



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 05:00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Tom Kenaston, Commissioners Terry Kruschke, Paul Zimmerman, Jennifer McCulloch, Mellisa LaBorde, and Kashif Bhatti.

EXCUSED: Rich Swanson and Matt Fink from Zion National Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Principal Planner Niall Connolly, Zoning Administrator Kyndal Sagers, and Deputy Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording. See the attached sheet for attendees.

Mr. Kenaston designated Kashif Bhatti as a voting member in Mr. Swanson's absence.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements: There were no general announcements.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: There were no declared conflicts of interest.

A. Action Items

1. Erosion Hazard Permit: Carson McKim Seeks an Erosion Hazard Permit Associated with a Remodel to the Home at 517 Watchman Drive. Staff Contact: Niall Connolly.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that Carson McKim had submitted the application on behalf of Elizabeth and Jim Cutler, the property owners. Mr. and Mrs. Cutler planned to remodel their home, which involved minor modifications to the home's footprint. These improvements were located within the moderate and high-risk Erosion Hazard Zone, requiring an Erosion Hazard Permit as part of the process. A study prepared by Rosenberg Engineering supported the application. The study examined the existing bank armoring on the property and analyzed the river dynamics at this location. It found that the riverbank was stable and that the existing erosion protection was in reasonable condition. While some concrete grout had eroded and a boulder had been lost, the engineer concluded that no interventions were needed at this time. The

study recommended that the property owners monitor the riverbank over time, and if additional grout, boulders, or trees were lost, repairs might become necessary in the future. The town engineer reviewed the report and concurred with its conclusions. The property owners were present, along with Jared Bates from Rosenberg Engineering, who had prepared the study.

Questions from the Commission: There were no questions from the Commission.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Kenaston noted that the Commission was being asked to determine whether the application complied with the applicable standards in the Town Code. He stated that he had visited the site a few days prior. In his observation, large boulders along the riverbank, intermixed with established trees, provided substantial protection against flooding. He added that the river ran straight in front of the home and that the property appeared to be 15 to 20 feet or more above the floodway. He observed that the property on the opposite side of the river was at a lower elevation, so any flooding would likely impact that side rather than the Cutlers' property.

Ms. McCulloch said that, after reviewing the assessment and the additional review, everything appeared satisfactory, and she agreed with the recommended conditions.

Mr. Kruschke stated that the application appeared to meet all requirements. The Commission agreed that it was a straightforward application.

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission approve the proposed Erosion Hazard Permit for 517 Watchman Drive as discussed in the Planning Commission meeting on June 18, 2025. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The proposed development meets all the requirements of the Erosion Hazard Zone Ordinance 10-13E: Erosion Hazard Overlay Zone, based on the findings in the erosion hazard assessment and additional review.**

The motion includes the following conditions:

1. **Any vegetation in the riparian zone that is disturbed during the renovation of the home on the property must be replaced with appropriate revegetation using plant species native to Zion Canyon. Native trees that are removed must be replaced at a ratio of two replacements for every tree removed.**
2. **The property owners will monitor the condition of the bank and implement any required maintenance or improvements needed in the future, obtaining the required approval from the Town for any such repairs or improvements.**

The Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Erosion Hazard Permit: Cheyne Chauvin Seeks an Erosion Hazard Permit to Build a Small Commercial Building at 95 Zion Park Blvd (Parcel S-138-C-1). Staff Contact: Niall Connolly.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that the project involved constructing a small building of approximately 300 square feet, or just under that, for Desert Ice, a local company that sells Italian ice. The proposed building would be located about 140 feet from the river, within the moderate Erosion Hazard Zone, thereby triggering the

requirement for an Erosion Hazard Permit. The building site was situated in front of the Brew Pub and Happy Camper Market buildings, which stood between the proposed structure and the river.

