



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2022, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BLVD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767.**

Meeting convened at 05:01 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Ric Rioux, Commissioners Kyla Topham, Tom Kenaston, Pam Inghram, Noel Benson, Pat Campbell, Adam Hyatt, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Principal Planner Niall Connolly, and Deputy Clerk Aren Emerson recording. See attached sheet for attendees known to have signed into the meeting.

Approval of the Agenda: Motion made by Pam Inghram to approve the agenda. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements:

Mr. Dansie welcomed Niall Connolly, who recently joined the Town staff as the Principal Planner, and urged the Commissioners to introduce themselves to him.

A. Action Items

- 1. Public Hearing - Design/Development Review:** Jonathan Zambella requests a DDR for a commercial building at 1013 Zion Park Blvd in the CC zone.

The proposal was for a new Commercial building intended to be used for a guiding and touring outfitter business. It was designed as a two-story structure but will appear as a one-story structure with a walk-out basement and covered parking in the rear of the building. The applicant had provided a revised site and landscape plan as well as some 3D renderings to assist the Commission in envisioning the design of the building (attachment 1). A rendering of the building that illustrated compliance with the setbacks was provided to the Commission (attachment 2). No public comment had been received regarding this item.

Commission Questions to Staff:

Mr. Benson asked about the parking requirements.

- The code did not require access to come off of a dedicated public street for Commercial development.

Public Questions to Staff: None were asked.

Presentation from applicant:

Jonathan Zambella presented the application as the owner. They decided to create the development with a single-story look with the parking lot at the back of the proposed development to preserve the view.

The architecture was unique, with a flat roof and eave overhangs to provide natural shade and seating areas for the general public. The building would sit lower than the main roofline of the Sol Foods hardware store. The main finishes on the building were steel for low maintenance and to help naturally blend into the landscape over time, as well as stucco. They would be using geogrid for the parking lot to help with potential runoff from the property. The plaza area would be stamped with concrete with natural gardens, and additional vegetation would be planted to mitigate impacts on the adjacent properties. They intended to relocate their business “Zion Guru” to the proposed building once construction was complete. They were conscious of the negative impacts of light pollution on the nearby residents, so can lighting was presented on the building to avoid light trespassing. He clarified that the effective net height of the fence would be five feet from the base of the two-foot berm.

Commission Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Inghram asked if the applicant had planned to install a pump to recycle the runoff water for landscaping.

- He had not verified if the Town allowed that but thought it was an effective use of that water.

Questions by the public to the Applicant:

Shayan Rohani asked who owned and maintained Big Springs Road.

- The Town previously paved the road under the impression that it was a dedicated public street. It had recently been clarified that Big Springs Road was a private street.
- Jonathan Zambella stated that although a specific resolution had not been reached, he was aware of the maintenance issue on the road and started having discussions with neighbors regarding that issue.

Motion made by Noel Benson to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Kyla Topham.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Shayan Rohani expressed concern about an increase in light pollution in the area and how it might affect the neighboring residents. He was also concerned about the maintenance of Big Springs Road and felt the burden of maintaining it should not fall on the residents.

Max Gregoric was the neighboring business owner and expressed his support for the project. They appreciated the applicants previously approaching them with their plans.

Jerry Healey was a resident of 24 years and expressed his full support for the proposed project. He appreciated that a community member was developing in town and hiring members of the community. The building was appealing and preferable over transient lodging.

Motion to close the Public Hearing made by Pam Inghram. Seconded by Tom Kenaston.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission deliberation:

The Commission appreciated the communication between the applicant and his neighbors regarding the proposed development and discussed that the project would enhance the look of SR9 and protect the viewshed. They commended Jonathan for the amount of thought and work put into the project to make it comply with the land use requirements.

Mr. Benson asked if the revised parking plan would need to be addressed in a motion.

- If the Commission decided to approve the proposed project, they should address in their motion that they approved the latest version of the parking plans.

Motion made by Tom Kenaston that the Planning Commission approves the proposed Design Development Review for 1013 Zion Park Boulevard as discussed in the June 1, 2022, Planning Commission meeting. This motion is based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed development meets all of the development standards of the CC zone. This includes the lot area, building size, building height, grading, colors, materials, and geologic concerns.**
- 2. The setback requirements as outlined in Ordinance 10-11A-6 were found to be fully in compliance.**
- 3. The landscaping complies with the 50% allowance for planned landscaping in the right of way.**
- 4. The applicant recently changed the parking configuration to be within the setback, so it is now in compliance.**
- 5. Lighting is also in compliance, but the applicant is reminded that any light illumination on the sign must be included in the total illumination cap for the property. Seconded by Kyla Topham.**

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Discussion / Non-Action Items

2. Discussion of a workforce housing zone.

In several meetings, the Commission had discussed housing options, specifically creating a workforce housing zone. The staff report outlined a basic overview of some strategies that could be included in a workforce housing overlay zone. The language was modeled on the City of Moab's workforce housing zone that they had recently adopted, the Moderate-Income Housing Overlay zone, and parts of the Cottage Housing Overlay zone. It was intended as an option for a developer to request the overlay zone and, if granted, would allow increased housing density on the property. The Commission needed to determine an appropriate density. As a condition for receiving the increased density, the developer would be required to ensure 75% of the housing units in the development were occupied by households where the Town of Springdale actively employed 50% of the adults. Actively employed would require working at least 30 hours per week for at least nine months per year for a business located within the Town. The Commission needed to discuss the strategies and concepts of the framework and give direction on how they would like to proceed.

