



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, FEBRUARY 17, 2015 AT SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.
THE MEETING BEGAN AT 5:04 PM.**

Work Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Jack Archer, Commissioners Randy Taylor, Liz West, Allan Staker, Mike Marriott
Kezia Nielson representing ZNP

EXCUSED: Commissioner Joe Pitti

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Moumita Kundu and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording
5 citizens signed in; see attached list.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Liz West to approve the agenda; seconded by Randy Taylor.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Mr. Dansie said Friday evening's presentation by the University of Utah planning students was excellent and beneficial. Copies of the final report and a recording of the presentation are available. Ms. Kundu will summarize the presentation for the Commissioners. The project will be a helpful resource as the Planning Commission continues to review the General Plan.

- Ms. West asked about the turnout at the event. Mr. Dansie said it was what you would expect for a Friday evening on a holiday weekend, about 16-17 people attended.

Action Items

Sign Permit: 38 Lion Boulevard, "Zion Park" – Melanie Madsen Thatcher: Mr. Dansie said Ms. Thatcher was not in attendance, but emails had been going back and forth between the Commission and the applicant. Ms. Kundu reviewed the staff report with the Commissioners.

- The original application requested two free-standing signs. In recent emails however, the applicant is now asking for only one since two signs are not allowed per the Town code.
- The staff analysis is the permit application meets most of the Town code requirements.

Chairman Archer suggested the Commission switch the order of the agenda items to allow more time for the applicant to be arrive.

Residential Design/Development Review: Anasazi Plateau Lot 9 – Luke Wilson: Mr. Dansie indicated the Town had not yet conducted a pole test to determine if it is a high impact or view obstructing lot. He does not believe it will meet either of these definitions. Home has been designed to conform to the requirements of a high impact or view obstructing lot. Discussion items may include:

- In the FR zone, property owners build to take advantage of views in Zion Canyon. Therefore they generally want large windows to maximize. The FR zone recommends sensitivity where windows will be placed due to neighbors. There is quite a bit of glass on the front of the property.
- The DDR appears to meet all design standards for the FR zone.
- Another point of concern is that the rear patio has a 5' retaining wall near the edge of the lot and drainage channel. The Commission should verify these elements can be constructed within the lot boundaries without disturbance of the conservation easement.

Luke Wilson, the applicant, was in attendance and approached the podium.

Mr. Taylor asked if they intend to use less reflective glass.

- Mr. Wilson mentioned he had a preliminary conversation with members of the Anasazi Plateau community and their concern about light emission and reflectivity.
- Mr. Wilson said all lights inside the home were recessed or shaded lighting. There were no direct bulbs or light emission. The home was designed for the views looking down and up. Also he was not aware of any restrictions relating to the percent of wall versus the size of the windows.
- Mr. Dansie explained that for high visual impact lots only 25% of the building elevation, that is visible from the valley floor or SR9, be composed of windows. This was the only hard regulation about the quantity of windows. The general language for the FR zone said views are important but the property owner should be sensitive to issues of light trespass and reflectivity. There is no quantifiable standard for glass. Mr. Wilson said the windows will meet code and be screened.

Mr. Wilson said construction is a few feet from the property line and the conservation easement. If necessary they can move another foot or two. During excavation they can put up a barrier fence for the conservation easement.

Mr. Archer asked if they were near the conservation easement with the other house they built in Anasazi. Mr. Wilson answered 'yes' and said they understand the perimeter needs to be preserved. The house design and layout on the land is in a good spot now but they are ok to move over a few feet.

- Mr. Archer said if they can build without encroachment that is fine.
- Ms. Nielsen suggested they put up an orange fence first along the boundary on two sides to help guide as construction is being done.
- Ryan Judd said their previous project on Lot 4 was much tighter than this one. They actually have more room to work and not disturb the conservation easement. Mr. Taylor said it would be up to them to manage properly.

Mr. Dansie said the site plan actually has a line showing where the fencing will be constructed and it is more restrictive. Mr. Wilson indicated they will probably cheat that a little to be sure they are good.

Mr. Taylor asked how much of the dry wash they intend to pipe. Mr. Wilson answered the lowest point will have an 18" culvert to handle the water. The same water way was done on Lot 4 and 18" handles a lot.

Regarding the retaining wall in the back, Mr. Archer asked about the type of drainage they would use. Mr. Wilson said the soils engineers make sure any collected water is down grading away from any footing. Hard piped daylight boxes will be installed for any surface water.