Mr. Connolly noted that in 2023, the town had approved an Erosion Hazard Permit for development at this location related to the AT&T cell tower, which included a small equipment enclosure behind the Happy Camper Market near the river. An Erosion Hazard Study completed at that time determined that no improvements to the riverbank were necessary. Given the study's conclusions regarding erosion hazards, staff believed it was reasonable to rely on those findings for this permit application, especially since the proposed building would be shielded from the river by the two existing buildings. The study had indicated that no additional erosion protection was required at that location. The Commission was asked to review the application to determine whether it complied with the requirements of the Town Code, particularly the Erosion Hazard Zone section.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Kruschke inquired whether the development proposal for the building would be presented to the Commission as a separate item.

- Mr. Connolly explained that because the building's size was below the minimum threshold for Commission review, the application would be reviewed by staff. The project would require a Design Development Review and a Floodplain Development Permit, both of which would be handled administratively.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Kenaston reiterated that the Commission was being asked to determine whether the application complied with the applicable standards in the Town Code and to confirm their concurrence with staff's conclusion that the erosion hazard study prepared for the wireless communication infrastructure in 2023 could be applied to this project. He stated that the application seemed straightforward and that he had no concerns.

Mr. Kruschke stated that he had reviewed the original 2023 erosion hazard assessment and noted that it did not require any additional work at that time. He believed the conclusions of that study remained valid. He acknowledged that the 2023 study might not have considered areas as far upstream as the bridge, where water could potentially overflow, but pointed out that such flooding would also impact the Market, the Brew Pub, and the existing buildings, not just the proposed structure.

Mr. Zimmerman recalled that prior floods had come from the western side of the property rather than the eastern side. He noted that water approaching from the east would flow into the lower parking lot area.

Mr. Kruschke observed that, if anything, the proposed building faced less hazard than the Market and the Brew Pub.

Mr. Connolly provided additional information regarding flood risk. He explained that in addition to the Erosion Hazard Permit, the applicant had submitted a Floodplain Development Permit, which staff had reviewed. The proposed structure was designed to be watertight up to the base flood elevation and engineered to be resilient against potential flooding. He noted that the Floodplain Development Permit addressed flood-related concerns.

Mr. Dansie emphasized that the Commission was reviewing two separate issues: flooding and erosion hazard. The purpose of the current review was to evaluate erosion risk, not flooding. He asked the Commission to keep that distinction in mind when discussing potential water flows, as flooding was covered under the Floodplain Development Permit. The question before the Commission was whether the river could erode the bank far enough to jeopardize the building during an erosive event.

Applicant Presentation:

Nate Wells, General Manager of Zion Canyon Village, where the property was located, shared that in December 2010, when they had experienced the peak of flood potential, the river was at 7,900 cubic feet per second. Since that time, they had not experienced similar flood levels. He noted that no property damage had

resulted from that event, and the riverbank directly behind the Brew Pub had been reinforced afterward, making it very stable.

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission approve the Erosion Hazard Permit for the proposed new Desert Ice building at 95 Zion Park Blvd as discussed in the Planning Commission meeting on June 18, 2025. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The proposed development meets all the requirements of the Erosion Hazard Zone Ordinance 10-13E.**
2. **The Planning Commission concurs with the staff's conclusion that the 2023 erosion hazard study associated with the wireless communications infrastructure can be used to satisfy the erosion hazard analysis requirement for this project.**

Second by Terry Kruschke.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Public Hearing:** Ordinance Revision: Changes to Chapter 10-24 of the Town Code Relating to A-Frame and Portable Signs. Staff Contact: Niall Connolly.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that the item was a public hearing for the Planning Commission to consider proposed changes to the signage ordinance relating to A-frame signs. The Commission had discussed the topic at a work meeting about a month earlier, where they considered whether it would be appropriate to modify the town's policy on A-frame signs. During that discussion, the Commission determined that it would be worthwhile to make minor changes to clarify the ordinance language, but not to alter the overall town policy on A-frame signs.

Mr. Connolly noted that the current code language was somewhat ambiguous. While it referred to restrictions on A-frame signs, it was unclear whether the restriction also applied to other small portable signs of different shapes. The proposed language aimed to clarify that the restriction extended to various types of portable signs of a similar description, regardless of their shape. He provided the proposed ordinance language for review and stated that he was happy to answer any questions the Commission might have.

Questions from the Commission:

Mr. Kruschke asked if it was just the one line that had been changed.

