



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

MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2014 AT 5:00 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Joe Pitti, Commissioners Randy Taylor, Liz West and NPS Liaison Commissioner Kezia Nielsen

ABSENT OR EXCUSED: Jack Archer and Mike Marriott

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Fay Cope recording. 6 citizens signed in; see attached list.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Randy Taylor to approve the agenda as posted, seconded by Joe Pitti:

Pitti: Aye

Taylor: Aye

West: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion and Announcements:

- Mr. Dansie announced Stephen Goldsmith's U of U planning students would be coming this fall to help the Town with planning tools that would kick off the 2015 General Plan Update. Their first day of class was 8/25/14, so they would probably start coming to Springdale in mid-September. The students would be coming in alternating groups of 5 throughout the fall months and would be looking for weekend lodging opportunities. Exact dates hadn't been determined yet.
- The Clerk announced the deadline for filing an application for the vacant Town Council seat was Friday at 3:00 pm.
- Chair Pitti explained the Commission had tried allowing citizens to comment at work meetings and had discovered the work meetings had become longer and less productive. The Commission was now going to revert to limited comments in order to keep work meetings no longer than 2 hours. If citizens had comments before or after work meetings, they were encouraged to submit them to the DCD.
- Randy Taylor asked about the Thatcher parking lot. Mr. Dansie explained the applicant had misunderstood the Commission's directive to submit a landscaping plan before beginning construction. No plan had been submitted yet and construction had been stopped.

Action Items

Approval of Consent Agenda: Minutes of May 20, June 3, June 17 and July 15. Liz West pointed out voting corrections were needed in the July 15 meeting. **Motion by Randy Taylor to approve the consent agenda with corrections, seconded by Liz West:**

Pitti: Aye

Taylor: Aye

West: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion/Information Items

Solar Panel Ordinance: Mr. Dansie said the last time this issue came before the Commission, there were only three commissioners present and those Commissioners felt a complete board should be present to take action. There was one change since last reviewed.

- 10-15e-2 (e): application fee removed;
- 10-15e-3: neighbor notice – Mr. Dansie said the Commission had discussed making changes to the section but hadn't finalized a decision because there wasn't a full board. Mr. Taylor thought the notice was the most important part of the ordinance. Mr. Pitti agreed that Commission review might be necessary for pole mounted or ground mounted displays, but since rooflines were already in place and height limits established and other

regulations were already in place, he thought Commission review could be waived for roof-mounted displays. Roof mounted displays were the preferred option; streamlining that review might be advantageous.

- Ms. West asked if there were exceptions for solar path lights. *Yes; 10-15E-7 covered that point.*
- 10-15e-7 also provided for alternatives to the three principal display types. It allowed for new technology and creative uses.
- Mr. Pitti said he had reviewed this draft of the ordinance with solar professionals; they had praised it as a good effort. He had also talked with Bill Ellard, a local specialist. He invited Mr. Ellard to speak. Mr. Ellard said he was watching Springdale go through the same thing other communities had already been through; he thought Springdale was responding well. He agreed that roof systems were the most effective arrays. Springdale had good rules for those displays. He also said inspections of the system were essential – the inspector could fail non-approved systems. Without inspector approval, Rocky Mountain Power wouldn't approve net metering on those installations. Mr. Ellard said the neighborhood notifications section concerned him – there were too many opportunities for neighbors to complain without warrant.
- The Commission discussed considering and providing standards for solar panels on street lights. They decided it was a good idea, but unnecessary until the Town was ready to consider that option. A section could be added if required.
- The Commission determined the ordinance was ready for passage to the Council. They had already heard it twice, so it would not be noticed as a public hearing item.

Accessory Structure Size Ordinance:

- Mr. Dansie explained this revision was being considered at the direction of the Town Council. The directive: Determine whether accessory buildings should be limited in size and if so, how that should be calculated. The Commission had studied the question in several meetings and in the last meeting had reviewed two very different calculation methods: 1) a chart based on the Rayner 'sliding variable equation' and 2) limiting the cumulative total of all accessory structures to ½ the size of the main building. The latter choice was preferred because it was less intimidating to applicants and was easy to administer. The other change they had discussed was adding additional methods to required screening of accessory buildings located in front of a main building. *10-20-8 (A)*
- The Commission thought this revision was ready for hearing; Mr. Dansie suggested waiting to schedule until after discussing the next item.

Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance:

- Mr. Taylor thought this revision was ready to advance to the Council, now that VR had been removed. Ms. West disagreed – she thought because the ordinance allowing ADUs on ½ acre parcels in other zones, to be consistent they should allow ADUs on ½ lots in the VR subzones if they could meet all the other standards. Mr. Dansie agreed that it would be better planning policy to be consistent; that didn't guarantee many lots could meet the standards. Ms. West said there were only 14 lots in both the subzones that met the ½ acre minimum. The Commission directed Mr. Dansie to remove the language that prohibited ADUs in subzones.
- Mr. Dansie said the August agenda was already quite full. Mr. Pitti suggested the hearing on the Accessory Structure Size Public Hearing be delayed till September and the solar panel and ADU ordinances could be listed as non-hearing items on the August agenda.

Submittal Standards for Applications to the Planning Commission: The Commission had requested having a discussion about substandard applications. Mr. Dansie's staff report indicated there were exhaustive checklists in the planning process but there weren't any standards for the quality of submittals. Mr. Taylor read suggested language requiring plans to meet professional standards. Mr. Pitti was hesitant about over-requirements. He would prefer allowing the DCD to make the decision about adequacy. Mr. Taylor said the ordinance should give the administrator something concrete to refer to. Mr. Dansie said the issue didn't come up very often; he understood the commission's intent and he could be more firm about the requirements. Mr. Taylor said it could be a 'kindness' to the applicants if the process required them to meet professional standards that identified problems before the project 'hit the ground.' Mr. Dansie agreed with Mr. Taylor that having ordinance back-up for standards would be most advantageous. He also agreed with Mr. Pitti that creating additional laws which added financial burden to applicants wasn't always the best thing to do. The Commission decided that since the situation rarely came up, they could leave things as they were in the ordinance, but give strong direction to the DCD to be insistent that applicants provide good quality submittals.

Adjourn:
Motion by Liz West to adjourn at 5:56PM. Seconded by Randy Taylor:
Pitti: Aye
Taylor: Aye
West: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Town Clerk Fay Cope

APPROVAL: _____