TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

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, JULY 19, 2016 AT 5:00 PM AT TOWN HALL, 118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.

Meeting convened at 5:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Jack Archer, Allan Staker, Randy Taylor, Scott Taylor, Liz West, Mike Marriott and Jack Burns from Zion National Park

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Toni Benevento and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the agenda; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Benevento announced the next Night Sky Event would be held on July 30th starting at 9:00pm at the Canyon Community Center. Avery Sloss from Zion National Park would provide a short presentation followed by stargazing.

Mr. Marriott announced the Pioneer Days Celebration would be held Saturday, July 23rd at the Rockville Town Park from 6:00pm to 8:00pm.

Ms. Carlson announced there was a Town Council seat opening vacated by Bill Weyher. Applicants must be a resident of and registered to vote in Springdale. Interested parties could apply with the Town Clerk. The deadline for applications was Friday, August 5th. As part of their regular meeting on August 10th the Town Council would interview applicants and appoint a new Council member.

Action Items
Public Hearing: Ordinance Revision: Changes to chapter 10-24 of the Town Code altering the requirements for illumination and colors for signage – Public comment and consideration of proposed ordinance: Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission had worked on this ordinance over the last several work meetings. The proposed ordinance would: alter regulations for color and illumination allowing only text portions of a sign to be illuminated; allow only 50% of an internally illuminated sign to be illuminated; allow warmer color temperatures not to exceed 3500K; prohibit bright white lettering; and remove all allowances and considerations for logos.

- The Community Development staff conducted enhanced public outreach seeking comments on the ordinance draft. These comments were included with the packet materials. There was a diversity of opinions expressed.

Mr. Archer recalled the color temperature would not exceed 3000K.

- Mr. Dansie said 3500K was in line with the Town's new street lights, but 3000K was in line with recommendations from the National Dark Sky Association. This adjustment could be easily made in the ordinance.

Ms. West thanked the staff for their efforts in collecting public opinion.

Public questions:
Laura Doty asked if the Town had done a survey and analysis of white lettering throughout Town. She asked the definition of bright white versus off-white. Ms. Doty did not think there was a need for internally lit signs. She preferred down-lighting and felt everyone could adapt to that.

- Regarding bright white text, Mr. Dansie said the Town used the Munsell Book of Color for its color palette. This tool classified colors based on specific attributes.
- As currently drafted the ordinance was not retroactive. Only new sign applications would be affected by the color change.

Motion made by Liz West to open public hearing; seconded by Mike Marriott.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment:
Darci Carlson recused herself as Town Clerk and spoke as a Springdale resident. She was in favor of prohibiting internally illuminated signs and establishing an amortization period to convert signs that did not comply.

Marc Hare, from Canyon Ranch, said minimally internally illuminated signs and low-lighting enhanced a business and the city. It gave the Town some character. Mr. Hare indicated he was in favor of keeping a broader color palette.

Motion made by Jack Archer to close public hearing; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:
Mr. S. Taylor was in favor of down-lighting and externally lit signs. He was unsure about a retroactive policy.

- Mr. Archer thought a retroactive policy was not necessary. He said many businesses had already changed signs.

Ms. West thanked everyone who responded. She said you could tell the difference between comments from businesses versus residents. There needed to be a balance. Ms. West said it was very important to protect the night sky. She did not think a sign was what drew people to a business.

Mr. R. Taylor said the 50% limitation helped to reduce impact.

- Mr. Dansie said this would affect channel lettering; there would need to be non-illuminated elements worked into the sign or background.

Mr. Staker said there were a lot of mixed emotions about this topic. As he drove through Town he did not see anything really blatant or unacceptable.

Mr. Burns said a guiding principle for the National Park Service was that the built environment should lie lightly on the land. There were few places that could boast the scenic background we had here. The Planning Commission had an opportunity to create a unique experience and move Springdale in a direction that drew people rather than creating an “Anywhere, USA” experience. Mr. Burns encouraged the Commission to prohibit internally illuminated signs and make existing lights come into compliance.

