



118 Lion Blvd • PO Box 187 • Springdale, UT 84767 • (435) 772-3434

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA

THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A SPECIAL MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2025, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BLVD – SPRINGDALE, UT 84767

A live broadcast of this meeting will be available to the public for viewing/listening only.

****Please see the stream information below****

Approval of the agenda
General announcements
Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

A. Action Items

1. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-19** Amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by Adding a Requirement for Enhanced Buffering and Screening on Commercial Properties Adjacent to Residential Uses. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
2. **Public Hearing: Zone Change** from Valley Residential (VR) To Public Use (PU) On Parcel S-137-C, A Two-Acre Parcel Immediately Adjacent to the East of the Town Hall Property. Applicant: Town Of Springdale. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
3. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-20** Amending Chapter 10-7A of the Town Code by Adding Medical Offices, Drugstores, Pharmacies, and Medical Clinics as Permitted Uses in The PU Zone. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
4. Discussion and Possible Recommendation for Appointment of Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for 2026.

B. Adjourn

***To access the live stream for this public meeting,
please visit or click the link below:**

<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeeting>

APPROVED

Tom Dansie

DATE

12/3/25

This agenda was posted at the Springdale Canyon Community Center and Town Hall at *1:15* am/pm by *R. Emerson* on *11/26/2025*

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Aren Emerson (435.772.3434) at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Packet materials for this meeting will be available at: <https://www.springdaletown.com/agendacenter/planning-commission-7>



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 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 Paul Zimmerman, Jennifer McCulloch, Mellisa LaBorde, Kashif Bhatti, and Matt Fink from Zion National Park

EXCUSED: Commissioners Terry Kruschke and Rich Swanson.

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

Mr. Kenaston designated Mellisa LaBorde and Kashif Bhatti as voting members in the absence of the excused Commissioners.

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mellisa LaBorde.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: 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. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-19** Amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by Adding a Requirement for Enhanced Buffering and Screening on Commercial Properties Adjacent to Residential Uses. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Dansie presented the proposed amendment to add a requirement for enhanced buffering and screening on commercial properties adjacent to residential uses, and said the Planning Commission had been working on it in work meetings over the past several months. He said the proposed amendment would require enhanced buffering to mitigate potential impacts of new commercial use adjacent to existing residential properties. Three buffering options would be available to new commercial development: (1) a narrower option with fencing and trees; (2) a middle option with berm, fence, and landscaping; or (3) a wider option with landscaping and no

fence, but more width and vegetation for buffer. Owners of commercial property would be required to consult with owners of adjacent residential property.

Questions from the Commission:

Responding to a question from the Planning Commission, Mr. Dansie explained that commercial zones in Springdale could more accurately be called mixed-use zones, because they allowed both commercial and residential uses. He asked the Planning Commission whether, if a property owner chose to develop commercially zoned property with a residential use adjacent to a residential use, there would be a need to buffer the two residential uses from each other. Mr. Dansie said the current language only referred to development in commercial zones, without differentiating between uses. He said the Town received a request to make the language more nuanced to clarify that buffering would be needed only if a commercial use were developed in a commercial zone adjacent to residential.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested the language should be more explicit in stating "all boundaries that adjoin residential use." Mr. Dansie said the proposed language was more explicit in Section A2 but suggested that it would be a good idea to make it clearer, if possible.

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

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

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: 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.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

Ms. McCulloch said the three-option plan seemed good and asked whether the proposed ordinance would be affected by House Bill 48 regarding defensible space. Mr. Dansie said plant selection could resolve the defensible space concern. He said it was his understanding that a majority of the commercial zones in Springdale would likely not be included in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area. Mr. Zimmerman said he believed the proposed language was a good addition to protect residential areas from the effects of commercial development.

Ms. McCulloch expressed the opinion that the proposed language should be changed to clearly reflect that buffering would not be necessary for new residential development in a commercial zone adjacent to residential property. Mr. Zimmerman expressed agreement. Mr. Kenaston pointed out that new housing-related development could end up as a nightly rental. Mr. Zimmerman said he would be less comfortable without a buffer in a commercial nightly-rental situation. Mr. Kenaston suggested no buffer would be okay with a long-term rental. Mr. Zimmerman said for a commercial property with a commercial use, including nightly rentals or short-term rentals, a buffer would be necessary. He suggested adding "...under a commercial use, including short-term rentals, where the property line is adjacent to residential zones" to Section A2. Ms. LaBorde expressed agreement.

