



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
ON TUESDAY NOVEMBER 13, 2018, AT 4:00PM  
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

**Meeting convened at 4:00PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Joe Pitti, Allan Staker, Suzanne Elger, Jack Burns, and Mike Marriott

**ABSENT:** Ethan Newman

**EXCUSED:** Cindy Purcell

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Sophie Frankenburg, and Deputy Clerk Katy Brown recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

**Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Allan Staker to approve the agenda; seconded by Suzanne Elger.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commission discussion and announcements:** Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission that there would be only one meeting in December which would take place on the 5<sup>th</sup> at 5:00PM. The Commission would discuss who should serve as Chair and Vice Chair for 2019 during that meeting.

Mr. Dansie also summarized a few training reminders for the Commission:

- 1) The Commission was charged with reviewing the merit of each proposal that came before them within the constraints of whether or not the proposal met standards set by Town Ordinance and was congruent with the General Plan. If an application met those standards, the Commission was obligated to approve, whereas if it did not meet standards, the Commission could deny the proposal. The Commission could not base their decisions on the merit of the applicant or their opinion of the person presenting the application.
- 2) Discussions and deliberations should be civil and respectful.
- 3) Since the Commission was tasked with reviewing proposals based on merit, it was important to keep in mind that the Commission's primary objective was to review proposals, not necessarily to offer design suggestions and alternatives to the applicant.

**Non-Action Items**

**Discussion of revised regulations for transient lodging:** Mr. Dansie highlighted some of the changes to the ordinance since the last work meeting. Changes included identifying and defining different types of lodging such as bed & breakfast, large hotel/motel, small hotel/motel, short term rental/vacation rental, and hostel. Mr. Dansie had also researched the difference between an "inn" and "hotel" and found that an "inn" spoke to a lodging establishment in a rural area, which would describe all lodging options in Springdale.

- Mr. Pitti suggested classifying small hotel/motels with less than 40 units as an Inn.

Mr. Dansie noted that there was a large number of multi-unit developments in the residential zones that were approved but not yet built, namely in Moenave. There was also "unbuilt potential" available via undeveloped lots in the Canyon Springs and Anasazi subdivisions. Because of this, Mr. Dansie was not convinced that setting a cap on the amount of lodging units per every one residential unit (via setting a

ratio) would necessarily accomplish the Commission's goal of curtailing an excess amount of lodging units. Mr. Dansie recommended looking at alternate approaches as outlined by the General Plan if the Commission sought more oversight on how lodging was to be developed in the future. Options included looking at the number of hotel units allowed per sq. ft. of property and maximum size of hotel based on number of units.

Mr. Marriott asked for clarification on the definition for number of rooms in a suite unit (under Hotel/Motel).

- Mr. Pitti asked if the number of rooms in a suite could be defined based on internal separations as well as having a separate entrance.
- Mr. Dansie agreed to update.

Mr. Marriott commented on primary vs. secondary building materials under Hotel Design Standards. Particularly, he questioned stucco as secondary building material in terms of volume for visual impact.

- Mr. Dansie was trying to emphasize that "primary" vs. "secondary" wasn't necessarily in terms of quantity of materials used, but rather the prominence or emphasis of those materials in the architectural design.

Mr. Marriott recommended a minimum of 24" on extensions of the roof lines. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Staker asked if the design standards in the proposed ordinance would be requirements or suggestions.

- Mr. Dansie said the standards would apply to any new transient lodging facility with more than 8 units, as well as any expansions or renovations to any transient lodging facility that either adds or impacts more than 12 transient lodging units.
- Mr. Marriott was concerned about any existing buildings and how the ordinance would impact future additions. With a new/different set of design standards, the facility could potentially end up having mismatched designs.

Mr. Burns felt the proposed standards lacked direction on how much of a structural element must be present in order to achieve "Parkitecture."

- Mr. Marriott suggested determining a maximum percentage for stucco.
- Mr. Pitti suggested keeping stucco listed as a secondary building material and attach a percentage to it.

Mr. Staker shared his opinion of a home he saw which included a full stucco wall that met a full stone wall at a corner. He felt the juxtaposition of the two materials meeting at a corner was peculiar and wondered if the Commission wanted to take that into consideration in the ordinance.

- The Commission agreed and felt that stucco served as a good building material for the desert climate but wanted to offer more direction on quantity so it wouldn't over burden the visual impact of the overall design.
- Mr. Dansie would refine based on the Commission's discussion.

Mr. Marriott felt further refinement was needed in regards to setbacks and height standards found in paragraph 2.A under Hotel Design Standards. He felt that buildings on the east side (river side) of SR-9 offered less visual impact. The buildings on the west side of SR-9 seemed to be far more imposing considering their position in relation to the road.

- The Commission voiced concerns over paragraph 2.A in general and felt it was not clear without further interpretation from staff.
- Mr. Dansie recommended taking the section entirely out rather than leave in language that was ambiguous and difficult to understand.

