TOWN OF SPRINGDALE
1862-2012

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

MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2014 AT 5:00 PM.
AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UT
MEETING BEGAN AT 5:01 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joe Pitti, Commissioners Jack Archer, Liz West, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor, Mike Marriott
EXCUSED: Kezia Nielsen
ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording
Two citizens signed in; see attached list.

Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the agenda as posted; Seconded by Jack Archer.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion and Announcements: Mr. Dansie announced

- Reminder that the University of Utah students will be in town from November 7-9 to conduct surveys. People are also encouraged to go to www.listeningtospringdale.com to provide input.
- Tree cutting activity will begin around River Park by Utah Division of Forestry Fire and State Lands to remove invasive Tamarisk and Russian Olive. Areas will be replanted with native Willows and Cottonwoods. Mr. Pitti asked if any other properties will be attended to. Mr. Dansie indicated that the grant focused on riparian areas and if funding was available the second priority would be tributary washes and then upland areas. Ultimate goal is to eliminate the seed source in the upriver water shed.
- Commission Staker asked about the status of the parking area on Lion Blvd. Mr. Dansie said progress was occurring in spurts. The property owner needs to finalize the curb cut access on Lion Blvd. and also the landscaping items.

Action Items

Design / Development Review: Addition and Remodel at Worthington Gallery - 789 Zion Park Boulevard, Stephen Roth: Mr. Roth was in attendance to represent the applicant Greg Worthington. Mr. Roth indicated that in Phase 1, 1,458 square feet of old portions of the building would be removed and replaced with 1,002 square feet of new. The west elevation, which faces Chuck Seward's property, will be finished with stucco and a wall of landscape will be planted. The east elevation will attempt to match the existing siding. The north elevation remains unchanged. The paint color will match the existing. The remodel will consist of retail, work and storage space. Phase 2 will come later.

- Mr. Pitti indicated the original paint colors are not in the currently approved paint palette and would therefore need to change. Mr. Roth asked if the whole house needed to change color or

just the new sections. Mr. Dansie said that historical building colors are allowed to remain unless the addition would impact more than 25% of the historic structure. If so, then the historic structure would need to be brought into current palette.

- Mr. Roth asked if the cream color was out of the palette; was it a value issue and not a hue issue? Mr. Dansie confirmed.
- Mr. Pitti asked if the neighbor was aware of the setback. Mr. Dansie said Mr. Seward was prepared to give his approval statement regarding the setback but that it had not been received yet.
- Mr. Archer asked the length of the west wall. Mr. Roth said it was a 60' solid wall.
- Mr. Taylor asked if the sheds located on the back of the property would remain after the addition. Mr. Roth believed that after Phase 1 the 6 or 7 storage sheds would be eliminated and contents stored in the basement of the building.
- Ms. West read ordinance 10-11A-13 which states *"the outside storage of objects and materials shall be permitted as an accessory use, providing such storage is totally screened from public view or view of any contiguous property"* and asked if the sheds were permitted as accessory use? Mr. Dansie indicated that storage containers are not allowed however any approvals or permits in the past were unknown. Ms. West asked if the sheds were moved would they then need to come into compliance. Mr. Dansie said the issue with the sheds had more to do with the affected landscape percentage and parking. They could remain as long as it did not affect these two items.
- It was noted that no specific landscape plan for Phase 1 had been submitted. Mr. Roth wants to wait and present a landscape plan when Phase 2 is complete. Commissioner Taylor wanted to know what if Phase 2 doesn't happen. Mr. Roth said that if they landscape during Phase 1 it would be difficult to maintain during construction of Phase 2.
- Mr. Pitti suggested they attach a condition to the motion if Phase 2 doesn't happen.
- Mr. Archer asked if the building will be open during Phase 1 construction. Mr. Roth believed the business would be closed for a time during the winter however he was unsure when.
- Mr. Marriott asked why the construction was happening in two phases. Mr. Roth indicated he did not know exactly when Phase 2 would start, but if Phase 2 did not happen he will present a plan to code for the landscape.
- Mr. Marriott also inquired about the roofing material. Mr. Roth said the existing building had asphalt roofing which was not energy efficient. The new structures will have 14" concrete tiles.
- Chairman Pitti wanted more information on the lighting plan. Mr. Roth doesn't anticipate exterior lights other than by a side door on the east elevation. Lighting will remain on the front of the gallery but no lights along the side. Mr. Pitti pointed out that the current lighting was not compliant. Mr. Dansie said that in 2016 all properties in the Town must be compliant. Lighting in trees is not allowed.
- Mr. Pitti indicated that the property must meet the light ordinance. The Commission should attach a condition to the motion regarding compliance. Mr. Pitti also noted that this construction will make the back of the building far more appealing and clean it up for the neighbor. The recent formulation of the Historic Commission may encourage differentiation between historic structures and new structures.
- Ms. West asked if the setback will be the same or if it is moving from the Seward side. Mr. Roth said the setback will not be conforming. Mr. Dansie reiterated that the 10' required setback can be reduced with a statement from the adjacent property owner. With this letter then you will have a conforming setback. Before the building permit is given the letter must be received.
- Mr. Archer asked if there would be any signage change and Mr. Roth said no.
- Mr. Staker commented that he likes that the new architecture will match the old.

