



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

**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2014  
AT 5:30 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH. THE WORK MEETING  
BEGAN AT 5:00 PM.**

**Work Meeting**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Acting Chair Mike Marriott, Commissioners Jack Archer, Tony Benevento, Randy Taylor and Liz West

**EXCUSED:** Joe Pitti and NPS Liaison Kezia Nielsen

**ALSO PRESENT:** DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Fay Cope, recording. 12 citizens signed in, see attached list.

**Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items:**

**Welcome new commissioners:** Mr. Marriott welcomed new members, Alternate Liz West and Tony Benevento, to the Commission. He was looking forward to working with them.

**Disclosure statements:** The clerk explained the disclosure statements were required by the Utah Code of Ethics and would be filed with the Mayor. They were public documents. Commissioners should fill out the form and return them to her as soon as possible, before they left, if possible

**DCD review of agenda items:**

**Cottage Neighborhood Developments:** The 'new' concept of cottage neighborhoods permitted higher-density developments designed as a neighborhood around a common space with common parking. Basic regulations were:

- One acre minimum, 6 cottages per acre plus a common structure, if desired.
- Maximum 12 cottages (on at least 2 acres)
- Allowed in VC, CC, and VR zones. More dense than normally allowed in VR, less dense than allowed in commercial zones.
- Individual ownership of lots.
- No more than 8 cottages could cluster on a common space. If there were 12 cottages, there would be at least two common spaces.
- Mr. Taylor asked if one acre of a two-acre parcel wasn't buildable, all 12 units could be placed on the buildable acre. Yes, as it was written.

**Accessory Dwelling Units:** Again, this would allow for a different type of housing than was allowed in Springdale now. Basic regulations:

- 1000 SF max
- One additional parking space per ADU
- Owner must reside on property.
- Could be in the main building or in a separate building.
- The ordinance didn't expressly forbid building an ADU for rental purposes, but 10-22-15 C (7) made it difficult. The Commission could address that more directly if they chose. Mr. Taylor asked who would inspect units. Mr. Mabbutt suggested the compliance officer could do that.

**Mixed-use live/work units:** In this revision, the PD approval process was revised to require less up-front applicant expense. PD projects were presently allowed in commercial zones, but not commercial uses within the project. This revision would allow an owner of a unit to also use part of their unit commercially. They couldn't lease space to someone else and they couldn't use the entire unit commercially. There might be building codes or fire codes that would affect the structure of the units,

**Zone map:** The legislation which permitted these smaller lots was already adopted. This map revision would specify the parcels. New subzones were: VR-A: ¼ acre, VR-B 5000SF

**Commercial Remodel – Thai Sapa:** This was already a non-conforming building. The proposal was to increase the height of the patio walls to meet the roof. If used as dining area, the parking would have to be re-calculated.

**Bylaw amendments:** Revisions included revolving the chairmanship in January rather than September, revising emergency meeting notice to comply with OPMA, and other housekeeping changes. Mr. Dansie thanked the Clerk for revising the document.

**Discussion of recently approved development projects under construction:** Mr. Archer asked about Moenave subdivision's construction plans. Mr. Dansie said they had now received all the approvals they needed to proceed with construction.

The Commission adjourned to the regular meeting without a break.

### **Regular Meeting 6:38**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice Chair Mike Marriott, Commissioners Jack Archer, Tony Benevento, Randy Taylor and Liz West

**EXCUSED:** Joe Pitti and NPS Liaison Kezia Nielsen

**ALSO PRESENT:** DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Fay Cope, recording. 12 citizens signed in, see attached list.

**Approval of agenda: Motion to approve the agenda by Jack Archer, seconded by Randy Taylor:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Commission discussion and announcements:**

Mr. Dansie announced there were Girl Scout Cookies for sale at the front desk.

### **Action Items**

#### **Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision: Addition of regulations for Housing Developments. Cottage Neighborhoods would allow clustering of smaller residential units with common open space.**

Mr. Dansie explained this was a new concept for Springdale and was allowed in the VR, CC, and VC zones only. The ordinance allowed neighborhoods of 6 cottages per acre, maximum 12 cottages on 2 acres. The concept was for smaller, individually owned units centered on a common area. There were limits on how close together cottage neighborhoods could be.