Mr. Marriott was perplexed how internally illuminated signs compromised the character of the Town. He felt some of the best signs in Springdale were internally illuminated and banning them was a mistake. Mr. Marriott said internally illuminated signs were more effective and in some cases more interesting. He thought there were other steps the Town could take to retain the look and feel.

- Mr. R. Taylor said some applicants don't want to play by the rules and tweaked the ordinance as far as they could.

Mr. Staker said if the 50% rule only accomplished smaller lettering he did not think this would be advisable.

- Mr. Archer said the intent was to reduce the amount of lighting. Decreasing the light temperature would also help.

Ms. West referenced 10-15C in Town Code which said outdoor lighting should be minimum, necessary to provide for safety, and low wattage. As a gateway town to a national park she did not think there should be internally illuminated signs but expressed a balance was needed to accommodate businesses.

Mr. Marriott said the Town did not have a way to measure what style of sign was transmitting more light trespass than another.

- Mr. Burns said in the last meeting there was recognition that internally illuminated signs impacted night sky quality. Any light that was broadcast out and up affected night sky. Down-lighting had the lowest potential for impact. The amount of lumens was also important.
- Mr. Marriott said he wanted data to prove this point.

Staff had researched the topic. Ms. Benevento read from a study written by the U.S. Naval Observatory Flagstaff Station. It stated illuminated signs produced light that was by nature unshielded and about 50% escaped directly into the night sky. Different styles of signs produced substantially different outcomes.

- Mr. Dansie said internally illuminated signs didn't control the direction of light and was scattered. Externally illuminated signs could be more directed unless poorly pointed.

Mr. Dansie said the Town's sign ordinance had three classifications of signs: internally illuminated, externally illuminated and backlit. Halo signs were classified as backlit.

Mr. S. Taylor said the night sky was important. Internally illuminated signs reminded him of St. George or Las Vegas. A down-lit sign represented more of a small town look to him.

Mr. Archer was in favor of doing away with internally illuminated signs but not requiring businesses to change their signs retroactively.

- Ms. West agreed. She did not like forcing businesses to change their signs but would like to see existing signs come into compliance with the color palette and lumens.
- Mr. Burns asked the Commission to think about short-term impacts versus long-term benefits.

Commissioners directed staff to make adjustments to the draft verbiage including prohibiting internally illuminated signs and lowering lumens from 3500K to 3000K. Changes would not be retroactive.

Public Hearing - Design/Development Review: Request for a new hotel building (24 new units) at the Bumbleberry Inn, 897 Zion Park Boulevard – Stan Smith – Public comment and consideration of proposed ordinance: Mr. Dansie said this proposal would add a new hotel building increasing the unit count to a total of 71. The applicant submitted a revised landscape plan and was committed to providing details on exterior lighting. In order to qualify for an increase in building size, the applicant took advantage of the employee housing incentive. This would require recordation of a restrictive covenant.

Stan Smith was in attendance to answer Commission questions.

- Multiple lots comprised the Bumbleberry complex. The analysis of this proposal was based on all lots combined since the business operated as one entity. All the lots were zoned Central Commercial. Mr. Smith said all lots, except for three homes, were under one umbrella. There was only one entrance therefore it would be difficult to subdivide the property. He said the two employee units would be recorded into perpetuity.

- Regarding the flood plain hazard, buildings would be constructed appropriately to comply with the commercial standards. The applicant had flood insurance.
- The use of the basement rooms would be for utilities and storage. There would not be an elevator.
- Mr. Smith planned to retro-fit the lighting on the existing buildings. All exterior hotel building light fixtures would be night sky compliant.
- The employee housing units were on the east side of the property.
- The development would add some new asphalt. There was already enough parking on the parcel but the applicant would re-stripe.
- The revised landscape plan complied with the standards of the ordinance. There was already a fence between the development and the house on Manzanita.

Public questions: None were asked.

