a primary contender especially given the timing of the property development.

Mr. Burns felt there was a captive audience in this location given proximity to hotels and shuttle stops. He said the public expressed concern to the Planning Commission regarding large scale hotel development. This proposal only contributed to an already maxed out hotel property, which was in the opposite direction of what the Town wanted.

- Mr. Carlson agreed but noted other large hotel developments were still possible in Town. The HPC tried to recognize some of the positive factors with this property and this proposal.

Ms. Elger asked about the costs associated with building rehabilitation.

- Mr. Carlson said estimates ranged from \$120,000 to \$140,000 to fully rehabilitate the building. The Town inspector felt the building had good structure, foundation, beams, and walls.

Ms. Elger questioned asbestos in ceiling tiles.

- If the project was pursued, an inspection could be done.

Mr. Marriott asked the maximum building occupancy.

- Mr. Carlson would need to get more expert advice to answer. Large group admission could be staged if necessary.

Ms. Elger asked the impact of the museum on the nearby employee housing units.

- Mr. Carlson suggested a fence or landscape barrier could be installed.

Public questions to applicant: Stewart Ferber asked if the HPC had considered the Canyon Community Center (CCC) for museum space. The Town could use existing labor to staff and not add more expense to the budget.

- Mr. Carlson said the Town was greatly pressed for space and not interested in giving up room at the CCC. Staff could be provided through volunteers, docents, or an Easter Seals program. The goal was to fund the project without the need to increase taxpayer expense.

Kathleen Kavarra-Corr asked about the structure of the deal with Best Western. She suggested the owners consider a more community-oriented approach with tax-incentives.

- In order to create an effective museum, the HPC sought possession of the entire building. They met with the ownership group and this proposal was the result of discussions. Mr. Carlson said the property owners wanted an economic return for what they were giving up.

Nick Ence, one of the owners of Canyon Ranch, was in attendance to answer questions. He understood the emotion and concerns of the community. Only a slim majority of their ownership group favored this proposal while the rest were fine opening a retail shop. Mr. Ence said they were interested in creating a win-win for both parties but the Town needed to decide the value of preserving history in the community.

Mr. Burns suggested the existing group retain ownership but donate use of the building to the Town for a museum.

- Mr. Ence replied the owners understood the value of property and this arrangement would not benefit them. They felt this was a generous offer.

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

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: Jack Fotheringham owned property next to the hotel. The new larger hotel development brought more noise and adding ten more units would bring even more. Changing the zoning would devalue his property. Mr. Fotheringham did not see the historic significance of this property and there would be a lot of costs to rehabilitate it.

Mark Chambers thanked the HPC for their work. He was a big supporter of historic preservation but did not think this was the project to accomplish it. There were problematic issues with this property. Hotel units should not be traded for a museum and Mr. Chambers referenced the General Plan Chapter 1 Priority 5, Objective 3.1.1, Objective 3.1.3, and Chapter 14 Priority 5 to illustrate this point.

Kathleen Kavarra-Corr said the HPC had done tremendous work to try and preserve the village quality in Springdale. Development incentive was useful but she did not feel it was proper in this plan. Ms.

Kavarra-Corr encouraged the ownership group to consider a better negotiation given the public feedback. She also asked the Planning Commission to work on the museum idea and help it move forward.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to close public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Pitti commented the public supported the HPC and Springdale history but the question was whether the proposed agreement was proportionate to the public benefit. Mr. Pitti said the building had been extremely modified and questioned the historic viability. He did not feel this was a fair trade and could potentially be a burden for the Town. The Planning Commission had been discussing ways to bring the number of hotel rooms down and this proposal flew in the face of that objective.

Mr. Marriott did not think a museum on this particular site was sensible. He suggested the Town reach out to other property owners to see if there were better options to accomplish objectives.

- Ms. Elger agreed and felt the Town was giving an unfair advantage to the Best Western property owners. Other property owners might have ideas or make a better offer. Ms. Elger added this site had a number of issues and was an imperfect solution.

Mr. Staker acknowledged the economic value of the additional hotel rooms were not equal to the building's worth. However, no matter where a museum was proposed there would likely be objection.