#### **Questions from Commission and Public:**

- Mr. Archer asked for clarification about the way cottages could be clustered. Mr. Dansie said they could be clustered in any way, but only 8 could center on one common space. So two common spaces would be required for 12 units. There was no prohibition against garages. In fact, the common building could be a garage.
- The idea was to cluster the parking, too. Mr. Archer said it had been discussed in a previous meeting that each unit should have a storage area. Mr. Dansie said that wasn't required, but it wasn't prohibited, either. The common building could be storage.
- Shaunna Young asked if someone with two ¾ acre VR lots could combine the lots and build 6 cottages. Mr. Dansie said there were other criteria that had to be met, but if they met those criteria, it was possible.
- Karla Player asked what size they would be: Maximum 1500 SF with a 1000 SF maximum footprint.

**Motion to open the public hearing by Jack Archer, seconded by Randy Taylor:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- Shaunna Young thought this was a great concept in a lot of ways, but not for every area in town. In some areas, she thought it would be disastrous.

- Bill Bassett thought this could negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods. He asked the Commission to think about having a development like this next to their own neighborhoods
- Lisa Zumpft read a quote about progress from Jim Stiles, author of *Brave New West*: “Progress is suitable housing for all its citizens. Development is another tacky condo development for wealthy out-of-towners looking to invest in a second home and hoping to turn a tidy profit.” She said she liked the pocket neighborhood concept very much because it offered the possibility of suitable housing for a market whose needs were not met. She had served on the housing committee and she knew and appreciated how much time Mr. Marriott had spent researching the idea and bringing it to the committee. She hoped there could be a way to make these developments a place for *residents*, people who would live here, not for second home owners or absent owners. She was concerned whether development of water and sewer would meet future requirements and suggested that it would be appropriate to do an analysis after every development approval. She said the public hadn’t had much time to read the drafts and didn’t know about the attorney’s comments. She agreed with Ms. Young and Mr. Bassett that this kind of development might be better in a commercial zone. She asked the Commission to table the item so there was more time to study the ordinance.
- Karla Player asked for whom this ordinance was targeted. Mr. Marriott said it was hard to know who this would attract; it might not be a low-income option. Ms. Player thought it was ‘fraught’ with problems.
- Louise Excell said she also sat on the citizen housing committee that brought together proposals to take to the Commission. Randy Aton, Mary Stults, Louise Excell, April Gates, Lisa Zumpft and Mike Marriott were also on that committee. The three ordinances on the agenda that night were direct results of that committee’s input. She said it was important for a healthy community to be diverse - economics, background, age, etc. The whole idea behind the cottage neighborhood was to give developers an incentive to provide affordable housing options in Springdale. The hope was that young families or employees who now had to live downstream could live in Springdale and become vested citizens. She said the housing committee hadn’t intended pocket neighborhoods to be either rich enclaves or shoddy neighborhoods, and if the ordinance didn’t prevent that, maybe it did need more work. She was in favor of this if it would encourage diversity.
- Brant Warner thought this was a good concept and there was a need for it. He just thought it was allowed in too many places in town. He agreed with Shaunna Young – there were places this would be horrible, and if increased density were allowed all over town, it might be disastrous. He also questioned the lack of infrastructure plans. He thought this was a good idea, but it was being done badly by allowing it all over town.
- Allan Staker wondered if it would be possible to walk through town and see how many places this kind of development would be likely. He wasn’t sure there were that many.
- Dan Mabbutt said he’d heard many people say the same thing – the Commission needed to table this and let the town learn more about it. He said he was in general agreement with the intent of the ordinance. He said if an ordinance could be crafted that captured the good intentions that had been expressed, they ought to do it. He said any ‘hole’ in the ordinance wouldn’t be caught that night; it would be caught when a developer’s team went to work on the ordinance to find it. He recommended taking more time on it.
- Bill Bassett asked which zones these would be allowed in: VR, CC, and VC. He said he was concerned about the inclusion of VR, especially in his part of town. The parcel next to town hall was appropriate. He asked if individuals could approach the town to have areas excluded.
- Karla Player said she only had one thing to say: Economics. Sol Town units, which were 500SF, sold for over \$200k. These units could be 1500SF and she wasn’t sure they would ever be ‘affordable.’
- Ms. Excell said the committee had indeed walked through Springdale and they had realized it wouldn’t be possible to develop this kind of neighborhood everywhere.
- Kristy Staker said there were places that would be perfect for this. They were commercially zoned and off the main highway. Elm Street and the empty field on Big Springs Road were examples. She recommended the Commission identify commercial properties whose location made them ‘illogical’ for commercial use and identify them as appropriate for cottage neighborhoods.
- Brant Warner said the agenda wording included nearly everything in town. He suggested eliminating VR and coming back next month. He said affordability was not guaranteed. As property values kept increasing, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> time buyers would pay much more than the original buyers.