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed ordinance revision to add buffer yard requirements for new commercial development adjacent to residential properties, as discussed in the Commission's December 3, 2025, meeting. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. The ordinance revision fulfills Land Use and Appearance Sub-Goal F1 of the General Plan for the Planning Commission to develop enhanced screening and buffering standards for new commercial development adjacent to residential uses.

The motion includes the following conditions:

1. Item A2 language is to read "Landscape buffer yards shall be located on the outer perimeter of a property with a commercial use, including transient lodging, when the property line is adjacent to a property in the Foothill Residential Zone (FR), Valley Residential Zone (VR), or an overlay zone with a primarily residential use. Landscape buffer yards shall extend to the property of the boundary."

Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Public Hearing:** Zone Change from Valley Residential (VR) To Public Use (PU) On Parcel S-137-C, A Two-Acre Parcel Immediately Adjacent to the East of the Town Hall Property. Applicant: Town Of Springdale. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Dansie said the Town of Springdale was the applicant for a proposed zone change from VR to PU on a two-acre parcel immediately adjacent to Town Hall property, with the intent to develop public uses, including a medical clinic. He said the Planning Commission should determine if the parcel met at least one of the criteria for a zone change: (1) the zone change would promote goals and objectives of the General Plan and Land Use Ordinance; (2) the zone change would accommodate substantial changes in conditions; or (3) the zone change would correct a manifest error. Mr. Dansie advised the Planning Commission to consider the Public Use Zone in general, independent of the intended medical clinic.

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

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

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Mellisa LaBorde.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

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

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

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

Commission Deliberation:

Ms. McCulloch said she believed the location was suitable for public use. Mr. Zimmerman said he agreed. Ms. McCulloch said she did not see any reason transportation would not work at the subject location, and Mr. Kenaston agreed there would be a negligible change in traffic. Ms. McCulloch said the impacts would be minimal, and the conceptual designs provided in the application would blend with everything already in place. Mr. Zimmerman indicated agreement. Ms. McCulloch said she believed the proposed change met two of the zone change criteria. Mr. Kenaston expressed agreement.

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed zone change from Valley Residential to Public Use on parcel S-137-C, located immediately to the east of the Town Hall property, as discussed in the Commission's December 3, 2025, meeting. This motion is based on the following findings:

- 1. In accordance with Section 10-3-2(A) of the Town Code, the requested zone change meets not only one necessary requirement, but meets two requirements for a zone change: One, the zone change will accommodate substantial changes and conditions due to a growing community of residents, businesses, and visitors, providing needed services as a result. Two, promote the goals and objectives of the General Plan by promoting community health and wellness and facilitating first-class medical facilities and care.**

Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

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

- 3. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-20** Amending Chapter 10-7A of the Town Code by Adding Medical Offices, Drugstores, Pharmacies, and Medical Clinics as Permitted Uses in The PU Zone. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Dansie explained that the current Town Code included a definition of medical or dental clinic, but the specific use was not identified on the Permitted Uses Chart in Code Section 10-7A. The medical clinic had been operating as a legal nonconforming use in the Public Use Zone on Town Hall property for over 40 years. Mr. Dansie said the proposed amendment would allow medical clinics as permitted uses in the Central Commercial, Village Commercial, and Public Use Zones. He said the question for the Planning Commission to consider was whether to allow medical clinics in the Town, and if so, were the CC, VC, and PU Zones appropriate zones for the use.

Mr. Dansie said pharmacies were currently listed as prohibited in the PU Zone on the Permitted Uses Chart, so an associated change would be needed to specifically allow drugstores and pharmacies as permitted uses in the PU Zone.

Questions from the Commission:

Responding to a question from Ms. McCulloch, Mr. Dansie showed the Permitted Use Chart and the inconsistency with pharmacy and medical office uses.

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

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

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: 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.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Zimmerman said he believed it was appropriate to have a medical clinic on public property in the PU Zone, and appropriate to have an on-site pharmacy associated with the clinic, but expressed concern with the idea of pharmacies popping up on other PU Zones not associated with a Town-sponsored clinic. Mr. Kenaston suggested permitting pharmacy and drugstore use as ancillary to medical clinic use. Mr. Dansie pointed out drugstore and pharmacy use were currently permitted in CC and VC Zones. Mr. Dansie suggested keeping drugstore and pharmacy use as currently listed for the CC and VC Zones, and adding another line for pharmacy and drugstore use in conjunction with medical clinic use in the PU Zone.