- Mr. Pitti disagreed and said Chapter 6 of the General Plan, specifically Objectives 6.1.3 and 6.13.d encouraged display space. There was no objection to a permanent space but whether this agreement was proportionate to the public benefit.
- In the spirit of cooperation Mr. Staker suggested the Planning Commission help the HPC identify a place that would be acceptable.

Mr. Burns felt the HPC could pull off a museum in this space however he was not comfortable with the trade. As a Planning Commissioner it was his responsibility to look at the big picture and the built environment. Therefore, he could not support adding more hotel rooms to this property.

- Mr. Pitti agreed and noted General Plan Chapter 1 Priority 5, Objective 3.1.1 and 3.1.3, 3.1.3d supported the idea that increasing the number of hotel rooms was discouraged.

The Commission considered tabling but questioned if they would just continue to discuss the same items.

- Ms. Elger indicated her biggest issue was parking and that the incentive was not equivalent to the amenity.
- Mr. Staker said the Town went to a lot of trouble to make the community walkable. For him, parking wasn't the issue; it was more the economics.
- Mr. Marriott felt parking for a museum was a big issue.
- Mr. Burns felt there was still room for negotiation and suggested more time to allow the parties to discuss. The museum was positioned as a walkable space so parking was not an issue for him. Mr. Burns expressed part of the issue was recognition a museum was important to the Town.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to table the development agreement for the Historic Preservation Commission and give them ninety days to continue to work on the proposal and get broader feedback from the party they are working with, or any other party who they may be interested in working with in the future; seconded by Jack Burns.

Staker: Aye

Elger: No

Pitti: No

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed.

The Commission took a brief break. The meeting reconvened at 7:01pm.

2. Public Hearing: Design/Development Review – Joe Pitti and Mark Chambers request review of a building containing one dwelling unit on the Under the Eaves property (980 Zion Park Boulevard): Mr. Pitti recused himself. As Vice Chair, Mr. Marriott took over running the meeting.

This request was for a new residential building located at the rear of the Under the Eaves property and designated for use by the owners. It could, however, be converted to a rental unit in the future. The building would be accessed off the Ralston property driveway on West Temple Drive. Allowable building height in the Central Commercial zone was twenty-six feet (26') and would be achieved by reducing the roof pitch from 12:12 to 9:12.

Commission questions to staff: Mr. Marriott asked how the new development tied into the landscape requirements.

- Properties in the Central Commercial zone were required to retain 35% in natural open space or landscape area. Mr. Dansie suggested the landscape plan be verified with the applicant.

Mr. Marriott asked about parking requirements if the structure was not used as a nightly rental.

- Parking was not well-defined in Code when there was a mix of commercial and residential units. If a residential unit, two parking stalls were required; if a rental unit, one was required. The applicants proposed constructing one additional parking space to supply adequate parking.

There were currently seven rental units on the property. Because this property operated as a bed & breakfast, they were allowed eight units.

Public questions to staff: Ken Dailey asked if the Town could provide a better distinction between a hotel and bed & breakfast facility since many lodging establishments provided breakfast.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission was working to update and modernize transient lodging regulations to correct issues such as this.

Commission questions to applicant: Mark Chambers and Mr. Pitti were available to answer questions.

Mr. Burns asked if the new unit would be visible from the street.

- Mr. Pitti said they conducted a pole test and small angles of the upper portion may be seen but was mostly blocked.

Mr. Marriott asked about the landscape plan and how the site would be accessed for excavation.

- Mr. Pitti indicated they had a shared easement to access the property. They would continue to terrace the landscape to match what existed.

Mr. Burns felt information showing how this structure would fit in with other structures on the property was missing.

- Mr. Chambers showed where the existing buildings were located on the site plan.

Public questions to applicant: None were asked.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to open public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment: None were made.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to open public hearing; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Marriott felt the project looked nice. The one missing component was the site plan so the Commission could see how parking and the buildings would integrate.

Mr. Burns said it was good to see a project keeping with the Town's character.

- Ms. Elger said the new building fit in with the others on the property.
- Mr. Staker felt it was a nice-looking building and fit the development parameters.

