



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 20, 2015 AT 5:00 P.M. AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.
THE WORK MEETING BEGAN AT 5:06PM.**

Work Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joe Pitti, Commissioners Mike Marriott, Jack Archer, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor

EXCUSED: Liz West, Kezia Nielson from ZNP

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording
13 citizens signed in; see attached list.

Discussion/Information/Non-Action Items

Chairman Pitti announced there were agendas by the front door. Tonight would provide an opportunity for the public to come to the podium and provide comment on the General Plan. The first part of the meeting is a work meeting.

Staff review of agenda items:

DCD Tom Dansie reiterated there would be public comment period on chapters 6-12 of the General Plan. These sections were the ones initially reviewed by the Commission and have less complex issues. The Commission could make revisions as necessary and then finalize these chapters in preparation for a recommendation to the Town Council. They can forward these seven chapters now, after another official public notice period, or they can chose to wait until the remaining chapters have been revised and submit as complete. The Commission will have to discuss and determine how to proceed.

- During the February 3rd work meeting, the Planning Commission will start on chapter 2 *Town Appearance*. There will be public comment at the beginning of the meeting on this specific chapter then the Commission will work as a group.
- Mr. Pitti indicated this is not the last of the public input. Tonight will provide a pulse of what the community is thinking. The Commission will hash out the comments and review surveys to take all input into consideration. There will be more opportunities for the public to express their views.

Mr. Dansie said on tonight's agenda was the appointment of a Chair and Vice Chair for 2015. This selection is made every year. For the past two years Joe Pitti and Mike Marriott have served in these positions and done a fantastic job. The Commission is welcome to reappoint these individuals or select new ones. In a conversation with the Mayor today, Mr. Dansie indicated Mayor Smith thought it might be good to rotate these leadership roles to give others the opportunity, but it was up to the Commission.

Also tonight is a DDR for the residential units in the Clark subdivision. Mr. Dansie reminded the Commissioners this project came before them last year for a planned development overlay zone change and preliminary plat. The Town Council approved the Planning Commission's recommendation. The applicants are here tonight to request a DDR of actual units. The final plat has not yet been reviewed or approved. Therefore the DDR would have to be contingent on the final plat being approved before building permits could be issued.

- Items of note include: The planned development overlay zone divided this into three duplex structures for a total of six dwelling units, however each half of each duplex reside on its own property. There are six lots in the project, but there are three pairs of units that need to be developed as duplex units.
- The biggest consideration in the review is the question of duplex development on the lots. It appears there are separate and distinct structures on each lot which seems to violate the requirement. Per the definition of attached buildings in the Town code, they are "any building separated by less than 10'. These pairs of buildings are separated by under 10'. They function for zoning purposes as one structure even though they are physically separated.
 - Mr. Marriott asked if there was a 10' setback on the new construction. Mr. Dansie replied that there was.

- Mr. Dansie indicated there are two competing ordinances. This may be something the Commission decides to clarify in a later ordinance amendment. Currently if buildings are not separated by 10' they are considered one building. For this particular DDR there is one main building and an accessory building.
- The intent of the ordinance was different than what was happening in this project, but this DDR complies with the technical aspect of code. Other than this issue, the application seems to be straightforward.

The next agenda item was an excavation permit for driveway realignment at the Holiday Inn Express. They are requesting to take current landscape and convert to a pass-through driveway. The proposed driveway improvement is 988 square feet. The property is maxed out in terms of lot coverage so excess parking in the back will be converted to landscape as an equal exchange. Issues such as grades, retention, and cut and fill slopes do not exist with this permit.

- Mr. Pitti asked how this fits in with their earlier signage proposal. Mr. Dansie answered that relocating the existing sign did not affect the landscape coverage. Signs are required to be integrated into landscaping.

Next item is a DDR for Town ball field restrooms. This facility would have restrooms, a concession area and storage space and serve users of the Town Park. The design was consistent with the look and feel of the Canyon Community Center. It will be a low profile building, modest in size.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the agenda; seconded by Jack Archer.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Archer: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dansie announced the University of Utah Planning Students have completed their report and would like to present their findings to the Planning Commission. The Commissioners determined February 13th was the most convenient meeting date. Mr. Dansie would confirm if this date would work for the students.