Motion made by Jack Archer to open public hearing; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment: No comments were made.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to close public hearing; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Archer felt the proposed development was appropriate for the zone. The ordinances were followed as long as flood hazard standards and light fixtures were compliant.

Mr. Marriott suggested the applicant unwind some of the existing subdivided lots to create one parcel. This would help avoid confusion in the future.

- Mr. Smith said he wasn't sure he could do that given the way the property was acquired and recorded with the county. Everything was tied together and titled under the same company.

Motion made by Liz West to approve the design/development review request for a new hotel building, 24 new units, at the Bumbleberry Inn, 897 Zion Park Boulevard. Chapters 10-11B and 10-16 have been met, including building size, setbacks, building height, landscape, illumination, colors and materials, unit count, parking, screening, flood hazard, and the central commercial design guidelines have been met. With conditions: 1) At least 40% of the property be retained as natural open space or landscape, with a minimum of 30% of the property be landscaped; 2) The applicant must execute a restrictive covenant running with the land that requires at least two employee housing units to be developed and maintained on the property in perpetuity. This restrictive covenant is required based on the increased building size for the proposed building; 3) The applicant must provide details on the locations of building mounted lighting and proposed light fixtures to DCD prior to building permit being issued; 4) The building must be designed in compliance with the flood hazard protection standards in section 10-13A-8A of the Town Code; seconded by Mike Marriott.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearing - Design/Development Review: Request to develop a 50 space parking lot on parcel S-138-A-2 (west side of SR-9, south of the Zion National Park entrance station) – Janet Mika – Public comment and consideration of proposed ordinance: Mr. Dansie said this parcel was located across from the giant screen theater on the west side of the road. The majority of the property had steep slopes and development difficulties. The parking facility was proposed to accommodate 50 cars and be a gravel surface. This project did not meet the front setback however the applicant applied for a variance. An Appeal Authority meeting was scheduled for July 26th. Mr. Dansie said the proposal contemplated disturbance of 30% slopes and required grading and retention. It also required filling in a significant natural drainage and adding a culvert which would need to be reviewed by the Town engineer in conjunction with plans for storm water run-off.

The 30 foot setback impacted the entire first row of parking spaces. If the variance was not allowed it would not be feasible to develop the parking lot.

Public questions: Luke Wilson asked if it was paid parking. He said this project was off a busy road and he asked if there was a requirement for a staging area.

Ms. Mika was in attendance to answer Commission questions. She referenced code section 10-23-10(7). The proposed project was in Village Commercial and off-street parking in the Central Commercial zone required a 30' setback, so given that this project was in the Village Commercial zone Ms. Mika believed the setback requirement did not apply. She said the Planning Commission had discretion to decide if the 30' setback provision applied. The intent of the setback was to provide a buffer between SR-9 and the commercial entity. Ms. Mika had submitted a proposal to UDOT to maintain and landscape the right-of-way. Fifty cars would have an impact on cars trying to find parking.

- Regarding drainage, Ms. Mika said there was a culvert at the asphalt. There would also be 140' of pipe, 3,000 cubic feet of retention basin and a storm drain.
- Mr. Dansie said there was a requirement that any post-development run-off was equal to any pre-development run-off. The Town engineer would have to analyze.
- Ms. Mika pointed out the location of the small pay station. Patrons find a parking spot and then pay at the kiosk.
- Mr. Burns asked how patrons would gain access to the Park. Ms. Mika said they would cross the street and go to the pedestrian entrance. Mr. Burns said it was a concern to direct people across two lanes of traffic. It was an existing problem and not one that was improved with this project.

Ms. Mika said she had the property under contract. Given constraints she did not believe anything beyond a parking lot could be built on this property.

- Mr. Burns said the Park planned to redesign the south entrance and there would be four approach lanes.
- There was no discussion at this point with UDOT about a crosswalk in this area.

