MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2026,
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UTAH

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Barbara Bruno, Council Members Jack Burns, Randy Aton, Pat Campbell, and Kyla Topham
ALSO PRESENT: Town Manager Rick Wixom, Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, Zoning Administrator Kyndal Sagers, Parks and Recreation Director Ryan Gubler, Police Chief Garen Brecke, and Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording.

The Regular Meeting convened at 5:00 pm.

Mayor Bruno led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of the Regular Meeting Agenda

Mayor Bruno noted that staff requested the Council strike Administrative Action items 2 and 3 from the agenda.

Jack Burns made a motion to amend the Regular Meeting Agenda, striking items D2 and D3, and to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

A. Announcements/Information/Community Questions

1. General Announcements

- Parks and Recreation Director Ryan Gubler announced the upcoming Town Birthday Party on March 6.
- Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie said there was a community open house and information presentation for the Wildland Urban Interface Code scheduled for February 17.
- Ms. Topham said the Community Messaging Initiative was scheduled for February 19.
- Mayor Bruno announced that, following a thorough hiring process, Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie had been hired as the new Springdale Town Manager.

2. Zion National Park update – Superintendent Bradybaugh

Superintendent Bradybaugh was unable to attend.

3. Council Department Reports, Questions, and Comments

There were no questions or comments.

4. Community Questions and Comments

Lisa Zumpft, Springdale resident, thanked the Town Council for rezoning the Town-owned property next to the Community Center to the PU Zone. She said the community room was never intended to be used for Council Chambers, and said it was time for the Council to move forward with a design for a new Town Hall. Ms. Zumpft said she wanted the Community Center back for community use and events. She expressed the opinion that the Town needed a new medical clinic in addition to a new Town Hall.

Cliff Roseman, Springdale resident, provided an update on problems with a hotel property adjacent to his property, and said there was much that still needed to be done. He asked the Council to eliminate from Code the need to give three violation warnings, and give the Police Department the ability to implement judgement.

B. Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items:

1. Review of Monthly Purchasing Report
2. Minutes: December 10, 2025, January 12th, 13th, 14th, and 30th, 2026

Randy Aton made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Jack Burns.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

C. Legislative Items

1. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-02 Amending Chapter 10-24-7 of the Town Code Regarding Banner Permits by Adding Additional Permit Requirements, General Standards, and Allowing Banners in the PU Zone

Zoning Administrator Kyndal Sagers explained that banners were currently permitted in the Village Commercial and Central Commercial Zones. The proposed amendments would allow banners in the Public Use Zone and would also add additional permit requirements and safety standards. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed revisions and added a suggested allowance of 12 banners per year for a display length of no more than 14 calendar days, with a minimum of 14 days between when a banner was removed and another displayed on the same property in the PU Zone.

Questions from the Council:

Mayor Bruno said it was her understanding that the proposed amendments were instigated in part by the Arts and Crafts Fair and a desire to use banners to direct people. The Mayor said the Community Center was heavily used and asked for the rationale behind the proposed minimum of 14 days between banner displays. Ms. Sagers explained that the Planning Commission had not wanted banners displayed on a property all the time. Responding to a question from Ms. Topham, Ms. Sagers clarified that only one banner could be placed on a property at a time.

Questions from the Public:

There were no questions from the public.

Jack Burns made a motion to open a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Kyla Topham made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

Council Deliberation:

Mr. Burns said some of the proposed amendments felt overly restrictive. He expressed the opinion that an event with two entrances should be able to display a banner at both. Mr. Campbell said “must” and “shall” were used interchangeably in the document, and suggested only one or the other should be used.

Mr. Campbell suggested that the language state that banners must comply with the sign standards in Section 10-24-3, in addition to the proposed banner standards. Ms. Topham said she did not agree with imposing all sign standards on small community event banners, and expressed the opinion that the color palette in Section 10-24-3 would be too onerous. Mayor Bruno said she did not agree with applying materials requirements in the sign standards to event banners. Mr. Campbell suggested Section 10-24-3 could be referenced, with reduced standards for banners clarified. He said he believed that referencing the sign standards would be cleaner. Mr. Aton said he agreed with Ms. Topham that banners should not be limited to the sign standard color palette, and said a sign was in place for the long term, but a banner was in place for a short time to catch attention for a special event.