Mr. Marriott asked for an update to the parking lot project on Lion Boulevard. Mr. Dansie said it was coming along slowly. Landscaping and curb and gutter issues need to be finalized before the project is in compliance with the granted approvals. The vehicles parking there now are from the Zion Canyon Adventure Company. The Town is continuing to work with the property owners to get the project done.

The work meeting adjourned at 5:23PM.

Regular Meeting

The regular meeting convened at 5:30PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joe Pitti, Commissioners Mike Marriott, Jack Archer, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor

EXCUSED: Liz West, Kezia Nielson from ZNP

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording
13 citizens signed in; see attached list.

Mr. Pitti indicated the agenda had been approved during the work meeting. Also announcements were made.

Discussion/Non-Action Items

Public comment period on Chapters 6 through 12 of the General Plan:

Mr. Pitti said they initially had break-out sessions to review these chapters; then came back together as a full Commission to discuss. Tonight was an opportunity for the public to comment on the work that had been done so far. They would take comments in order of the chapter. The first is chapter six, *Historic Preservation*. Mr. Pitti said a recent Commission had been put together to look at creating more historic sites in our community. Mr. Pitti looks forward to this being part of the plan.

Lisa Zumpft approached the podium and thanked the Commissioners for doing this work. She recognized it was a difficult job. She was on the Historic Preservation Commission. In the minutes of the last Planning Commission meeting she noted the Commissioners did not want to have the Historic Preservation Commission specifically work on this section. Therefore she is on her own making comments. As a general comment on all the sections, she said many things have been taken out that weakens the integrity of the plan.

- She questioned why section 6.1.2.h “Review existing ordinances that reference the 1938 WPA Streetscape and make any appropriate changes” had been deleted. Mr. Dansie answered section 6.1.2.g covered this. Also there was discussion to possibly add language through ordinance regulation. One strategy could accomplish rather than two.
- Ms. Zumpft said under the Historic Preservation section, there was text addressing a comprehensive ordinance that was taken out. She said they have not done that yet. An ordinance was developed to create a Historic Preservation Commission, but nothing related to a comprehensive ordinance. This was something that still needed to stay in and still be done. For section 6.1.2 she recommended the Planning Commissioners work with the Historic Preservation Commission to write a comprehensive ordinance.
- Under objective 6.1.2, “Preserve and rehabilitate historic elements as appropriate”, Ms. Zumpft suggested they add a paragraph once historic resources in Town have been identified, the newly appointed Historic Preservation Commission will be tasked with assisting the Town to protect. She wanted the General Plan to include note that there is another body working on historic items.
- Ms. Zumpft also requested that section 6.1.2.a not be deleted.

Jack Burns elaborated on Ms. Zumpft’s comments regarding section 6.1.2.a and said in order for the Town to be eligible for certified local government grants they need to have a Historic Preservation ordinance. He also advocated this be kept in the General Plan.

Chapter 7 *Environmental Resources* was addressed next:

Ms. Zumpft said the Town had partnered with the state to remove Russian Olive and Tamarisk trees. She would like to see verbiage added to section 7.6.1.e that encouraged the continuation of maintenance and follow up. Continue to monitor the initial removal and keep track so it does not return. Also, due to the increased amount of tubing in the area, Ms. Zumpft suggested language in section 7.6.2.e be strengthened that protects resources on the river.

Chapter 8 *Public Works* was addressed next:

Barb Farnsworth wanted the Commission to add the word “native” when talking about landscaping and water conservation. Xeriscape and drought tolerant plants are not necessarily native. All wildlife including birds, insects, mammals depend on a healthy food chain. She said native plants are the best at sustaining native wildlife habitats. She also suggested text requiring low water plantings in designated land use areas be kept in the General Plan. Ms. Farnsworth wanted the Commission to use stronger language when talking about large amounts of grass areas. She liked the idea of providing information about desert native plants in the educational section.

Ms. Zumpft agreed with Ms. Farnsworth. She suggested in section 8.2.2.c language be added that addressed runoff from new development to ensure it doesn’t affect old development.

Ms. Zumpft also questioned why section 8.4.4.b was deleted. She felt “Exploring options to develop community organic collection and composting areas” was something the Town should aspire to.