Motion made by Suzanne Elger to approve the Design/Development Review for a new residential structure at 980 Zion Park Boulevard. The motion is based on the following findings: that the building size is in compliance with our standards along with the building height as modified to twenty-six feet (26'); that the setback requirements are met; that the building materials comply with Town standard and the colors are going to be selected from the Town's color palette; and the property is in compliance with the parking and grading standards. With the following two conditions: 1) in order to be in compliance with the height limit standards the structure must be constructed with a 9:12 roof pitch and have first floor elevation and grade level as shown in the revised structural drawings; 2) a landscaping plan and site plan be submitted prior to a building permit being issued; seconded by Allan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pitti returned to the dais.

3. Zone Change Request – AIL Group, LLC, represented by Mike Marriott, requests a zone change from Valley Residential (VR) to Valley Residential – Cottage Housing Development Overlay (VR-CHD) on parcel S-141-NP (immediately south of the Canyon Vista Bed and Breakfast). The zone change will allow the development of 12 cottages on 2.28 acres: Mr. Marriott recused himself.

The public hearing for this item was held last month during which time the Commission raised concerns about design and layout. Adjacent property owners also raised concern about impacts to their property in terms of noise, traffic, and the character of the community. In response, the applicant resubmitted a site design. In doing so some of the cottage units were placed in the flood hazard area. Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission development in the flood hazard area was allowed but prohibited in the flood way.

Additional public comment letters had been received voicing similar concerns to those voiced in the previous meeting.

Mr. Pitti asked how many units could be built on the property without the overlay zone.

- Mr. Dansie said the property could be sub-divided into three Valley Residential lots each supporting a single-family home or duplex, for a total of six units.

Mr. Burns asked if the development was intended to be employee housing.

- The intent was to use as employee housing, however, if this couldn't happen, Mr. Marriott explained they would like to develop the property as a cottage-style neighborhood and sell the units. Rental property was the initial preference.

Ms. Elger asked who owned the property.

- It was owned by AIL. Mr. Marriott was not one of the owners but represented the ownership group and had submitted a letter of authorization to act on their behalf.

Mr. Pitti appreciated the changes to the design as they made the development feel more residential. However, Mr. Pitti felt the spirit of the CHD was to create affordable housing, not rental units, and referenced section 10-13F-1 and 10-13F-4 from Code.

- Mr. Staker made the distinction low priced housing could be rental housing.

In addressing changes, Mr. Marriott said the common building was taken out in response to a neighbor conversation and request to reduce density. The revised parking layout was designed to better tie into the units and provide more visitor parking.

Ms. Elger asked about constructing the development in phases.

- Mr. Marriott said this would be driven by the ability of people to occupy them and market demand.

Mr. Burns asked how concerns by adjacent property owners were considered in any recommendation.

- Mr. Dansie said public feedback could be used as a factor to evaluate a project. Concerns should inform decisions related to standards in the ordinance and compliance with the General Plan.

Mr. Burns said people invest in property based on the current zoning. They should not be on guard to what could potentially happen adjacent to them.

- Zoning was a legislative action and by nature was always subject to change. Property owners did need to be on guard and why there was a public hearing process.

Mr. Marriott said cottage neighborhood units were charming and an asset to the community. Building three (3), five-thousand square foot (5,000 sq. ft) buildings would be more impactful.

- Mr. Pitti commented this proposal doubled the density. The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designated this property as agricultural/residential. Mr. Pitti read the definition from Chapter 13 of the General Plan.
- Mr. Marriott countered the open space and community garden in the proposal addressed these issues.

Ms. Elger understood the idea was to get affordable housing but feared the density was too much. She also questioned where garbage cans would be stored.

Mr. Burns wanted a clear picture the project would provide a different level of housing for people in Springdale.

- Mr. Marriott indicated that was the objective. Units were intended to provide housing for employees of their properties and would likely be subsidized, although these details would need to be worked out.

Mr. Burns felt the intent of the overlay was to benefit the community not a specific business. He was uncomfortable agreeing to a project that was a moving target.

- Mr. Marriott responded it could benefit both. The main objective was to provide housing for those who lived in Springdale. It was not a negative if people worked for their family of businesses.

Ms. Elger asked if AIL would manage the unit rentals.

- Mr. Marriott was not sure if the ownership entity would manage the property. The objective was not to make money off employee housing.

Mr. Staker noted there were other businesses that provided employee housing, in some cases it was free which was a form of subsidy.

- Ms. Elger underscored in this case it was using a CHD zone change to provide employee housing.

Mr. Marriott said the Planning Commission recently approved another CHD overlay zone without contingencies of who could occupy.