**Motion to close public hearing by Jack Archer, seconded by Tony Benevento:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Commission deliberation:**

- Mr. Archer asked what happened with the packet information. The clerk said it had been posted last week, but at some point during the weekend, it disappeared from the town webpage. She said she had reposted it as soon as she learned it was gone and had notified her e-list.
- Mr. Archer suggested the town should host another information social. He'd heard they were successful at 'getting people out'. It would be better to inform 100 people than 20. He thought it would be a great opportunity to show people what cottage neighborhoods could look like. He expressed concern about how increasing development would affect the water system. He said the water treatment plant was nearing capacity. Moenave was adding about 55 units, some of which would be moderately priced. He wondered who would really be able to afford cottages. Not the workers. He said there were other big issues: Irrigation water, increased traffic, Winderland congestion, etc. He thought a Town gathering was a good idea.
- Ms. Benevento asked how VR had been included in the concept and was told it had always been included, beginning with the recommendation from the housing committee. She suggested a map showing possible locations would be helpful.
- Mr. Taylor said he had problems with this ordinance early on – he thought garages were necessary and should be required. Otherwise yards became junkyards. He wondered if pocket neighborhoods should be conditional uses. Mr. Dansie said the ordinance required a zone change, which gave the town far more regulatory choices than a conditional use permit.
- Ms. West said she was new and inexperienced. She had read the packet material but thought she needed to learn more. She was concerned that higher density developments like these could affect population growth faster than Springdale was ready to experience and feared Springdale's 'integrity as Springdale' would be lost.
- Mr. Marriott said he had explored this idea in depth during the general plan update and had taken the idea to the housing committee. He thought these neighborhoods had amazing potential and could 'fit right in'. He didn't think they would necessarily be affordable, even though they were higher in density. He agreed with Mr. Archer - he didn't think this concept would work for a dishwasher's budget. He said it sounded like a pause in the process was a good idea. He suggested tabling the item, making sure the packet was available and asking the townspeople to provide feedback about how to make this better.
- Mr. Archer asked if the Council knew the Commission wanted to have a town gathering. Mr. Dansie said they were completely supportive of a meeting, though they were expecting a different focus.

**Motion by Jack Archer to table this item until February 18 so the community had another opportunity to review the packet information, look at examples of cottage housing online and provide feedback to the Commission. Seconded by Tony Benevento:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Archer strongly suggested getting the gathering scheduled.

Mr. Bassett said any maps provided the Commission would be helpful for the townspeople, too.

**Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision: Addition of section 10-22-15, making allowance for Accessory Dwelling Units and revisions to related sections. Accessory Dwelling Units would allow the long term rental of guesthouses and casitas as residential units.**

Mr. Dansie said the ordinance now prohibited long-term occupancy of casitas and other accessory structures but this revision allowed long-term rentals under certain circumstances. There were provisions to protect neighborhoods and views.

### **Questions from the Public:**

- Karla Player asked and Mr. Marriott answered: Which zones would allow this use? VR and FR. Could people build units for the purpose of renting them? The ordinance didn't anticipate someone building a casita to rent, but it didn't prohibit it.
- Bill Bassett: This ordinance was permitting what was already happening illegally all over town. Mr. Dansie acknowledged that. He said the town thought it was important to establish regulations to protect neighborhoods, if possible.