- Mr. Pitti said the Commission had discussed and determined Washington County had this already. They decided there would be difficulty in who would manage the community collection. Ms. Zumpft commented that if it is taken out it will be lost. If left in then they will have to figure out a way to make it work. Mr. Taylor said it was difficult to do on a small scale legally with the health requirements. It did not seem feasible. The state has regulations on composting. If it is done on a large Town scale it is much more difficult to manage.
- Mr. Pitti advised there would be an educational component in the chapters to encourage people to do it on their own.

Ms. Zumpft thought the Town was doing chipping at the maintenance yard. Therefore she encouraged people bring debris to chip as opposed to burning it. She would like to see the promotion of alternative ways to dispose of waste.

Chapter 9 *Transportation* was addressed next:

Lisa Zumpft did not think the Commission should replace the photo on page 9.4. She indicated there is still a problem with curb and gutter.

Mr. Pitti said the area illustrated in the picture had been fixed and this is why the Commission wanted to delete it. Mr. Dansie suggested they can have an illustration of the problem but should pick a more current example of the issue.

Under section 9.1.3.b, Ms. Zumpft didn't want the Commission to redline. She wanted to continue to encourage sidewalks. Mr. Dansie indicated that only a small portion in front of the undeveloped lot of the Desert Pearl did not have sidewalk. Otherwise the 3-1/2 mile stretch of the east side of the road had sidewalks. Ms. Zumpft suggested the language remain in the General Plan until all sidewalks were done.

Chapter 10 *Parks, Recreation and the Arts* was addressed next:

Ms. Zumpft requested under section 10.3 the Commission add a strategy that encouraged the Town work with the OC Tanner to increase performances and improve parking. It would be a nice gesture to partner with them.

Chapter 11 *Peacekeeping, Health and Safety* was addressed next:

Chuck Passek thought it more appropriate to use EMS instead of EMT. EMT is "Emergency Medical Technician" and EMS is "Emergency Medical Services". It is semantics, but it can be confusing since EMT is generally thought to be a person rather than services.

Lisa Zumpft noted that under the strategy of 11.1.4.d the Commission added and highlighted the term "code enforcement" and asked for clarification into what that meant.

- Mr. Dansie apologized and said it was a note from the previous work meeting to embellish this strategy to more specifically talk about nuisances and code enforcement. It was just a note to make it a stronger strategy that would reference code enforcement. The current language is vague. They want to put a priority on nuisance abatement and code enforcement for the purpose of promoting safety.
- Mr. Pitti added that mention of a code enforcement officer would also be included in this section. Mr. Archer agreed and noted that one of the officers had already been designated as code enforcement.

Ms. Zumpft noted under section 11.2 of this chapter there was mention about the residential user percentage being 50%. She wanted the Commission to find out if this percentage was still valid.

Also under the strategy for 11.1.2.a, "Consider utilizing foot and bike patrol during the tourist season". Ms. Zumpft wanted to know why using bike patrol was taken out.

- Mr. Archer indicated he spoke with Chief Wright and they tried it, but it didn't work. The bikes had also been sold to the Park. Ms. Zumpft still thought it was an idea worth keeping in the General Plan.

Chapter 12 *Sustainability* was addressed next:

As a general comment, Ms. Zumpft expressed to the Commissioners that she hoped they didn't rush the process of updating the General Plan. She wants them to continue to take public comment and not give the document to the Town Council sooner than it is ready.

Barb Farnsworth asked why section 12.1.3.d regarding gray water was removed. She asked if there was some way to promote this for commercial use.

- Mr. Taylor said he had the same question, but learned that while the state allows, the local Five County Health Department has outlawed it.

Mr. Pitti wrapped up the public comment period of the Planning Commission meeting and stated this was just the beginning of the process. He thanked everyone for their feedback. They will continue to seek input. He reiterated that it is an important document and sets the tone for ordinances and the direction of the community.

Action Items

Consideration and action regarding nomination of 2015 Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair:

Mr. Pitti said he had been doing it for the last two year and wanted to know if someone else was ready to take his chair. Mr. Marriott expressed that Mr. Pitti had been doing a fantastic job.

Mr. Taylor asked if Mr. Archer would be interested in taking over the role as Chairman. He said he would do it as long as he is here. The Commissioners said that was an ominous statement.

Motion made by Alan Staker to nominate Jack Archer as 2015 Planning Commission Chairman; seconded by Joe Pitti.