- Mr. Pitti said the units in that development were for sale. The location, density and objective of a cottage housing neighborhood were considerations in any recommendation.

Mr. Staker commented Commissioner Ethan Newman had indicated a lack of affordable rental housing was also a concern.

When considering a zone change, Mr. Burns said it had to be the right fit. A number of adjacent property owners expressed concern the development would be detrimental.

Mr. Marriott asked for feedback from the Commission of what should change.

- Ms. Elger was concerned with the number of units per acre and wanted the building density reduced.
- Mr. Pitti said this area was more rural in nature with a residential feel. Therefore, it was important to create a compatible design. Ultimately the Commission needed to determine if this application was appropriate for this particular property.
- In view of the zone change recommendation given to the other proposal with similar density, units per acre, and feet of buildout, Mr. Staker felt it would be arbitrary and capricious not to recommend approval of this request.
- Mr. Burns said this development would stretch out high density in part of Springdale with a rural feel which was counter to the character of the community. He was unsure the CHD zone, as currently drafted, was appropriate for this parcel of property.

Mr. Pitti suggested the item be tabled to give the applicant an opportunity to make adjustments based on tonight's discussion and input from neighbors.

As a matter of procedure, the Commission needed to take action on the application ninety days (90) from date of submittal. This could include tabling to a specific date. Mr. Dansie reiterated getting input and taking comments from neighbors in context of the overall decision-making process was essential, but the Commission could not deny an application just because neighbors didn't want it.

Motion made Joe Pitti to table the application until January 16th, or until the first regular Planning Commission meeting in January 2019 is held; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: No

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Motion passed.

Mr. Marriott returned to the dais.

4. Excavation Permit: 479 Zion Park Boulevard – Stewart Ferber: This was a proposal to enclose a portion of the Blacks Canyon Wash with a box culvert. Mr. Dansie noted removal of native vegetation would need to be replaced at a 2:1 ration. This proposal was in preparation for another project to redo the parking and access to the campground. Additional landscape restoration and revegetation would be done at completion of that project.

This wash was in a mapped special flood hazard area however the applicant had already been through an extensive process with FEMA to get a special letter of map revision to allow disturbance. Additional engineering analysis was required at the conclusion of the project and the developer would be required to provide this to the Town and FEMA.

Mr. Ferber was in attendance to answer questions. He indicated UDOT was in favor of this project because it would help get RV's off SR-9.

Ms. Elger asked about the red triangle on the site plan.

- Mr. Ferber said this indicated an easement provided by the neighbor. He hoped to start the project in December and it would take approximately three months to complete.

The Commission felt the project would enhance and improve the area.

- Mr. Pitti appreciated the property owner took time to work with FEMA and analyze effects of the project.
- Mr. Dansie said the Council determined this project was not development as regulated by Mr. Ferber's development agreement with the Town.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the Excavation Permit at 479 Zion Park Boulevard for Stew Ferber whereas the Commission finds it is in compliance with grading standards found in Chapters 10-13A and 10-15B that pertain this permit. With the following conditions: 1) The property owner must either: a) submit revegetation and landscape plans and have the revegetation and landscape complete within six months from the completion of the box culvert project, or alternatively, b) submit a DDR for the parking / access reconfiguration project; 2) Any mature native vegetation over six feet in height that is removed as part of the project must be replaced with vegetation of the same or similar species at a 2:1 ratio; 3) Limits of disturbance will be established on the downstream portion of the culvert project to protect the natural qualities of the portion of the wash that is not being altered; 4) The applicant is required to produce all post-construction engineering analysis and documentation required by the CLOMR and submit the same to both the Town and FEMA; seconded by Joe Pitti.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Consent agenda:

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the minutes October 17; seconded by Suzanne Elger.

Staker: Aye

Elger: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Burns: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn at 8:49pm 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.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting Planning Commission Date 11/7/18

Lila Moss
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Janet Jollin
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Stewart Fisher
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

DAVE BREER
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Luke Wilson
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Margie McNeal
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Ken Alby
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Nick Enre
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Paul Hansen
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Mark Chambers
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

RYAN GUBLER
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Donna Smith
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Kathleen L. Coyle
Name (please print)

Name (please print)

KEVIN BOWERS
Name (please print)

Name (please print)