- Kristy Staker asked and Mr. Dansie answered: What does 'long-term' mean? 60 days. Ms. Staker thought it was already okay to rent out casitas long-term. No.
- Ms. Player said she thought the ordinance already allowed long-term rental of a home to up to three unrelated people. Mr. Dansie explained: 1) One family could occupy a single family home. A family was defined as 'any number of people related by blood, marriage or adoption, or 2) up to three unrelated people could occupy a single-family home. If she owned a three-bedroom house, she could rent two rooms to unrelated people. If she had a family of three, she couldn't rent any rooms because there would be four unrelated people in the house.
- Bill Bassett thought even though vacation rentals were prohibited, this opened the door to the idea. Mr. Marriott said no – that was expressly prohibited.
- Mr. Warner said this seemed to 'lend more to vacation rentals' than not. He asked who monitored these things and was told it would be Garen Brecke, the compliance officer.

**Motion to open the public hearing by Jack Archer, seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- Louise Excell thought the 60-day limit was not long-term enough. She suggested 90 days. She said, and this applied to all the hearing items, it was unfortunate that people who didn't like the ordinance said they hadn't had a chance to study it and asked the town to table it. She passionately complained about the attitude people were showing against opportunities to help the people who were the lifeblood of the community. She then left.
- Shaunna Young thanked the Commission for considering this ordinance revision. She said she would like to see a couple of changes to the proposed revision. 1) She agreed with Ms. Excell that 90 days better defined long-term rental. 2) If it was a separate structure on the property, why did the property have to be a minimum of ¾ acres? Why not ½ acre? 3) She said most casitas she knew of were more than 1000 SF and many already existed that were detached on property smaller than ¾ acre.
- Karla Player said she would like to see the VR zone removed from the ordinance. Most VR properties were in subdivisions with CCRs that would prohibit this use. Neighborhood like hers would be negatively impacted.
- Lisa Zumpft liked this idea and thought it was one way to alleviate housing shortages. She liked the requirement for a notarized statement that the owner would be living in one of the dwelling. She preferred the 90 day requirement, and she thought it was a good idea to require notice to the neighbors. She agreed with Shaunna Young that ½ acre vs. ¾ acre was irrelevant.
- Dan Mabbutt commented on the process. If the Commission had a really good idea in this meeting and didn't take the time to write it properly, it would go to the Council and perhaps go back to the Commission again. He said the ordinance process now included multiple work meetings and multiple hearings.
- Karla Player asked, if they didn't remove VR from the ordinance, if they would specify 'existing structures' to prohibit the building of additional structures just for rentals.

**Motion to close public hearing by Tony Benevento, seconded by Jack Archer:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Deliberation:**

- Mr. Taylor supported including the FR zone. He lived in a FR subdivision that prohibited rentals, but it had happened anyway. He said the HOA wasn't able to stop it, so it seemed sensible for the town to have regulatory authority, instead of it being completely ignored. There would also be a record. 90 days seemed logical to him.
- Mr. Archer asked Mr. Dansie if he got much feedback from neighbor notices. Occasionally.
- Ms. West thought the 90-day rental time was a very good idea. She thought FR should be included to be consistent with the community.
- Ms. Benevento asked if a casita bigger than 1000 SF would be prohibited. Mr. Dansie said yes; the idea was to keep the neighborhood impact minimal. Mr. Archer said he agreed that two large structures on a lot seemed excessive. Ms. Benevento and Ms. Cope argued that since many existing casitas were already larger than 1000

SF and were already impacting their neighborhoods, eliminating them would unnecessarily defeat the purpose of the ordinance, which was to increase the inventory of rentable units. Mr. Marriott suggested allowing existing oversized casitas to be rentable, but not future ones.