Taylor: Aye
Staker: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to nominate Randy Taylor as 2015 Planning Commission Vice Chairman; seconded by Alan Staker.

Taylor: Aye
Staker: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

The nominations will go to the Town Council to be ratified in their next meeting. Mr. Pitti will remain the Chairman for the Planning Commission work meeting on February 3rd until the Council can ratify on February 12th.

Residential Design/Development Review: Duplex units in the Clark Subdivision (approximately 1776 Zion Park Boulevard): Mr. Pitti introduced the applicant. Mr. Rayner was in attendance representing the Clarks. He said that he spent time with the new architects since Peter Stempel left. He provided the elevations for the Commissioners review. There were broken roof lines and textural elements to add interest. The design followed the ideas of parkitecture. The idea was to keep the structures small and follow the size restrictions given by the Town Council which was 4200 square feet total, including the garage. Mr. Rayner said the structures were separated so trash could be placed between the buildings. He thought this broke up to make the structures appear smaller. The engineering is approved but they need to work out the conservation easement agreement.

Mr. Archer asked about the distance between units. Mr. Rayner indicated the distance between duplex units was about nine feet.

Mr. Taylor asked about the garages for the two end units. Mr. Rayner said they were detached so the square footage wouldn't be counted.

Mr. Staker also questioned the separation distance. Mr. Dansie said buildings need to be separated by less than 10' to be deemed attached. In order for this plan to work, none of the structures can be considered accessory to any of the units. They need to be considered attached for zoning purposes.

Mr. Taylor asked if this runs into conflict with the accessory dwelling unit having to be 15' or 20' apart. He said there is another ordinance. Mr. Dansie said there are two ordinances that seem to compete with each other. If you separate a structure by less than 10' it is deemed attached. These are therefore considered part of the main structure for zoning purposes.

To reiterate, Mr. Taylor said when dealing with an accessory structure less than 10' away none of the accessory building ordinances would apply. Mr. Dansie said 'correct'. It would be considered an addition to the main structure. The ordinance counts any functional space covered by roof coverage as building square footage. For this project, if the area between the structures was covered, it would have been considered in the total square footage and therefore place them over what the Town Council approved.

Mr. Marriott said the development looked like a pocket neighborhood.

Mr. Rayner asked about the cottage neighborhood ordinance and if it had died off. Mr. Pitti said 'no'. Once they get to the Housing portion of the General Plan it would likely be addressed again.

Mr. Pitti said the only alarming issue for him was using the word 'duplex'. This word evokes notion of an adjoining wall.

Clearly you found a space in the ordinance that defines a duplex as not having that type of description. Therefore the Commission does not have footing to stand on. He said they are definitely separate buildings and not duplexes in his mind.

Mr. Taylor went back and looked at the original plat approval. All of the language led the Commission to believe they would really be attached. He wondered if this was now broken up more and actually looked less massive. The separation actually makes the project better.

As Mr. Dansie first pointed out, Mr. Pitti also thought there is ambiguity and conflict in our Town code. He also asked about the landscape lighting. Mr. Rayner did not think there would be any. There are sconces on the outside.

Mr. Taylor had a question for Mr. Dansie. He said in the write up under required improvements it states "These improvements (addressing paving of the lane, utilities, storm drainage) need to be constructed prior to the issuance of the final plat. He thought the plat came before construction of the improvement. Mr. Dansie responded they have preliminary plat approval which allows them to make the street widening, storm drain and sewer improvements. The final plat is an instrument that physically divides the property and allows the individual lots to be sold and cannot be recorded until these improvements are complete. It ensures the developer provides the improvements they promised. Also under our code, the developer can bond for the improvements and then release at the end of the project.

Mr. Marriott said by Springdale's definition of a duplex it could be approved. Mr. Pitti agreed and said all the other requirements are met and there was special attention paid to the Town Council's conditions.

Motion by Mike Marriott to approve the Design/Development Review for the duplex units in the Clark Subdivision at 1776 Zion Park Boulevard. The Commission finds the project is in conformance with the Town Code relating to the building provisions such as building size, height, set-backs, landscape, parking, lighting, colors and materials with the following conditions 1) no building permit for the construction of the building will be issued until the final plat for the subdivision is recorded and 2) landscape lighting is prohibited in the development; seconded by Randy Taylor.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Archer: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Excavation Permit: Driveway reconfiguration at the Holiday Inn Express (formerly Best Western Zion Park Inn):

Mr. Marriott is related to a member of the project and therefore recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Dansie said they had discussed the item in the work meeting but essentially the applicant would be trading existing landscape for parking area. Other issues with grading permits don't seem to come into play. Main issue is to document there is an equal area of new landscape being provided for new driveway.