Motion made by Mike Marriott that the Planning Commission approve the DDR for the addition and remodel at Worthington Gallery, 789 Zion Park Boulevard based on the project being compliant with the following: 1) the size, height and parking ordinances; 2) paint colors must comply with the standards of the color palette; 3) property owner will have one year to produce landscape plans at the completion of Phase 1 in the event Phase 2 is postponed beyond Phase 1; 4) setback issue will be approved with submission of signed, notarized statement from adjacent neighbor consenting to variance and the building permit will not be issued until this letter is received by the

DCD; 5) all lighting must be compliant with ordinance before certificate of occupancy will be given; Seconded by Randy Taylor.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Modified Design Development Review: Revision of previously approved plans at 35 Lion Boulevard, Max Gregoric: Mr. Gregoric was present and explained that the previous architect Peter Stempel miscalculated the parking area. He indicated the original calculation assumed all the building space would require dedicated parking. The revised calculation adjusts parking by 9-10 spots which pushed into the 30% grade of the slope. A portion of the space was to be converted to an ice cream shop Mr. Gregoric provided additional documents for Commission review (see attachment 1).

- Mr. Dansie indicated the parking code says that "x" number of spaces are required for a specified use – retail is an example of a specified use; storage is not a specified area. For the sake of this request, Mr. Gregoric calculated the areas that have a specified area only. Other areas were taken out.
- Mr. Taylor asked if the plans met the parking ordinance. Mr. Dansie said they did. Mr. Gregoric elaborated and said there were (2) spaces for housing, (18) car spaces, (1) bus parking space, (1) truck parking space, (2) employee parking spaces. Mr. Taylor asked if street parking was included in the count and Mr. Gregoric said no.
- Mr. Pitti commented that the removal of the parking structure would reduce the visual impact.
- Commissioner Marriott asked if the ice cream shop was categorized closer to a restaurant or closer to a retail spot. Mr. Gregoric believes it meets the category of "other" since everything is take-out. Mr. Marriott further inquired if there was seating. Mr. Gregoric said it was a park-like atmosphere with a plaza to mingle; no tables.
- Mr. Taylor asked if there would be outside tables or seating to which Mr. Gregoric said there would be no seating area, but benches to sit.
- Mr. Marriott questioned that if closer to a restaurant, how does this impact parking. Mr. Dansie said that 1 parking space per 200 square feet was required. Mr. Gregoric said there was 484 square feet which included an 8' x 19' space for customers. Mr. Pitti said that this would require (1) parking space.
- Mr. Dansie said this point was mute depending how you classify. Per the Town, a restaurant is an establishment that serves food to patrons seated in a building or seated outside a building. He recommended the Commission determine if seating for ice cream patrons coming to an area less than 200 square feet is needed. There is a covered patio so the Commission must decide if this is considered a dining area or not.
- Mr. Marriott asked if tables will emerge or if it will be table free. Mr. Gregoric said that he intends benches and rocking chairs in front.
- Mr. Pitti asked how big the patio area was and Mr. Gregoric said 400 square feet.
- Mr. Dansie said that if the inside area and covered patio area were considered seating area then there would need to be more parking. Mr. Gregoric said that if the Commission made this determination he would have to strongly object since this had been allowed for other businesses. He will be serving ice cream, gelato, soft serve, smoothies, Italian sodas, all as grab & go.
- Mr. Marriott pointed out that the minute you bring in tables and chairs it changes the condition, like the Candy Store. They added tables and chairs outside the business which is not in compliance. Mr. Pitti agreed and said in the event tables and chairs are added Mr. Gregoric would need to come back to the Commission. Mr. Gregoric said it was a 2-acre parcel and there was room to expand. If the bus parking spot was taken out, this would allow him to add 2 more car parking spots.
- Chairman Pitti said the Commission will look at approval now without seating, but if added in the future, it would be up to the Town to enforce the ordinance. He cited the Candy Store example again.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the modified DDR revision of previously approved plans at 35 Lion Boulevard based on findings that elimination of the parking structure is keeping with the Town code and is in compliance with ordinances; the plans have the required parking and 2014 conditions are binding with approval; Seconded by Jack Archer.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Sign Permit: Holiday Inn Express (formerly Best Western Zion Park Inn) – 1149 Zion Park Boulevard, Kirk Barker: Mr. Marriott recused himself as he is related to the applicant and moved to the audience seating area. Mr. Dansie said that due to a schedule change, Mr. Kirk Barker would be unable to attend, but Mr. Rob Bishop was here instead. Mr. Dansie also indicated that there was an error in the staff report. Notations that the monument sign would be illuminated externally were wrong; it will be internally illuminated.