- The Commission discussed parking requirements. Mr. Marriott said they had required two parking spaces for a cottage, which was roughly the same size. He thought they should be consistent. Mr. Dansie pointed out the intent, again, was to keep the residential neighborhood intact. The Commission discussed other parking decisions they had made about other projects and determined the same reasoning still applied: If two people occupied a place, there would probably be two cars.
- They discussed ½ acre vs. ¾ acre and asked Ms. Young, who knew more about valley residential properties in Springdale than anyone else in the room, for more information. She re-asserted that many existing casitas were larger than 1000SF and there were a surprising number of them on lots smaller than ¾ acre. It was proposed to allow the use on existing small parcels but not future. Mr. Dansie said it wasn't good planning practice to create non-conforming uses intentionally. He suggested changing the size limit in the revision if the Commission thought ½ acre was sufficient; if many units already existed on smaller parcels, perhaps it made better sense. It would also be best to remove the 1000 SF limit on casitas than create non-conformities.
- Mr. Marriott suggested they move this ordinance forward to the council. Mr. Taylor asked if they needed a new draft. The senior commissioners were comfortable with making a clear motion, knowing Mr. Dansie would redraft the ordinance accordingly. That would allow the ordinance to keep moving forward.

**Motion by Jack Archer: The Planning Commission recommends approval of the ordinance adding section 10-22-15 with the following changes: 1) Changing 60-day minimum rental period to 90 days minimum; 2) requiring 2 additional parking spaces per unit instead of one; 3) If PDU is in a separate structure the minimum lot may be ½ acre instead of ¾ acre; 4) Eliminating C-2 (1000 SF maximum); 5) adding the requirement for neighbor notice before permit issuance. The Commission finds this change will bring into compliance many properties that are being used as illegal rentals and create a permitting process to keep track of rentals. The Police department will follow up on code enforcement. Motion seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Hearing - Ordinance Revision: Revisions to section 10-13C-1 and related sections making allowance for projects in commercials zones with the Planned Development Overlay zone. Also includes revisions to the review process for projects in the Planned Development Overlay zone.** Mr. Dansie explained this revision would allow limited commercial uses in a PD zone; the uses would have to be live/work units. This revision changed the timing requirement for engineered drawings to after preliminary PD approval rather than before, which made the development process less financially demanding up front. 10-13C-9 listed the specifics of live/work units.

**Questions from Commission and Public:**

- Mr. Archer asked if the work and living spaces had to be separated. Mr. Dansie said not specifically. Work space had to be 'contained within'. Design wasn't specified, so there could be two story buildings with residential spaces upstairs, or one story units.
- The Commission discussed whether requiring the spaces to be designated during the Design/Development Review process was preferable to allowing that to be determined later.
- The ordinance as drafted didn't allow tenants to protest neighbor uses.
- Ms. Young asked about parking and signage. Mr. Dansie said there would not be exceptions to parking or signage, so those ordinances would have full force.
- Ms. Zumpft asked why the units had to be owned and operated by the same person. Could a manager live there? Mr. Dansie said a manager could probably be deemed the 'operator, so would be allowed. The intent was to prohibit leasing a business to someone who was not resident
- Mr. Warner asked about the application of PD zones. Mr. Dansie said the units on Juniper Lane could be approved only because the PD zone was applied. That allowed separate ownership of the units. A PD overlay could be applied over any zone, and there were many reasons that might be done. A typical reason it was applied over a commercial zone was to allow individually-owned multi-family housing. Currently, commercial uses were not allowed in a PD, regardless of the underlying zone. This revision would change that. This would allow a commercial use within a primarily residential unit.

- Ms. Zumpft asked if there were any businesses in town where this was being done. No. Although there were businesses and residences in the same building, they were under common ownership.
- Mr. Dansie asked the Commission to consider whether they wanted to require live/use design as part of the initial approval process or if they were willing to contemplate retroactive application.

**Motion to open the public hearing by Tony Benevento, seconded by Randy Taylor:**

**Archer: Ayes**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- Shaunna Young said she thought this was 'the best thing since cotton candy' because she had owned her own business all her life and had loved her live/work opportunities. She said she would be sick, however, if she had purchased one of the Juniper Lane units and suddenly her neighbors opened galleries in their garages. She strongly disapproved of allowing live/work to be applied retroactively.
- Brant Warner said if the driving idea of a PD Overlay was to take large parcels of land and develop affordable housing, that would be great. To increase the commercial impact was not so great. He thought this should be limited to more residential-type uses instead of the entire list of commercial uses.
- Ms. Zumpft recommended requiring initial design of a live/work project. Live/work would require additional parking, signage and other commercial requirements. That would be nearly impossible to do later.
- Mr. Mabbutt disapproved of the way the Commission had approved the last ordinance. He thought there should be a written ordinance in front of the Commission before they approved it. He strongly recommended the Commission refuse to write ordinances in this context. He had suggested before and would say it again: The Commission should have to approve the exact language the council would see.