Mr. Staker said he has no problem with the concept, but made the observation that in a Town where parking is so limited and in great demand, spaces were being eliminated. Mr. Pitti said for this project there is enough parking and was separate from the parking issue in the community.

Mr. Archer likes that it eliminates some of the parking by residences, especially bus parking in the back.

Mr. Taylor commented that he was concerned that landscape was being eliminated in the front.

Mr. Pitti thought this was pretty minor. The project solves traffic flow and will be good for the occupants of the restaurant and hotel. He thought it a good solution. Mr. Archer said this was an improvement for buses.

Motion made by Joe Pitt to approve the Excavation Permit for the Holiday Inn Express driveway alignment based on the fact it is a minor change that will create a better traffic flow on the property without a large negative impact on the natural surroundings; seconded by Jack Archer.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Archer: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Taylor asked what was settled with the Holiday Inn Express sign. Mr. Marriott said they changed the color to be in compliance. Mr. Dansie told the Commissioners he would email a picture. It was now halo-lit rather than internally lit. The issue that conflicted with the ordinance was resolved.

Design/Development Review: Public restrooms at the Springdale Town Park, 126 Lion Boulevard:

Mr. Dansie said the Town wanted to install restrooms by the ball field for some time. Finally it has funding to construct. It will have the same architecture as the Community Center to tie the two buildings together visually and look integrated. Size of the structure is fairly modest, with a low profile roof and minimal exterior lighting. It is intended to fill a need not currently being met for users of the ball field.

Mr. Taylor asked about the total rough area and if it included the covered picnic area. Mr. Dansie said 'no' and this was a good point. He said the Town had two different ways to measure building size; one for the residential zones and one for everybody else. In residential zones, anything covered that is a functional area is included in your building square footage. In commercial and public use zones, building size is measured from outside of wall to outside of wall and does not include overhangs, patios or covered roofs. So building size for this project does not include the roof canopy.

Mr. Pitti asked if these restrooms would be locked and used only when the ball field was open. Mr. Dansie said this was a question best directed at Zac Martin. He thought they were intended to always be open. Mr. Pitti noted that the restrooms by the tennis courts appear to always be in disrepair. If the Town can't take care of these then he had concern about the addition of more. Mr. Dansie said much of that had to do with the original construction. The new restrooms will take some pressure off the others and therefore won't have as many issues.

Mr. Archer asked how often the ball field was being used outside the Music Festival. Mr. Dansie indicated it is used for three to four other large events a year. Also used frequently for smaller events such as weddings and parties.

Mr. Marriott asked if these would eliminate the need to rent porta-potties for big events. There will still be a need to bring in porta-potties but not as many. Mr. Pitti said the quantity is determined by a math equation tied to the number of proposed attendees.

Mr. Taylor asked about the concession stand. Mr. Dansie said it was not the intent to have a fully operational concession stand all the time. If there is an event, it can be used during these times.

Mr. Archer asked if it was set up for the American Disabilities Act, to which Mr. Dansie indicated the plans were ADA compliant.

Motion made by Randy Taylor to approve the Design/Development Review for the Town Park restrooms and concession stand. It complies with all applicable codes including building height, setbacks, landscaping, lighting, colors and materials to match the Community Center; seconded by Jack Archer.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Archer: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the consent agenda; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye

Pitti: Aye

Archer: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn made by Mike Marriott at 6:37PM; seconded by Alan Staker.

Taylor: Aye

Staker: Aye
Pitti: Aye
Archer: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson
Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: 



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD Please sign

Meeting of Planning Commission on 1/20/15

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.

26 McQuay
name

TODD BENSON
name

CANDICE REED
name

MIKE AITTOCKER
name

MICHAEL PATTER
name

LISA ZUPPI
name

Shirley Young
name

Matt Rayner
name

Trista Kelin
name

Ford Reeves
name

Randall D. Clark
name

Lauren
name

Luci Francis
name

name

name

name

name

name

name

name

email (not required)

email (not required)

email (not required)