



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

**PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA**  
**THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A WORK MEETING**  
**ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2026, 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. Discussion / Non-Action Items**

1. Discussion Following Direction from The Town Council to Revise Chapter 10-21 of the Town Code, Relating to the Repair and Refurbishment of Noncomplying Buildings. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
2. Discussion of Renovation of Noncomplying Buildings in the Commercial Zones. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

**B. Adjourn**

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

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

APPROVED

*Jennifer McCulloch*

DATE

*01/07/26*

This agenda was posted at the Springdale Canyon Community Center and Town Hall at

*11:45*

am/pm by

*R. Ramo*

on

*01/02/2026*

**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 WORK MEETING HELD ON  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2026, 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 Jennifer McCulloch, Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Mellisa LaBorde, Kashif Bhatti, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

**EXCUSED:** Commissioners Paul Zimmerman, Terry Kruschke, and Rich Swanson.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Zoning Administrator Kyndal Sagers, and Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording. See the attached sheet for attendees.

Ms. McCulloch designated Ms. LaBorde and Mr. Bhatti as voting members in the absence of the excused Commissioners.

**Approval of the Agenda:**

**Motion made by Mellisa LaBorde to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Tom Kenaston.**

**Vote on Motion:**

**McCulloch: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**LaBorde: Aye**

**Bhatti: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**General Announcements:**

Ms. Sagers announced that on January 30th at 2 PM at the Canyon Community Center, there will be a presentation on the history of Zion Canyon. All were welcome to attend.

Mr. Dansie announced that on January 31st, there will be a Community Service Project at River Park, where a revegetation effort with native willows will take place. The community is invited.

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

**A. Discussion / Non-Action Items**

1. Discussion Following Direction from The Town Council to Revise Chapter 10-21 of the Town Code, Relating to the Repair and Refurbishment of Noncomplying Buildings. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

**Staff Presentation:**

Mr. Dansie reminded the Commission that they had been working on this project for a couple of months, so he wanted to give a refresher of where they were and how they had gotten to that point. There were two major points of discussion with the Commission. The first, he stated as a reminder, was that non-complying buildings were those that were legal at the time they were constructed, but subsequent changes to the code had made them not conform or not comply with the current iteration of the code. For example, a setback might have

changed or the building height regulation might have changed, and a structure that was legal when it was built no longer complied. That was considered legal non-complying. Those buildings could remain, and a property owner could add to or alter a non-complying building as long as the alteration did not increase the amount of non-compliance or create any new non-complying features. If a non-complying building was voluntarily removed, any future building on the property needed to comply with the current ordinance. The question, then, was what constituted "removal" of a building.

The second item of discussion for the Commission was the concept of ordinary maintenance and repair. Mr. Dansie stated that the current code allowed a property owner to perform what was called "ordinary maintenance and repair" to keep the structure safe, sanitary, and habitable, and that this was permitted on a non-compliant building. The question, then, was what the scope of ordinary maintenance and repair was and how much it allowed. Did it essentially allow reconstruction of the building? If the entire building was in a state of disrepair, did that allow someone to go in and rebuild the entire building? Did it allow them to replace a few studs? Did it allow them to perform cosmetic work? That was the other issue the Commission had been struggling with—what "ordinary maintenance and repair" meant.

In a previous meeting, the Commission requested some hypothetical scenarios to review, discuss, and reach a consensus on what "ordinary maintenance and repair" might mean. Mr. Dansie stated that his department had created different scenarios, and he invited the Commission to go through them together with him. He asked the members to discuss their responses and seek a consensus. If no consensus was reached, they were to try to form a majority opinion. The intent was that, once a consensus or majority opinion was established, Mr. Dansie's staff could draft ordinance strategies to help implement the consensus or majority positions.

#### **Commission Questions and Discussion:**

There was a total of 6 Scenarios presented to Commission for review and discussion.

- **Scenario 1:** Lucy's house is legally noncomplying. It encroaches into the front and side setbacks. The house is in good condition and has no specific structural damage or decay. She wants to redevelop the property with a new house and plans to voluntarily remove the entire house (including the slab, foundations, and underground utilities) and rebuild.
  - After discussion, Commission agrees that Lucy should be able to build her house within the current footprint of her home.
- **Scenario 2:** Lucy decides not to demolish her entire house, but to keep some of the structure and do a major renovation and addition. Remember, the existing house is in good condition with no damage or decay.
  - After discussion, Commission agreed that if there was a major change to the home that it would impact the dynamic of the neighborhood as a whole. It is agreed that the property owner would be able to develop something that is consistent with the look and feel of the existing neighborhood, and that requiring Lucy to come into full compliance with current standards would be a hardship, because their neighbors most likely would be out of compliance still, and it could change the character of the neighborhood. This started a discussion on possibly changing zone standards to keep individual neighborhoods in compliance as they currently are.
- **Scenario 3:** Mark's house also has noncomplying setbacks. The house has water damage and mold, as well as some termite damage. These issues have developed over time. He would like to make repairs to his house for the purpose of making it safe and sanitary to occupy. He does not plan to make alterations or renovations other than those necessary to make the structure safe.
  - Most commissioners leaned toward flexibility for homeowners dealing with damage beyond their control, especially if safety concerns are documented by an expert. However, staff noted this approach could perpetuate noncompliant structures indefinitely, representing a policy shift from gradually bringing such properties into compliance. Final thoughts on this are that the replacement of the structure would be the same as what exists right now. You can take it out, but what you put back in must be the same as what you took out. The shell of the structure must remain the same.