**Motion to close public hearing by Jack Archer, seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Deliberation:**

Mr. Taylor thought to make this work a PD would have to be designed for a live/work development. There would have to be extra parking, adequate access and infrastructure and signage. This ordinance didn't prohibit retroactive zone change, and it should. A project would just be chaos if it weren't properly designed from the beginning. Mr. Dansie said he never anticipated anything but a project initially designed for live/work use, but Mr. Taylor was right; nothing prohibited its application to a developed parcel, which the Commission might want to address. Mr. Marriott recommended tabling the ordinance to allow them time to redraft.

**Motion by Randy Taylor to table this ordinance until it is rewritten along the lines of their discussion that evening. A revision will be brought back at a future date for additional hearings.**

**Seconded by Tony Benevento.**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Hearing - Zone Change: A revision to the zone map placing properties in the Valley Residential (VR) zone that are less than 0.75 acres into either the VR-A or VR-B subzone, depending on property size**

Mr. Dansie explained the town had already adopted the VR-A and VR-B zones and identified parcels that would be rezoned. This map would actually change the zoning on all those parcels. There were some parcels that didn't necessarily qualify per size; they had been rezoned consistently so the development regulations were the same in the entire neighborhood. However, there were also lots that couldn't be zoned like neighboring property because they were simply too small.

**Motion to open the public hearing by Liz West, seconded by Jack Archer:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- Shaunna Young thanked everyone who worked hard on this ordinance change – it was a very positive thing for the town.
- Dan Mabbutt said he completely endorsed it and it should be passed as written.

**Motion to close public hearing by Tony Benevento, seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Deliberation:**

Ms. West said it was clear a great deal of time and effort had gone into this ordinance and there was strong support. Mr. Taylor said everyone was in favor. Mr. Marriott suggested moving the ordinance on 'as is'.

**Motion by Jack Archer: the Planning Commission recommends approval of a revision to the zone map placing properties in the Valley Residential (VR) zone that are less than 0.75 acres into either the VR-A or VR-B subzone, depending on property size. The Commission finds it brings many small lots into legal compliance; seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Commercial Remodel – Thai Sapa, 198 Zion Park Blvd:** Dennis Brooks, who had sat quietly observing the entire meeting, said this had been a very good learning experience and he strongly approved of any changes that would make affordable housing available to his employees.

Mr. Dansie said Mr. Brooks was proposing several changes, including enclosure of the patio area and the rear 'shed roof'. He would put a raised patio over the pavement to make the area level. Mr. Taylor suggested sidewalk and curb and gutter. Mr. Brooks thought that was a great idea. It was such a great idea he was tabling the bamboo fence idea. Mr. Marriott agreed that curb and gutter was a better idea than the bamboo fence. He asked Mr. Brooks if he was fully enclosing the patio. Mr. Brooks said he was also tabling the enclosed patio. He would put some pavers on the 'grassy knoll' and put tables there. Mr. Dansie said Mr. Brooks was also working on interior remodeling; that work could go on. Mr. Marriott asked Mr. Brooks to bring back revised plans to the Commission meeting on Feb 4. No action was taken.

**Amendment to Planning Commission Bylaws: Motion by Mike Marriott to approve the amendments to the Planning Commission Bylaws as drafted; seconded by Jack Archer:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Consent Agenda: Minutes: 1/15/13, 2/19/13, 5/21/13, 6/4/13, 6/18/13, 7/16/13, 8/6/13, 12/3/13**

**Motion to approve the consent agenda by Jack Archer, seconded by Randy Taylor:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Adjourn: Motion to adjourn by Randy Taylor at 8:19 pm; seconded by Liz West:**

**Archer: Aye**

**Benevento: Aye**

**Marriott: Aye**

**Taylor: Aye**

**West: Aye**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Fay Cope, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  \_\_\_\_\_