The Commission further discussed visual impact. The newly constructed Terrace Brook Lodge came up as an example of high visual impact due to its positioning on the upslope side of SR-9 and its close proximity to the road. Conversely, the Hampton Inn's main building had relatively low visual impact, even as a two-story building, since it was set back further from the road and it was on the lower side of SR-9.

- Mr. Dansie suggested simplifying the ordinance by requiring two-story buildings to be a certain number of feet from the roadway.

The Commission agreed that developing a ratio for housing/lodging mix was not a good way to regulate future lodging development.

Mr. Staker and Mr. Marriott felt that development in Springdale was self-limiting and there were very few parcels left to develop.

- Mr. Dansie agreed that the potential for more large hotels in Springdale was very limited, although the potential for properties converting from commercial uses to vacation rental units was highly likely.

Mr. Pitti felt that the Commission should agree on a standard to serve as a message to future developers that clarified what the Town wanted to see in terms of size and scope.

Mr. Burns asked the Commission to also consider what kind of community they envisioned as a neighbor to a National Park. He felt the current trends could easily transform Springdale into another Estes Park unless the standards for size and scope were abundantly clear.

Ms. Elger was concerned that commercial businesses long enjoyed by residents could easily begin to convert to nightly vacation rentals, cutting off the potential for community enjoyment or patronage. She felt the trend would ultimately undermine the sense of community that many wanted to protect.

- Mr. Burns agreed and felt that vacation rentals accommodated a sense of consumptive tourism that only took from a community and didn't give anything back.

Mr. Pitti felt that investors were looking to Springdale as a place to benefit from lodging ventures rather than looking to build up other types of businesses that fostered community.

- Mr. Marriott suggested hoteliers could be viewed as partners in building community rather than an enemy.
- Mr. Burns felt that the biggest threat to a community was commercial development, but not just hotel development. The type and scale of businesses had the potential to drastically shape the surrounding community.

Mr. Staker felt that development in Springdale in the last ten years was indicative of the trends happening at large in the country and it was increasingly difficult to reverse it. He didn't see revising ordinances in an attempt to stymie certain types of development as a productive task for the Planning Commission.

Ms. Elger agreed that Springdale had changed and would continue to change, but also felt that the Commission should plan for what they want rather than passively allow the town to become just a mix of vacation rentals and gift shops. She was in favor of exploring ways to limit the conversion of commercial properties into vacations rentals.

Mr. Pitti reiterated the Planning Commission's charge to consider the concerns voiced from the community and translate that feedback into planned growth that was conducive to both community and commerce.

The Commission agreed to discuss strategy that would represent all sides of the community in upcoming work meetings.

**Cottage Development Overlay (CHD) Zone:** Mr. Dansie reviewed that the intent of the overlay zone had been to encourage an underrepresented type of housing. After reviewing two proposals for the CHD zone, the Commission had encountered a number of concerns about the real-world application of the ordinance. Mr. Dansie summarized the Commission's concerns as a map for possible revisions to the ordinance:

- **Density:** Current ordinance allowed six cottages per acre under, however the General Plan suggested five cottages per acre.

- **Layout/Design:** The Commission felt they could strengthen standards in terms of cottage arrangement to clarify how the cottage neighborhood should look and feel. They wanted to discourage too much uniformity and promote a more “clustered” development.
- **Maximizing without concern to sensitive areas:** The Commission could determine the appropriate number of cottages in a development by looking at total developable area, exempting flood hazard areas, steep slopes, or riparian areas inherent on the property.
- **Parking areas:** The Commission could discuss the best approach to parking areas in the CHD and whether to promote a larger, combined parking area or promote splitting up the areas to minimize impacts.

Ms. Elger asked who originally had input in the General Plan regarding cottage housing developments.

- Mr. Dansie said that feedback on pocket neighborhoods was taken from the 2010 General Plan revision wherein housing was identified as a priority. A Housing Committee was formed at that time and reported their findings to the Commission who crafted an ordinance for the Council to review. The Council ultimately did not approve the ordinance but the concept was revived during the 2015 General Plan update and has continued as a priority for the Commission ever since.

Mr. Pitti wanted to see the current developments built before making any further refinements to the ordinance.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission could make a statement to the Council that they would not recommend favorably on any other applications for cottage housing developments until the Commission had chance to see the current developments finished.

The Commission agreed to continue discussion in a subsequent work meeting.

**Motion to adjourn at 5:51pm made by Allan Staker; seconded by Mike Marriott.**

**Staker: Aye**

**Elger: Aye**

**Pitti: Aye**

**Burns: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Katy Brown, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: Joe Pitti DATE: 12.5.18

**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](mailto: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 Meeting Date 11/13/18

Stewart Feby  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)

Joyce Hartless  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)

Reay  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)