Mr. Archer asked about the vegetation. Mr. Wilson said one tree had to be removed but two new ones would be planted. They will also seed any scarified dirt.

Mr. Taylor asked about the presence of blue clay. Mr. Wilson said there were two test holes and none was found. If when making their cut some is discovered they would reassess.

Mr. Archer said according to the staff report the building height was approximately 18'. Mr. Dansie said this was measured from existing natural grade.

Mr. Marriott arrived.

Mr. Archer inquired if there was a lighting plan. Mr. Dansie said 'yes' and displayed a picture of the sconce on the screen.

- Mr. Wilson said it shined down and was screened. Placement would be on each side of the garage. There is also a pillar near the front door.
- Ms. West asked if there was lighting on the walkway. Mr. Wilson answered that the pillar lights the walkway from the driveway. He said he knows people appreciate less lighting.

Chairman Archer asked about the glass garage door. Mr. Wilson said it was heavily frosted and laminated. There was an aluminum frame to match the windows. It was not completely opaque. When the fluorescent light was on in the garage there was a small glow.

Commissioner Taylor asked about the cut and fill slopes and if they exceeded the height restrictions. Mr. Dansie said the maximum fill slope is 10' and all were below.

Mr. Archer commented it was a good design. It was different from most of the homes in Anasazi. It fits size-wise and building height-wise. He agrees with Mr. Dansie that it doesn't appear to be a high visual impact lot or a view obstructing lot.

Mr. Marriott asked if the plan meets the criteria of a view obstructing lot. Mr. Dansie suggested landscape features to further shield was the only design standard the plan did not meet. Mr. Wilson mentioned they would build a masonry planter with indigenous foliage. Mr. Marriott said it seems to fit all the criteria.

Motion made by Randy Taylor to approve the Residential Design/Development plan for Anasazi Plateau Lot 9 based on findings it is not a high visual impact lot, it is a normal lot, it meets setback, building size, height, lighting, landscape, color and materials according to Town palette, the design conforms to normal lot design criteria, with condition that orange boundary fence be installed prior to any construction or excavation on the lot; seconded by Mike Marriott.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Archer said the Commission would go back to the agenda item concerning the sign permit at 38 Lion Boulevard. The applicant was still not in attendance but they would continue with the review.

Mr. Taylor said two major problems had cropped up. One was the request for two signs and the other was the national park's concern about the image.

Mr. Archer said the Planning Commission would address the sign size and location only, not content. He was hoping the applicant would be here tonight so they could discuss directly. The issue of content will be taken up by outside people who do not have anything to do with the Town or the Planning Commission. Also, in the latest correspondence with the applicant, she withdrew her request for two signs.

Mr. Dansie indicated another email from the applicant came in ten minutes before the meeting. Mr. Dansie put the correspondence up on the screen and read some of the content (attachment #1). Basically the applicant disagrees with many of Mr. Pitti's comments. Mr. Dansie suggested the Commission stay focused on the size and placement of the sign.

Mr. Taylor asked about the status of the fee sign in accordance with the sign ordinance. Mr. Dansie said you can have one free standing sign with whatever content you want. The applicant can choose to put the fee structure on this sign, an advertisement for the parking lot, or a combination of the two. The ordinance does not allow for more than one sign visible from the street. Once you pull into the parking lot, information about the fee structure can be visible.

Ms. West asked if the applicant would need a setback requirement or a barrier so it is not seen from the road.

- Mr. Dansie said the definition of signage is if it advertises a good or service and is visible from outside the boundaries of the property. If they twist the orientation it would be ok.
- Mr. Archer mentioned the wooden structure has fee information. But if sign faces the street this would constitute two signs. According to ordinance 10-24-8(B)(2) directional signs can be 3' above grade. Currently the directional signs on this property are way above 3'. This needs to be corrected.

Mr. Staker said a five minute discussion with the applicant would resolve these issues. If these issues can be fixed we would all be happy. Mr. Archer commented that is why we were all hoping she would be in attendance tonight.

- Ms. Nielsen suggested the Commission table the agenda item until Ms. Thatcher can be here. She said there are a lot of small things that are problematic.
- Mr. Dansie said the Commission can table if they have questions about compliance. Or, if they can make a determination based on the code, they can make a motion with conditions. Then we can have a conversation with the applicant and advise approval with conditions.
- Mr. Taylor commented that they haven't had good luck with that. His concern was that Ms. Thatcher and her designer are not understanding, accepting or willing to comply with all of the requirements. He said Mr. Dansie has tried valiantly to get them to comply.