Motion made by Liz West to open public hearing; seconded by Randy Taylor.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment: Marc Hare from Canyon Ranch said the project was a good idea if the applicant was willing to take the risk.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to close public hearing; seconded by Jack Archer.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation: Mr. Archer said parking was desperately needed in Town but drainage and the variance approval were factors. He voiced concern with the use of gravel instead of asphalt given the slopes and heavy water. Without paving the property it would likely turn into a mud pit.

- Ms. Mika said there was water service to the property from an 8" water line. The intention was to xeriscape. Mr. R. Taylor pointed out if the water line was culinary it would require a meter. It was not determined yet if the line was culinary or irrigation.
- A retaining wall would be required. Ms. Mika said they would fence off the site while the retaining wall was being constructed so the 30% slopes were not impacted.

Mr. S. Taylor asked if the project would be viable if the parking lot was paved instead of using road base. Ms. Mika was not sure and would likely have to wait for a season to find out.

- Mr. S. Taylor said he would only be in favor of the project if it was asphalted within a period of time.

Mr. Staker said the viability of the project depended on the variance hearing decision and clarification about drainage. He felt any decision now was premature.

Commissioners discussed the options and felt it was better to table.

Motion made by Jack Archer to table pending the outcome of the variance request and revisit after the July 26th hearing; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriot: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a brief break.

Design/Development Review: Single Family Residence at Claret Cup, Lot 2 – Luke Wilson: Ms. Benevento said Claret Cup was a planned development with individual building lots surrounded by common area. The lot was not a high visual impact. The proposed design complied with the stricter guidelines of a view obstructing lot.

- Outdoor light fixtures had been submitted. They were full cut-off and down-directed.
- There were no issues with the soils report and there were no slopes of 30% or greater.

Luke Wilson was in attendance to answer Commission questions.

- He agreed to not putting up solid concrete for the walls.
- The chimney was approximately 21'. Mr. Wilson said he could reduce the size if it was an issue.
- The lot size 34,126 square feet. This subdivision was designed so homes could not see each other.
- Mr. Luke said the excavation and fill was almost a net zero. There was no blue clay and there were no 30% slopes in the area of the development.

As long as all the grading was contained in the limited disturbance areas a grading plan was not needed.

Ms. West asked if there would be any issues with drainage from adjacent lots. Mr. Wilson said homes were far apart. This project was nestled above a main drainage basin and therefore it was fairly protected.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to approve the design/development review for a single family residence at Claret Cup Lot 2 based on findings that the project is in compliance with setbacks, building size, building height, lighting, landscape, colors and materials, design standards and grading; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Design/Development Review: Single Family Residence at Anasazi Plateau, Lot 7 – Luke Wilson: Ms. Benevento said this property was located on the corner of Hopi Circle and Anasazi Way. It was not a high visual impact lot but designed to meet the more restrictive standards of a view obstructing lot. No slopes of 30% or greater existed on the site. The applicant submitted revised plans for the rock wall and terraced retaining wall. Ms. Benevento indicated the limits of disturbance were compliant.

Normally the utilities and driveway were in the same area to limit the amount of disturbance. For this project the driveway was on Hopi Circle due to a blind spot on Anasazi Way.

Exterior lighting was cut-off and down-directed. There was a 2:1 replacement of the juniper trees being taken out and applicant would reseed the utility area.

Mr. Wilson said they had to build on piers due to the clay in the area.

Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the design/development review for Anasazi Plateau Lot 7 as the building of the lot are within Chapters 10-9A, 10-15, 10-13C including building size, building height, lighting, grading plan has been submitted. The driveway will be placed on Hopi Circle rather than Anasazi Way. With conditions: 1) Must contain all construction within building pad except for driveway and utilities and the utilities egress needs to be revegetated; 2) Back part of property with slopes needs to be fenced off; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Design/Development Review: Moenave Single Family Homes – Mountain Vista Development, Tyler Kukahiko: Ms. Benevento said these homes were distributed through lots 1-10 and 17-30 in the Moenave Subdivision. The applicant submitted three residential plans that differed in square footage. Houses would be mostly obscured from SR-9. The subdivision was in the Valley Residential Planned Development zone therefore standards were different from the traditional Valley Residential zone.