Responding to a question from Mayor Bruno, Ms. Sagers said street banners had separate rules. Mayor Bruno said she thought 14 days was a long time for a banner to be displayed and did not think a full 14 days was needed between different banners. Mr. Campbell pointed out that there may be multiple groups with activities or events on a property in the PU Zone at the same time, and asked why the property would be restricted to only one banner at a time. Ms. Topham suggested asking staff to draft language based on the Council's direction that evening. She said she agreed with a limit of one banner per property in commercial zones.

Mayor Bruno summarized that the Council did not think an interval between banners was needed for a new event in the PU Zone. A majority of the Council indicated they were comfortable with a one-banner limit after Ms. Sagers explained that multiple small signs were allowed with an event permit. Mr. Aton suggested

that the language limiting a property to 12 banners per year should be eliminated if banners were limited to one per event in the PU Zone.

Ms. Topham asked whether an organization could apply for a banner permit to advertise an event with a banner in the PU Zone if the event would not be held there. Mr. Aton said he agreed the question should be considered and that he would not want 14 banners on public property in the middle of town at one time. Mr. Dansie commented that the Town could control the time, place, and manner of a banner's placement, but could not control its content. He suggested only allowing banners in the PU Zone for events on Town property. Mr. Dansie explained that, as the owner of the property, the Council could say yes to one group and no to another, as long as the decision was not capricious or arbitrary, and suggested adopting a policy similar to the existing street light banner policy.

Mr. Burns said he would be comfortable allowing up to three banners at a time on a property. Mayor Bruno suggested clarifying whether “property” meant a parcel or a campus. Staff pointed out that school and Fire Department properties were within the PU Zone. Ms. Topham suggested the banner limit should apply per parcel. Mayor Bruno suggested starting with a limit of one banner per parcel at a time in the PU Zone, with the possibility of reevaluating if needed. Mr. Burns said he would not want the Town to be in the position of having to turn one group down because another group already had a banner. A majority of the Council supported allowing up to three banners at a time per parcel in the PU Zone.

Kyla Topham made a motion to table the banner permit Ordinance 2026-02 to allow staff to make the changes discussed regarding the number of banners and the length of time that they can be displayed. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Ordinance 2026-03 (Formerly 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**

Mr. Dansie presented changes to proposed amendments made at the Council's direction at a previous meeting. He said the changes clarified that transient lodging was considered a commercial use, that commercial properties developed with transient lodging must include a landscape buffer yard, and that property in Central Commercial or Village Commercial Zones developed with a residential use did not need to include a landscape buffer yard. Mayor Bruno said she was comfortable with the changes made. Ms. Topham said the proposed ordinance was much better with the changes.

Kyla Topham made a motion to approve Ordinance 2026-03 Amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by adding a requirement for enhanced buffering and screening on commercial properties adjacent to residential uses as discussed in the February 11, 2026, Town Council meeting. The motion is based on the following findings:

1. **The General Plan Land Use and Town Appearance General Goal states to protect residential uses, as well as General Plan Land Use and Town Appearance Sub-Goal F1: develop enhanced screening and buffering standards for new commercial development adjacent to residential uses.**

The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Ordinance 2026-04: Changes to Section 6-1-5 of the Town Code Regarding Motor Vehicle Idling Restrictions, Reducing the Number of Warnings Required Before a Violation Fine Can be Imposed**

Mr. Dansie said the State required that, if adopted, motor vehicle idling prohibition restrictions should be primarily educational and that warning citations must be issued to a violator before a fine could be imposed. He said the State reduced the number of required warning citations from three to one several years ago, and suggested the Council amend the Town ordinance to be consistent with State Code. Mr. Dansie said reducing the number of warning citations from three to at least one would assist in more effectively enforcing the restrictions.

Responding to a question from Mr. Aton, Mr. Dansie said there was no set time limit for compliance. He explained that a warning citation would apply to an individual vehicle operator or to a company that operated a fleet of vehicles. The number of warning citations given would be at the discretion of the enforcement officers. Mayor Bruno noted that the Town ordinance included exceptions to the idling restrictions for extreme temperatures. As the restrictions were meant primarily for educational purposes, enforcement would always be at the discretion of enforcement officers.