- Mr. Marriott said the only issue on the table tonight was the single sign. They are not discussing a master sign program.
- Mr. Archer said the setback on the property also needed to be addressed. It's the sign issue, the directional signs and the setbacks. Mr. Marriott asked if the Town handled the directional signage. Mr. Dansie said there was no permit required for directional signage. Mr. Marriott felt the Commission could address the sign and leave the rest to be communicated by the Town.
- Ms. West said there was also question about the shape of the arrowhead, but Ms. Nielsen said this issue was not for the Planning Commission to discuss or decide. Content will be discussed in a different venue.
- Mr. Archer said the Commissioners need to look at the sign size, placement and colors. If you feel they are ok we should rule. Mr. Marriott agreed.
- Ms. Nielsen said the application was for two signs so in the motion they need to make clear the approval is for only one.
- Mr. Taylor said if the fee sign is visible from the roadway it would be considered a second sign and is not allowable.

Mr. Staker asked about the cut in the sidewalk. Mr. Dansie said this was another issue discussed at length. It still needs to be done. It is a controversial topic between the Town and the applicant.

Ms. Kundu said the sign permit does not have any specifications on setback. According to the code the sign needs to be at least 6' away from the public right-of-way. She recommended this be added to the motion.

Mr. Marriott said Ms. Thatcher was using about half of the available square footage therefore if she wanted to add the fee structure information the sign design could be modified.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the sign permit for 38 Lion Boulevard with the following conditions: 1) approval is for a single sign only, 2) fee sign be removed or placed in a way that is not visible from the street, 3) the illumination or lighting is directed and shielded so light is only on the sign face and does not trespass onto adjacent streets, roads, property or into the night sky; also light must be directed at a 45% angle or less, 4) set back is at least 6' from the public right-of-way; seconded by Liz West.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion/Non-Action Items

Review of chapter 2: *Town Appearance of the General Plan*: Mr. Dansie said last meeting the Commission went through the entire chapter with a cursory review. During this meeting you wanted to refine the definitions of 'village atmosphere', 'unique rural village', and 'village scale'. In the staff report, Mr. Dansie recommended the Commission reference the surveys, the University of Utah presentation and input from public involvement events. Mr. Dansie suggested Commissioners consider three questions:

1. What are the overall character, feel and appearance the Planning Commission wants to promote? What are you trying to achieve? Do you want to keep as is, or accommodate for growth?
2. What currently exists now that makes a positive contribution to the Town's appearance and should you continue to encourage these things? Conversely what detracts? Should policies be developed that will discourage these things?
3. What else contributes to the Town appearance that we want to promote? Examples include open space, recreational opportunities, parks or other things outside the built environment.

Mr. Archer indicated Lisa Zumpft sent in an email with her comments (attachment #2).

Mr. Marriott picked up from the previous meeting discussion and asked what we mean by 'unique appearance' and a 'small rural village'. Everyone has their own ideas but there is no collective definition of what this means in Springdale.

Ms. Nielsen stated the people in the community defined it for us in the surveys. They identified other words that help define, such as small scale and walkability.

- Ms. West felt they needed to add language about our pioneer heritage, the historic buildings, and being a gateway town to a national park.

- Mr. Archer said some of this is addressed in the key findings with talk of: modest scale structures; mixed-use residential and commercial buildings; a pedestrian friendly streetscape; activity in the community center area; a hometown flavor; and small unique locally owned businesses. All of this was reflected in the ordinances and we continue to fight for this.

Ms. Nielsen said the elementary school was also important to the people who live here and for a diversified community. She also wanted to remind the Commission about something Mr. Dansie said earlier in the process. – If it's working, don't fix it. Don't just wordsmith. She felt the existing conditions and key findings in the General Plan match what the community thinks. It's not a strip mall town or a normal gateway community. It is unique in that we have small businesses, owned locally, and everyone knows each other. These are the elements that make Springdale a unique, rural community. We need to be careful not to make an issue out of something that is not an issue to the community.

Mr. Archer pointed out the University of Utah presentation provided some great points. He recommended everyone take a look and listen to the discussion afterward. He suggested the Commissioners especially focus on the build-out here and address this. We are approving building because the ordinances allow it however it may not be what the people want.