- All the proposed colors and materials were compliant however some design elements may be better suited for Springdale. The developer expressed some willingness to make adjustments.
- A landscape plan did not need to be submitted for individual lots per Chapter 18 of Town Code as long as the subdivision as a whole met standards.

Tyler Kukahiko and Derek Ellis were in attendance.

Mr. Archer said there had been a lot of changes in this subdivision over the years. He asked if there was any consideration of screening of headlights coming down from Matilda Lane onto the homes on Red Hawk.

- The developer said they could submit screening suggestions with the landscape plan. Mr. Archer suggested they contact the Red Hawk Association and have discussions.

Mr. Kukahiko said the exterior materials and colors would likely remain the same. The stone would be more natural to match the area. They planned to change the roof to a gable-end roof. The front door and garage door would have a wood style. Renderings would be updated to reflect these updates.

Mr. Kukahiko answered questions from the Commission.

- Lighting would be down-directed and shielded. Pictures would be submitted to staff for approval.
- The homes would be staggered at least 5 feet. Each floor plan was about forty feet wide with varying depths. The developer would offer three plans and two exterior color schemes.
- Homes would be presold before they were built.

Mr. Burns asked if the project would look like a cookie cutter development.

- Mr. Kukahiko said they were building a product people wanted and the community needed.
- Commissioners commented there was a lack of variety, style and distance between homes. Mr. Ellis said they were trying to balance cost of homes with what the homes looked like. If they built custom homes they would not be affordable.

Mr. R. Taylor asked the price range.

- Mr. Ellis said homes would range from $385,000 to $600,000. The idea was to meet the need of people who lived here. On a square foot basis these homes were less expensive than the condos by Sol Foods. Homes would be energy efficient and have a porch option which extended into the setback.

Mountain Vista would also develop multi-family units in Moenave in the future.

Mr. Burns asked the developer not to turn Springdale into Anywhere, USA. He asked that they recognize the uniqueness of the area. He expressed concern.

Mr. Burns confirmed a desert tortoise survey had been done. He indicated the Park would appreciate a copy of the report.

Mr. Archer noted that disturbed areas needed to be re-vegetated. The developer confirmed the trail would be replaced.

The Commission discussed the development.

- Ms. West said this was like tract housing.
- Mr. R. Taylor said the Town talked about the need for affordable housing. In order achieve this developers had to get away from building custom homes.
- Mr. Archer said affordability was important. The design changes were an improvement.
- Mr. Staker commented this was likely as affordable as homes would be in Springdale.
- Mr. Marriott said he previously opposed the project because of the layout. The developer was compliant with the basic parameters of the agreement. He hoped the homes would be varied enough when they were built.

Commissioners said it would be good to have a clear picture of what the revised renderings would look like. A changed roof style would affect the elevations.

- Mr. Ellis said the homes, as designed, were compliant. He did not want to be penalized and postpone approval. They were willing to work with staff on the changes.
- Mr. Marriott said changes were significant enough that new drawings were warranted.
- Mr. Archer said the Commission liked to see what was being approved and confirm designs were in line with the General Plan.
- Mr. Ellis asked that changes be reviewed and approved by staff. If the Commission did not approve the designs tonight then they would reject making the suggested changes. Mr. Ellis reiterated the designs and engineering, as currently submitted, were compliant.

Motion made by Randy Taylor to approve the design/development review for the Moenave subdivision single family dwellings on lots 1-10 and 17-30. There are three proposed floorplans and the Commission finds they meet the lot area setbacks, building size and height, grading, and landscape. With conditions: 1) Colors, materials and designs are going to be resubmitted for review at the next Planning meeting. The applicant is committed to revise the exterior designs to more appropriately comply with Springdale ambience; 2) Applicant must submit an outdoor lighting plan to the DCD before a building permit is issued; 3) Applicant must submit a landscape plan which includes details about revegetation in common areas before a building permit is issued; 3) Applicant must provide a plan as to where proposed houses will be placed on a lot by lot basis; 4) Design elements that are going to be changed be submitted for review at the next Commission work meeting on August 2; seconded by Mike Marriott.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Ratification of the Canyon Ranch Design/Development Review motion of approval: Mr. Archer asked if the bullet points of the motion had been reviewed and approved by the attorney.