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed ordinance revision to allow dental and medical clinics, pharmacies, and drugstores that are ancillary to a medical clinic in the Public Use Zone, as discussed in the Commission's December 3, 2025, meeting. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. The purpose of the Public Use Zone is listed in Section 10-12-1 of the Town Code. The Public Use Zone is established to provide for the location and establishment of public and quasi-public facilities.
2. Section 10-2-2 of the Code defines "quasi-public use" as: A use operated by a private nonprofit, educational, religious, recreational, charitable, or philanthropic institution, such use having the purpose primarily of serving the general public.
3. Medical clinics provide services as private nonprofit organizations providing services to the general public.
4. Medical clinics fit the purpose of public uses, therefore, are appropriate to be included in Public Use Zones.
5. The revision supports the directive of the General Plans Vision Statement: Amenities and Services, the Public Health General Goal, Public Health Sub-Goal A, Public Health Sub-Goal A1c.

The motion includes the following conditions:

1. The definition of clinic, dental, or medical includes pharmacies and, in this case, the change will include pharmacies that are associated with a medical clinic.

Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kenaston: Aye

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

4. Discussion and Possible Recommendation for Appointment of Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for 2026.

Mr. Kenaston said he believed there were many good choices on the Planning Commission for both the Chair and Vice Chair positions. He said he had served as Chair for two years and would opt out of both positions for 2026. Mr. Kenaston expressed the opinion that Jennifer McCulloch had taken a lead role in agenda item discussions and in handling motions in the last year. He said Terry Kruschke had shared with him a willingness to remain Vice Chair, with no interest in the 2026 Chair position. Chair Kenaston said Terry Kruschke had expressed interest in Jennifer McCulloch serving as Chair.

Motion made by Mellisa LaBorde that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Jennifer McCulloch as the Chairperson for the Planning Commission in 2026.
Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

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

Motion made by Jennifer McCulloch that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Terry Kruschke as the Vice Chairperson for the Planning Commission in 2026.
Second by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion:

Mr. Bhatti inquired about Mr. Kruschke's health and expected return. Mr. Kenaston reported that he had spoken with Mr. Kruschke recently and that he plans to resume attending Commission meetings at the beginning of the new year.

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

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to Adjourn at 05:47 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mellisa LaBorde.

Vote on Motion:
Kenaston: Aye
Zimmerman: Aye
McCulloch: Aye

LaBorde: Aye

Bhatti: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.



Robin Romero, Town Clerk

APPROVAL:  _____ DATE: 1/21/26

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.





PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting: Planning Commission Special Meeting

Date: 12/03/2025

ATTENDEES:

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

ATTENDEES:

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Name (please print)

Dear PC Members,

I am concerned that there is discussion about putting a pharmacy on PU land. This is inappropriate. Please do some research before your meeting this Wednesday and not allow that — especially a pharmacy with any 24/7 availability. It would be the only one in Southern Utah. Pharmacies are businesses and should not be on PU land, so if the land next to Town Hall is approved for a zone change to PU, it still should not house a pharmacy. According to the information provided by Mr. Dansie, the definition of medical clinic includes pharmacies, but that is highly unusual and should be changed. Most consider them separate, one appropriate for PU land, one not.

Typical treatment:

- **In most laws, leases, and zoning codes:**
“Clinic (dental or medical)” refers to facilities that **diagnose or treat patients**, usually where medical professionals provide services.
Pharmacies are usually classified separately as **“retail pharmacy,” “drugstore,” or “pharmaceutical services.”**

I wish you well in your discussions. This feels like something Town Council will do what they want regardless of what Planning Commission decides. Obviously I hope I’m wrong or I wouldn’t bother to write especially when today happens to be my busiest day of the year so far.

Thank you for your time, this meeting and all your meetings. You have a difficult job and I, more than most since I watch nearly every meeting, am very much aware of your time and commitment.

Warmly,

Elizabeth Cutler

Additional research yields:

In most cases, a **pharmacy is *not* considered an appropriate use for land designated as Public Use, unless** it is part of a larger *public* facility.