Pat Campbell made a motion to approve Ordinance 2026-04, revising Section 6-1-5 of the Town Code regarding Motor Vehicle Idling Restrictions, reducing the number of warning citations required from three to one before imposing a violation fine, consistent with Utah State Law, and directs the Mayor to sign. Kyla Topham seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Ordinance 2026-05: Review and Possible Approval of Revisions to Town Code Section 5-2-13(B) Allowing Dogs to be Off Leash at the New Fenced Dog Area Near the Playground**

Parks and Recreation Director Ryan Gubler said the Town Code was very specific about where dogs were allowed to be off-leash. He reported the new fenced dog area was complete, and suggested the Council approve amendments to allow dogs to be off leash in the new area.

Jack Burns made a motion to approve Ordinance 2026-05, amending Section 5-2-13(B) of the Town Code, allowing dogs to be off leash at the new fenced dog area at the Town Park and directs staff to remove the fourth recital reference to fireworks, and directs the Mayor to sign. Kyla Topham seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

D. Administrative Action Items

1. Request to Modify a Noncomplying Building Located at 145 Zion Park Boulevard by Adding a 108 Square-Foot Office, Applicant: Nate Wells

Mr. Dansie explained that the Town Code allowed noncompliant buildings to be modified only if such a modification did not increase the degree of noncompliance. Under the current Town Code definition of building size, the proposal to enclose an existing covered area to create an office would expand the size of the building and expand the noncomplying nature of the building. The building was originally approved in the mid-1990s under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Mr. Dansie explained that allowances and findings of a CUP were binding on the land in perpetuity. In 2010, for a different application to expand, the Town Council found that, because of the unique nature of the property, the ordinance in effect at the time the CUP was issued could be applied. The Town Ordinance at the time of CUP issuance stated that building size was measured by everything under the roof, not by everything enclosed by walls, and the requested addition was approved. Under that definition, the current proposal to enclose an area already covered by a roof would be acceptable. Mr. Dansie said the applicant requested the Council make the same finding as the Town Council in 2010 and allow the addition of a 108 square-foot office.

Mr. Aton showed a photograph of the existing structure he took earlier that day. Mr. Campbell suggested the Council change the Code to allow such de minimis building alterations. Mr. Aton said allowing the requested office space made sense to him, given the building's footprint. Ms. Topham said the requested office addition would be minimal, but asked where the line would be drawn in the future. She said the request felt to her like eroding the initial approval an inch at a time. Mr. Aton said the Council needed to do the homework and really look at each individual situation. He said he was comfortable with the current request.

Mayor Bruno said that applying the Town Council's 2010 findings would make the current request an exception to the rule. Mr. Burns said the logic of relying on the Council’s decision in 2010 made him nervous. He asked why 108 square feet of office space could not be found in an already 9,000-square-foot building.

Nate Wells, General Manager of Zion Canyon Village, said it was a question of efficiency in how the space was used and that he believed the building's appearance would be improved by the proposal. Mr. Wells said the property was limited in its future expansion because, under the CUP, the building was restricted to the existing roofline. He said adding the office space would increase the efficiency of the use and provide a cleaner exterior appearance.

Mr. Burns said the reasons for wanting the expansion made sense, but emphasized the request did not comply with the current ordinance. Mr. Campbell asked how the Code would need to be adjusted to allow the de minimis alteration. Mr. Dansie responded that the Planning Commission was currently considering an ordinance change along those lines. He said the Planning Commission recognized that several noncompliant buildings in the commercial zones contributed to Springdale's character and was considering ways to encourage investment in those properties.

Mayor Bruno said approval of the current request would feel much like approval of a variance, which was not within the Council’s purview. Mr. Dansie said he agreed that approval should not be phrased as a variance. He said the Council could consider the same line of thinking as in 2010 and find that the ordinance in effect at the time of CUP approval should apply. Mr. Aton said it was clear to him that the proposed addition would improve the building and that he leaned toward following the guidelines set by the Council in 2010, allowing the proposed change to proceed.