- Mr. Dansie said the attorney made some clarifications on condition 3 pertaining to the color temperature of LED lighting, condition 8 pertaining to the pedestrian trail connection through the property, and condition 9 pertaining to the protection of the existing vegetation. These were in the motion to record the developer's commitment to take these actions however there was nothing in the ordinance that forced the developer to comply with these three conditions. Compliance would be up to the good nature of the developer.
- Mr. Dansie noted under condition 6 the clause "impacted property owners" should be changed to "adjacent property owners".

Motion made Liz West to approve the ratification of the Canyon Ranch design/development review. The Planning Commission finds the proposed hotel redevelopment at 668 Zion Park Boulevard, the Canyon Ranch, meets the standards in sections 10-11A (Central Commercial zone), 10-16 (Architectural Standards and Design Guidelines), and other applicable sections of the Town Code. The Commission therefore approves the design/development review for the project as presented in during the June 21, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, subject to the following conditions; 1) Building A must be located at least 100 feet from a residential zone, as shown on the revised site plan dated June 21, 2016; 2) Building C must be located at least 20 feet from the rear property line, as shown on the revised site plan dated June 21, 2016; 3) The Planning Commission recommends the LED parking lot lighting to use "warm color" light sources, a maximum of 3,000K in color temperature; 4) The recessed can lighting on the second story balconies must be shielded such that the light source is not visible from the single story adjacent residential development; 5) All lawn grass in the development must be a variety on the Town's approved plant palette. The revised landscape plan dated June 21, 2016 shows the lawn areas planted in fescue which is an acceptable grass variety; 6) There are residential uses adjacent to the property on the southwest, northwest, and northeast. The developer must screen the proposed hotel development from these adjacent residential uses with a combination of fencing and landscape for the properties to the southwest and northwest, and with vegetation for the property to the northeast. The developer must consult with the adjacent property owners on the height of the screen fence (up to a maximum of 8 feet); 7) The metal roofing on the buildings must have a non-reflective finish designed to prevent glare and reflection; 8) The developer has agreed to work collaboratively with the surrounding property owners on a pedestrian trail connection through the property. While not a condition of development approval, the Planning Commission urges the developer to provide pedestrian connections through the property to adjacent properties; 9) The Planning Commission appreciates the developer's commitment to protect the existing mature vegetation on the property. While not a condition of development approval, the developer has agreed to contract with a professional arborist who will provide recommendations on the best way to preserve the existing mature trees during construction and who will be on site during construction to ensure measures are taken to protect the trees. (pick up the from the staff report) motion of approval; with change on 4 be changed to single story adjacent residential balconies and number 6 that the word impacted be changed to adjacent; seconded by Mike Marriott.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Consent agenda
Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the minutes from July 5th; seconded by Liz West.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. West said the Commission would miss Mr. Archer and she thanked him.
On behalf of staff, Mr. Dansie thanked Mr. Archer for his years of service to the Planning Commission and for being chair the last year and a half. The Commission and staff applauded.

Adjourn
Motion to adjourn at 8:46pm made by Jack Archer; seconded by Alan Staker.
Staker: Aye
R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
L. West: Aye
M. Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson
Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ DATE: 8-16-2016

TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD
Please sign

Meeting of Planning Commission **on** 7/19/16

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)
Susan Smith	
Lila Gross	
Janet Mika	
Tyler Kukahiko	
Derek Ellis	
Jerry Giardina	
Greg Mathis	
Ryan Smith	
Trisha Clark	
LAURA DOTY	
Mark Jake	
Luke Wilson	