Mr. Benson inquired about the density requirements of the Moderate-Income Overlay zone.

- Currently, there was no set density; it was calculated in the negotiation between the applicant and the Town.

Ms. Inghram asked why the landscape requirement was 50%.

- If the intent was to provide housing opportunities, that gave the developer flexibility to work with their property and still offered a significant amount of landscaping.

Ms. Inghram expressed concern about the impacts of reducing specific density standards and landscape requirements.

Ms. McPartland added that if the Town prioritized providing a workforce housing option, slightly reducing density or landscape standards was a way to incentivize to promote the community atmosphere.

Ms. Inghram suggested adding a maximum occupancy per room to avoid congestion and negative impacts.

- There was language in the definitions section to clarify what a family consisted of and the maximum number of unrelated adults allowed.

Mr. Campbell was concerned about which zones this applied to. He could see negative impacts from these more significant developments being placed next to residential areas without a buffer zone.

Ms. Topham and Mr. Hyatt stated that since a lot of the businesses in Town were not open year-round and most employees in Town were seasonal, they should be slightly flexible on the criteria of a full-time employee.

Mr. Benson stated this would be a fundamental shift in the way developers approached the Town and wanted to receive public feedback before moving forward.

Ms. Inghram requested construction costs before moving forward to ensure the benefit to the Town outweighed the benefit to developers and to determine if the numbers were economically feasible.

Jonathan Zambella provided insight as a resident, developer, and business owner. He provides housing to staff in Rockville that was heavily subsidized. He highly cautioned against an overlay zone and did not feel it would be an incentive in the Town as a developer. He stated that as a developer, a smaller piece of land was more appealing and would place smaller units on the property with parking below the units to conserve density.

The Commission appreciated the framework of the ordinance and decided to gather public input to ensure it made sense and feel more confident in the language they would be putting out. The Town Council was entertaining hiring a housing consultant in their next meeting who could provide crucial information and some of the economic analysis to the Commission to understand the figures and framework better.

3. Evaluate Planning Commission work item priorities.

Ms. Topham asked what item Councilmember Zumpft wanted the Commission to prioritize.

- Mr. Dansie stated that Ms. Zumpft requested the Commission look into allowing restaurants to continue to operate in the Agricultural zone (AG). Upon further research, Mr. Dansie discovered that restaurants were permitted in the AG zone and had not been prohibited with the removal of the CUP process. He recommended that the Commission place a minimum lot size requirement if the Commission were to keep restaurants in the AG zone as Councilmember Zumpft had requested.

Ms. Inghram was concerned about restaurants in the AG zone with AG property taxes. She questioned why the Town would want a restaurant to have AG property taxes.

- The Commission primarily focused on land use. Zoning decisions should not be based on tax revenue.

The Commission determined that their high priority items would be:

1. Review the allowance for restaurants in the AG zone and possibly creating a minimum lot size.

- Ms. Inghram volunteered to review the land use issues in the AG zone and create a minimum lot size to protect the views in that zone. She suggested a building size to prevent more significant buildings from being developed in those zones.

2. Water conservation policies and strategies.

- The Commission determined the water conservation policies and strategies would be a priority and recommended getting input and education to see where the Town was with these issues.
- Mr. Dansie stated that the Town analyzed the information regularly and could provide this information to the Commission for review and research to implement land-use policies to help conserve water.

3. The proliferation of Ebike rental companies and mitigating the safety hazards in Town.

- The Commission liked having more people on bikes but was concerned with the proliferation of Ebike rental companies in Town and the safety hazards that come with it. They wanted to consider requiring those companies to provide customer staging and training areas.
- Mr. Hyatt suggested looking into the parking needs and implementing a requirement for those specific companies since there was some confusion about which category they fell under.

4. Allowing long-term rental of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU).

- Ms. Inghram suggested allowing the long-term rental of Accessory Dwelling Units since the Commission was currently working on housing strategies.

C. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 07:09 pm made by Tom Kenaston Seconded by Pam Inghram.

Topham: Aye

Benson: Aye

Rioux: Aye

Kenaston: Aye

Inghram: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Aren Emerson, Deputy Clerk

APPROVAL: _____

DATE: _____

A recording of the public meeting is available by contacting the Town Clerk's Office. Please call 435-772-3434 or via email at springdale@springdale.utah.gov for more information.