Ms. West asked if this would be addressed in chapter 3 Land Use and Zoning. Mr. Archer answered 'yes' but it was also in Town Appearance. There are a number of areas that overlapped.

Mr. Taylor said he felt what the General Plan says now is what the Town still wants. He looked at comments from the question 'what does village scale mean to you' and the responses are all consistent with what we have been talking about – walkable, individual residences, limited population, friendly, no chain stores or restaurants, small size, oriented toward its residents. We need to listen to what the community wants.

Ms. West felt this statement summarized it well: village scale is a communion with the surrounding landscape and resident community year-round.

Mr. Marriott said this was great and important to retain, but what is missing is an acknowledgement that there are 3 million people that come here.

- Ms. Nielsen said "H" was about tourist services. They don't live here. We can accommodate and welcome but not to the extent that it compromises everyone else that lives here. The people that want to live here have stated what they want this Town to look like. We need to be careful about changing that.
- Mr. Staker agreed but he said look at the numbers. If there are approximately 300 tourist days, that equates to 10,000 people per day that visit Springdale. We are doing a pretty good job of maintaining open space and small scale. We haven't gone overboard yet but the Town can be overwhelmed by visitors.
- Mr. Archer reminded the Commission there are still two more hotels that are going to be built. Food service also needed to be addressed. Mr. Staker said there are currently not enough rooms to accommodate everyone.
- Ms. Nielsen said we can't accommodate everyone, nor do the people who live here want that. We need to look at what we want Springdale to look like in the future and what we want to accommodate. Visitation may go down in the future. We must focus on what we can control. We must remember who we are representing. The General Plan is the overarching vision for the Town. The ordinances dictate. We look at the General Plan every five years and this is reasonable for what to expect during that time.

Mr. Marriott said they need to answer Mr. Dansie's questions: "What is the overall character, feel and appearance the Commission wants to promote over the next twenty years":

- Ms. Nielsen said the citizens have answered that. They want a community that is a small scale. If people want St. George or Los Angeles they can go there. Must think about the people that live here.
- Mr. Taylor expressed what frustrated him is that we want to cater to the people who live here then they build a 300 room hotel. People feel the Commission and Council are not listening to them.
- Mr. Marriott asked the Commission how they get their arms around the definition of small scale. Ms. Nielsen said it is defined through the ordinances as it relates to size. Mr. Staker asked what in Town fits the definition. Examples given were: the hardware store, some hotels such as the Cliffrose, most restaurants, both markets, the medical clinic.
- Ms. West said people also mention a high-value, aesthetically pleasing environment and how things look, and how things are placed.
- Mr. Marriott added that he placed value on the use of native sandstone in construction. This helps bring the feel of pioneers and parkscape. Ms. Nielsen agreed in the importance of native sandstone and materials in construction.

- Mr. Staker thought the visitor cabins in Zion National Park represent small scale.
- Mr. Taylor mentioned that even though Hampton Inn is large the design and architecture includes rock and a parkitecture feel.
- Mr. Archer said signs built with a rock base bring the Park into the Town. Ms. Nielsen agreed and said this helps represent the connection between the two. It becomes more seamless and reflects 'wild versus built' – the natural environment becomes part of the built environment. Mr. Marriott liked the idea of making this visual connection and the continuity in architecture between the Park and Town.
- Mr. Staker said it sounded like they were all on the same page.

Conversely, Mr. Marriott asked what elements we don't like.

- Mr. Archer said they need to address more organized parking and the flow of traffic. He mentioned the idea of a roundabout on SR9 that was suggested in the University of Utah presentation. Mr. Dansie displayed the conceptual drawing.
- Mr. Marriott said the back up at the gate in the Park was an issue for the Town. Ms. Nielsen indicated the Park had a plan to address this. It would be implemented within the next six years. It will include more lanes and probably a round-a-bout. They were considering technology similar to the employee lane.
- Mr. Marriott questioned UDOT's right of way as it relates to a round-a-bout. Mr. Dansie answered they have to look at the design but generally they would require more right-of-way. An analysis would have to be conducted. Mr. Marriott acknowledged that traffic flow issues will be key in the future.
- Mr. Archer said people don't want to have a traffic light in Town.
- Mr. Staker said the University of Utah report recommends we loosen parking requirements in the central commercial zone. Mr. Archer mentioned the Town has discussed getting funds to purchase land for parking. Another suggestion in the presentation was a parking structure which would be a big negative in Town.