- **Scenario 4:** Mark (from scenario 3) decides that as long as he is doing some work to make the house safe and sanitary he might as well add that theater room he has always wanted, change roofline, and raise the ceiling height from 8' to 10', which will result in an increased building height (still in compliance with the building height max). All these changes are proposed in the area of the noncomplying setbacks.
  - The Commission discussed that if the owner wanted to make additions or other significant changes beyond ordinary maintenance and repair, the property would need to be brought into full zoning compliance. The consensus was that rebuilding the same structure could be allowed, but any expansions or modifications would require compliance with current standards. If there is an add-on, the structure would need to be brought into full compliance. Commission states that he cannot increase the height of the ceiling, and that the addition would be going beyond the parameters of "ordinary maintenance and repair."
  
- **Scenario 5:** Caroline owns a commercial property on SR-9. It does not comply with the Town's setback, parking, and landscape ordinances. There is nothing wrong with the building and it still has useful life, but the design is outdated the building is a little bit tired. She would like to freshen up the building and give it a new lease of life.
  - Mr. Dansie explains that Scenario 5 is similar to Scenarios 1 and 2, but with a twist of commercial real estate. The Commission clarified that redevelopment within non-compliant setbacks would be allowed, but other non-compliant aspects, such as landscaping, parking, or building height, would need to be brought into compliance. The group discussed whether variances could be granted for issues like parking. It was explained that variances were intended only for cases where unique property characteristics created a hardship. The Commission ultimately agreed that while non-compliant setbacks could remain, all other non-compliant elements would need to be brought into compliance.
  
- **Scenario 6:** Doug's commercial property does not comply with the Town's setback, parking and landscape ordinances. The building has deteriorated over time and is in need of extensive repairs to keep it safe to occupy.
  - Mr. Dansie explains that Scenario 6 is similar to Scenarios 3 and 4, but with a twist of commercial real estate. Commission discussed flexibility for updated design while maintaining consistency with prior discussions. The Commission clarified that redevelopment could occur within existing non-compliant setbacks, but other elements—such as parking, landscaping, and height—would need to comply with current standards. They also discussed allowing property owners to move toward greater compliance (for example, increasing setbacks beyond the existing non-compliant distance) but not permitting further non-compliance. The Commission agreed this concept had merit and directed staff to draft ordinance language reflecting these ideas and apply the same principle of allowing greater compliance in earlier scenarios as well.

Mr. Dansie states that he and his staff will work on ordinance language and present that in a future meeting.

2. Discussion of Renovation of Noncomplying Buildings in the Commercial Zones. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

**Staff Presentation:**

The Commission discussed the prevalence of non-compliant buildings in commercial zones, many of which had been developed before the current code was adopted. Under the town's existing policy, these properties were only required to come into compliance when they redeveloped, a process that could take decades. The discussion focused on whether that gradual approach was acceptable or whether the town should take a more proactive role in accelerating compliance. Possible strategies included creating incentives to encourage incremental compliance or modifying zoning standards. At the previous meeting, the Commission had indicated that while the issue existed, it might not be a significant concern requiring major changes. Mr. Dansie presented a virtual field trip, showing examples of current commercial buildings in Springdale that are not in compliance with current code.

**Commission Questions and Discussion:**

There was a discussion and consensus that part of what makes Springdale unique and aesthetic is the eclectic nature of development, and the different architectural characteristics of the low buildings, low heights, and open space. An opinion that current city ordinances promote this was agreed upon. Even the legally non-complying buildings bring a variety and unique character and authenticity to the town. Commissioner Kenaston brought up a concern from community comments to him about properties that are not being used. He asked if there is a way that we can regulate the non-use of those properties. Mr. Dansie said that they were aware of those concerns, and that the options to require the use of property are limited. He stated that there are requirements for properties to be maintained and kept up. The conclusion for item 2 on the Agenda was that the actions being taken from item 1 were sufficient for the current discussion.

**B. Adjourn**

**Motion made by Mellisa LaBorde to Adjourn at 06:35 p.m. The motion was seconded by Kash Bhatti.**

**Vote on Motion:**

**McCulloch: Aye**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**LaBorde: Aye**

**Bhatti: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**



*April Raddatz*

April Raddatz, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: *Jennifer McCulloch*

DATE: 3/18/26

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



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

**ATTENDANCE RECORD**  
**Please print your name below**

**Meeting:** Planning Commission Work Meeting

**Date:** 01/07/2026

**ATTENDEES:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)

**ATTENDEES:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (please print)