Here’s how it typically works:

When a Pharmacy *Could* Be Allowed on Public Use Land

A pharmacy might be appropriate **only if it is part of a public facility**, such as:

- A **public hospital** or health clinic
- A **county health department facility**
- A **VA or public medical center**

In these situations, the pharmacy directly supports the public purpose of the primary facility. Some jurisdictions classify these as “accessory uses” to a permitted public use.

When a Pharmacy Is *Not* Appropriate

A **stand-alone, privately operated commercial pharmacy** (e.g., CVS, Walgreens, Rite Aid, independent drugstore) usually **does NOT meet the Public Use definition** because:

- It is a **private commercial business**, not a public facility
- It does not serve a governmental, civic, or public-infrastructure purpose
- Zoning for Public Use is intended for schools, libraries, parks, civic centers, public works, hospitals, etc.

Most zoning codes place pharmacies in commercial districts, not public-use districts.

Exceptions (Rare)

Some cities may allow:

- **Leasing of small spaces within public buildings** to private vendors
- **Commercial services that directly support a public facility’s function**

But these require specific authorization or conditional use permits.

Dear Tom, Planning Commission and Town Council,

In your application for a zone change, you justify your application for the change because the area falls under "mixed use". Yet your proposal has no mixed use in it; all your proposals are of quasi commercial use. From the FLUM, it states:

Higher density residential uses (including multifamily uses) are appropriate in this area, as well as small-scale commercial development.

A four thousand square foot building is hardly small scale. Adding a transit hub to the property will also require a lot of space. Nowhere in your proposal are any residential uses. Surrounding this area are residential uses.

The Town's request for a zone change does not meet the requirements needed for approval and should be denied as it has done to private property owners who fail to meet the criteria for zone changes. The Town might want to consider not growing our government with more buildings and more employees and try to hold on to a village atmosphere. If anything, the Town could use more low income housing and small scale commercial on this property that would actually meet the criteria for a zone change.

Max and Julie Gregoric
Sol Foods Supermarket
Hoodoos General Store

Dear Tom,

In addition to my previous email, I would like to remind the Town and the general public about previous zone change denials. Nowhere in your application do you mention any history of denials or proposals to develop this property by private parties. The Planning Commission and Town Council should be made aware of this history. Please include this email in the record.

Max and Julie Gregoric
Sol Foods Supermarket
Hoodoos General Store

I would like to add a public opinion to Item #2 on this agenda enclosed below.

I would encourage the planning commission to recommend against approval of the Zone Change on the parcel listed:

1. This parcel has been before the commission for zone change and changes to go from VR to VC. I was against that zone change, am against this zone change, and am against all zone changes. Zone changes deteriorate the basis of the General Plan, even if as is proposed in this case, are for the public good.
2. The Town jumped the gun in buying a piece of land that was not already zone appropriate for public use development. If a private land owner had done such, they would be denied any zone change regardless of their intent with the property, such as Melanie Madsen (Starnes at the time), Mike Lang, and recently Justin Maebe on this same parcel.
3. Very few medical facilities operate in the black, most are in the red. Expansion of a modestly used medical facility to a new property is unnecessary and could be done on the public use land the town has properly zoned and if done, should be on grant based funding, not from sales tax revenue.
4. Future uses on this property are rhetorical. If a private applicant were to come forward we would require the entire phased planning to be drawn and analyzed before any approval would be given for a zone change.
5. A new post office is preposterous in this town and using this land for that purpose would be a huge waste of public assets and funds. The USPS will be non-existent in 10 years so to build a structure that will have a 30 year or longer pay-off for the residents of this town is over-burdening.
6. The town has obtained 5 or 6 lots from the Ferber Development agreements, one of which is Village Commercial and could be used for a Medical clinic. This VR land could be used for an employee housing development which is more inline with the future use map and General Plan.

Thank you for considering these opinions.

Jonathan Zambella

Tom,

As I believe you know, I represent Zion Park Land, LLC and Zion Park Holding, LLC. We are aware of the proposed buffer zone ordinance that is going to be considered at the Planning Commission meeting tonight. In general, I think we are supportive of this ordinance. However, we wonder if it should apply to VC zoned properties that cannot be developed commercially, which is the case with most of the property currently owned by Zion Park Land on the east end of the campus that we refer to as Pod 3.

We would appreciate the Planning Commission's consideration of some sort of exemption from the buffer zone requirement if the development is housing related (which may or may not be used for nightly rentals), rather than commercial buildings.

Thank you,

A. Craig Hale

HALE | WOOD pllc