Mr. Dansie said the Commissioners hit on an important topic. Within the next five years, this will have a major impact on Town appearance and it is currently not addressed. He felt it wise to put parking and traffic flow as a new element or chapter in the General Plan. It would be beneficial to develop these ideas more fully. The Commission can recognize the existing condition and then add strategies how to preserve the preferred appearance. They all thought this was a good idea.

Mr. Archer brought up the Zion Park Scenic Byway and asked if the information had been updated. Mr. Dansie mentioned this was also a comment from Lisa Zumpft. They can update this section with projects that have been completed and those currently underway.

Mr. Archer moved the Commission into a discussion about village atmosphere.

- Ms. West read in the survey that people think another crosswalk would be helpful. Mr. Archer agreed and said there are blind spots in the commercial areas.
- Mr. Taylor stated that crosswalks can be more dangerous because pedestrians think cars will stop for a painted line.
- Mr. Dansie said the University of Utah presentation also recognized the need for more crosswalks. Since UDOT will not install a mid-block crosswalk, the proposal suggested traffic calming features that give pedestrians more protections. We currently have these near the Bit & Spur, Driftwood and Bumbleberry. They narrow the road and slow traffic.
- Ms. West also thought reducing the speed limit in the CC zone would help people see the crosswalks and slow the traffic. Mr. Dansie said UDOT does speed studies and sets the speed limit at 85% of what people actually drive on the road. The Town continues to lobby UDOT for a reduction in speeds and an increase in crosswalks.
- Mr. Archer said one area of concern was near Sol Foods over to the Shell station.
- Mr. Marriott suggested they use speed bumps to mitigate speed.
- All of these ideas could go into a new General Plan section about parking and traffic.

Mr. Archer said 2.11 promotes pedestrian friendly townscape. He felt this was part of what they were discussing right now. They need to finish the sidewalks all the way through Town.

Ms. Nielsen asked if the Planning Commission would get a chance to review the Town's lighting project. Mr. Dansie indicated the engineers were nearing the 50% design review. A public meeting would be scheduled in about a month. The Planning Commissioners could attend. Once the project is near a more complete stage the Commissioners can review in an official capacity.

- Ms. Nielsen mentioned that if talking about pedestrians, some lights work for that purpose and some do not. Mr. Dansie said the Town has given specific feedback regarding safety and light trespass. New lights will be LED and can control this type of lighting more precisely.
- Mr. Dansie said that light color spectrums were also being discussed. The Town was coordinating this with the Park and using their analysis to help us make decisions.

Regarding the pedestrian-friendly townscape, Mr. Archer felt the Commissioners had covered this. Mr. Marriott suggested they expand on 'hometown flavor' on page 2.2 and develop this more fully. He felt this was important. What can they do to help build the unity and interactions in the community?

- Ms. Nielsen said focusing on walkable and getting people out of their cars is important. It's special to live here.
- Mr. Staker asked if there was a way to make the shuttles more fun to ride in order to encourage ridership.
- Mr. Archer also wanted to focus on the friendly, local atmosphere.
- Mr. Marriott brought up interconnected trails through Town and asked Ms. Nielsen if the Park could help with this. She answered 'potentially', but there are desert tortoise habitats to consider and dogs are not allowed.

Mr. Archer said that they will pick up the discussion during their next meeting. Mr. Dansie said the Planning Team will summarize the ideas discussed tonight for the next meeting. They will also create a draft of section 2.5 which will address the traffic and parking items discussed tonight.

Adjust date of November 3rd work meeting to accommodate municipal elections: Ms. Carlson stated when the 2015 meeting date calendar was created she did not notice the conflict between the November 3rd Planning Commission work meeting and the municipal elections. She requested the Commissioners consider another meeting date that week so she can focus on election priorities that evening.

The Commissioners decided their meeting could be moved to Wednesday, November 4th.

Consent agenda

Regarding the February 3rd minutes, Mr. Taylor requested a change to page 3. He noted the sentence that read "Mr. Pitti said that he, Mr. Marriott and Ms. Nielsen were the only three on the Commission in 2014" should be corrected to read "Mr. Pitti said that he, Mr. Marriott and Ms. Nielsen were the only three on the sub-committee in 2014".

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the consent agenda with correction to page three of the February 3rd minutes that changes 'Commission' to 'sub-committee'; seconded by Alan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn made by Randy Taylor; seconded by Alan Staker.

Staker: Aye

Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.


 Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  3-17-15