- Mr. Taylor asked if the "H" was a logo. In his mind it was.
- Ms. West read ordinance 10.24.17 which states "*a logo is a uniquely designed symbol used for advertisement and ready identification of business*". She agreed it is a logo.
- Mr. Pitti Googled the Holiday Inn logo prior to the meeting and indicated it is a branding item for Holiday Inn. Under the current ordinance 10-24-4 a logo is exempt from the color palette if the size is limited to 10% of total signage area. Otherwise it must come into compliance. Chapter 10-17-4 cites exterior color standards and acceptable ranges of color for sign copy.
- Mr. Taylor stated there have been previous discussions with other applicants over the same issue.
- Mr. Dansie said the sign is approximately 36 square feet in size. The Commissioners need to determine if the "H" should be classified as a logo or text. This will influence the provisions of the code pertaining to colors for logo or colors for text.
- Mr. Pitti said copy is the integration of letters. The "H" should be classified as a monogram; it's branding and its own logo. He asked Mr. Dansie to Google the Holiday Inn logo. Mr. Dansie brought up images on the screen and the Commission was able to view a number of different branding elements specific to Holiday Inn and Holiday Inn Express.
- Ms. West asked if Zion Park would be part of the sign. Mr. Bishop indicated no.
- Mr. Taylor questioned if it was a change of business ownership or just a branding change. Mr. Bishop advised that it was branding only. He indicated that Holiday Inn has strict copyrights and trademarks. He said Holiday Inn would be an asset to the community because of their commitment to running a green business. They are also historically good community sponsors. Although the business did not want to be above the law, he expressed concerned about their ability to make adjustments. He did not think Holiday Inn would be flexible.
- Mr. Pitti reminded that Best Western, Hampton and Quality Inn all had to make changes in order to comply with the ordinance. Holiday Inn would also have to find other options.
- Mr. Bishop asked for clarification if 10% pertained to the white or the square that it is in. Mr. Archer indicated it is the white "H" itself.
- Mr. Dansie said the Commission could change the sign ordinance to be more specific.
- Mr. Pitti suggested the business expand the words Holiday Inn Express.
- Mr. Bishop asked for clarification on the color palette. Mr. Pitti said there was a book at the town office that they could reference. Hues and values must all comply.
- Mr. Bishop said he would report back to the ownership group and further discuss with IHG. Mr. Pitti also suggested they confer with the DCD to get the proportions. Mr. Bishop thanked the Commission for their recommendations.
- Mr. Taylor noted that the setback was not sufficient. Mr. Bishop said he would advise.
- From the audience, Mr. Marriott asked is gray was an option for the "H" color. Mr. Dansie said yes, gray was workable.

- Mr. Marriott inquired if it were possible to table the issue until next meeting when adjustments could be made. Mr. Dansie reminded that the next Commission meeting was a Work meeting but that they could open a Special meeting inside the Work meeting.
- Chairman Pitti said the Commission could approve with a condition that the size or color change be in compliance with the ordinance.
- Mr. Marriott, again speaking from the audience, asked if signage could be moved to alternate locations to avoid proximity to the power pole. Mr. Dansie indicated that it could as long as setback and landscape design conditions were met.

Motion made by Joe Pitti to approve the Sign Permit: Holiday Inn Express, formerly Best Western Zion Park Inn, at 1149 Zion Park Boulevard under the following conditions: 1) the "H" in the signage is a logo therefore it must comply with the color palette or, 2) reduce the "H" to 10% of the total signage; approve relocation of the monument sign with condition it meets setback, landscape and lighting conditions; Seconded by Randy Taylor.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

Minutes: Work meeting September 2, Regular meeting September 16, Work meeting October 7

Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the meeting Minutes from 9/2, 9/16 and 10/7; Seconded by Liz West.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn by Mike Marriott at 6:29 PM; Seconded by Chair Joe Pitti.
Taylor: Aye
Pitti: Aye
West: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson
Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: Joe Pitti

TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please sign

Meeting of Planning Commission **on** 10.21.14

If you'd like to be included on our great e-notice list, please give us your email address. That's the only reason you need to provide that information. Your address will never be sold, though we may have to provide it as public information. **If you have provided the information before, you don't need to add it again.**

name	email (not required)
MAX GREGORIC	
[illegible]	