- Mr. Connolly confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Kenaston remarked that it was a simple change, while not trivial, it was straightforward and effectively made the language more all-encompassing. He stated that he had no questions.

Questions from the Public: There were no questions from the public.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Jennifer McCulloch.

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye
McCulloch: Aye
Bhatti: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Jennifer McCulloch.
Kenaston: Aye
Kruschke: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
McCulloch: Aye
Bhatti: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Kruschke stated that it was a simple change and reflected what the Commission had discussed at the work meeting. He noted that they had decided to hold off on making any changes to the ordinance regarding the use of A-frame signs until there was a clear need.

Ms. McCulloch agreed, confirming that the Commission had thoroughly discussed the matter and reached that conclusion.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke that the Planning Commission recommend the approval of the proposed changes to Chapter 10-24 of the Springdale Town Code regarding A-Frames and other portable signs as discussed in the Planning Commission meeting on June 18, 2025. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **This change to Chapter 10-24 of the Springdale Town Code clarifies that portable signs of various designs beyond just A-Frame signs are prohibited.**

Second by Jennifer McCulloch.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:
Kenaston: Aye
Kruschke: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
McCulloch: Aye
Bhatti: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

B. Discussion / Non-Action Item

1. Review of Reprioritization of Future Planning Commission Work Meeting Agenda Items as Discussed at the June 2, 2025, Meeting. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Dansie explained that the Commission had recently discussed reprioritizing its work meeting items. The discussion was a non-action item, so no formal motion or approval was needed. A verbal confirmation from the Commission that staff had adequately and appropriately summarized the Commission's priorities from the last meeting would suffice. He requested feedback from the Commission.

Mr. Dansie noted that an additional item had been included on the priority three list, as it had come up since the last work meeting. This item involved minor tweaks and clarifications needed in Section 10-7A-2, which outlines permitted uses by zone. Commissioner Zimmerman, through his research, had identified discrepancies that required correction. Mr. Dansie emphasized that this was purely an administrative cleanup, not a policy decision. He added this item to ensure it would not be overlooked.

Mr. Dansie also informed the Commission that staff had discussed clarifying the application requirements for farmers market permits and private outdoor event permits. This, too, was an administrative cleanup without any new policy involved. Staff believed they could handle the necessary work on both of these items and bring them to the Commission for quick review at a future work meeting. He asked whether the Commission would like staff to proceed, noting that although these were priority three items, they could likely be addressed quickly.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

Mr. Zimmerman proposed moving the street performing item from priority three to priority two.

Mr. Kruschke suggested that the two administrative cleanup items, the table corrections and the farmers market application requirements, also be moved to priority two, since staff could complete most of the work.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed with that suggestion.

Mr. Kruschke expressed that, given the items involved straightforward cleanup and could be resolved quickly, he generally supported moving them up the priority list.

Mr. Kenaston agreed, adding that if these items would not take much time and were relatively important, it would be beneficial to clear them from the to-do list. He noted that their priority one items would require much more time, so addressing smaller tasks efficiently made sense.

The Commission agreed to move the street performing item, the table cleanup, and the farmers market application clarifications to priority two. They also agreed that staff could complete the footwork and bring the items to the Commission during a work meeting. The Commission was comfortable with the rest of the priority list as presented.

Mr. Kenaston inquired about the parking ordinance revisions and asked whether the consultant was still on track to complete their report by mid-July.

- Mr. Dansie confirmed that was correct and added that the final draft plan was out for review and scheduled to be presented to the Town Council on July 9th.

C. Consent Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes from May 7 and May 21, 2025.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke to approve the Consent Agenda for the Minutes from May 7 and May 21, 2025. The motion was seconded by Jennifer McCulloch.

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Bhatti: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

D. Adjourn

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to Adjourn at 05:32 p.m. The motion was seconded by Jennifer McCulloch.

Kenaston: Aye

Kruschke: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Robin Romero, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ **DATE:** _____

A recording of the public meeting is available on the Town's YouTube Channel at youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings. For more information, please call 435-772-3434 or email springdale@springdale.utah.gov.

DRAFT