Mr. Burns said he believed the best precedent the Town Council could set was being true to current Town ordinances. He said he probably would not have agreed with the Council's logic in 2010. Mr. Burns emphasized a desire to be true to the ordinance as it was currently written. He said he was glad to hear that the Planning Commission was reviewing the ordinance and considering amendments that may allow the requested change in the future. Mayor Bruno and Ms. Topham both said they wanted to approve the request, but agreed they should stay true to the current ordinance.

Pat Campbell motioned that the Town Council has reviewed the Cable Mountain Lodge building permit application for a 108 square-foot office addition to an existing building located at 145 Zion Park Boulevard, Springdale, UT. According to the application, the office will be created by enclosing an open-air area currently beneath the building's roof. The Town Council considered the following facts drawn from the application and current Town Code:

1. **Section 10-21-8 allows alterations to a noncomplying building if the alteration would not result in expansion of any existing nonconformities or create new nonconformities.**
2. **The proposed office is currently an open but covered space, and under the current definition, is not counted in the gross area until it is fully enclosed by walls.**
3. **Enclosing the space would add 108 square feet to the gross area of a building that already exceeded the maximum allowed size, which is an increase in the degree of noncompliance.**
4. **Section 10-21-8 does not authorize any increase in nonconformity. It bars expansion, regardless of scale, so even a very minor expansion in the area was not permitted.**

Based upon the sum total of information, the Town Council denies the application for a 108 square-foot office addition, determining that the enclosed addition increases the building's gross area, and concludes that this increases an existing non-conformity in building size as described in the application. While making clear that the denial is required by the present text of Section 10-11B-5 and Section 10-21-8, and not by any judgment on the merits of the use itself. The motion was seconded by Jack Burns.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

5. **This item was struck from the agenda**

6. **This item was struck from the agenda**

7. **Consideration and Possible Approval of an Amendment to the Springdale Parking Application Pilot Program Agreement Between the Town of Springdale and Utah Tech University**

Police Chief Garen Brecke said he reviewed the proposed amendment to the Springdale Parking Application Pilot Program Agreement with the Town's legal counsel to incorporate Council feedback from the December 2025 Council Meeting. He presented the revised document for Council review and possible approval.

Mr. Campbell expressed approval with the document as revised. Mr. Burns said the agreement did not address the sharing of non-sensitive data. He said he knew data was important for transportation studies and asked whether non-sensitive data from parking meters could be shared with UDOT upon request. Chief Brecke said the Town owned the data and could decide whether to share it if requested.

Responding to a question from Ms. Topham, Chief Brecke said he was happy with the agreement and the pilot program.

Pat Campbell made a motion to approve the amendment to the Springdale Parking Application Pilot Program Agreement between the Town of Springdale and Utah Tech University, and directs the Mayor to sign. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

8. **Review and Possible Approval of Updates to the Park Rental Policy**

Mr. Gubler presented proposed updates to the Park Rental Policy to add a provision for parking. He said the proposed updates would provide guaranteed parking for individuals renting park facilities and prevent larger events from taking over the area's limited parking. Mr. Gubler answered questions from the Council.

Pat Campbell made a motion to approve the addition to Section I of the Town Park Rental Policy, designating specific parking areas available for rental of the Town Field at the rear of the Canyon Community Center and for rentals of the gazebo area adjacent to the playground, and authorize the Mayor to sign. Kyla Topham seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

9. **Partnership Agreement with Preservation Utah – Developing and Hosting a Digital Historic Tour Through the Preservation Utah Tours App**

Ms. Sagers said the Preservation Utah Tours App was a self-guided app that shared stories of Utah's historic places with a wide audience. The proposed agreement was to develop a historic tour of Springdale through the app. Ms. Sagers explained that Preservation Utah would develop, launch, host, and maintain the tour on the app. The agreement would be for a minimum of two years, with the possibility of extension. Ms. Sagers said the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the proposed agreement on November 13, 2025, and recommended that the Town enter into the partnership. She said Town attorneys had reviewed the document and were comfortable that it was an agreement, not a contract, with no cost to the town and voluntary participation.

Ms. Sagers said staff had concerns about including the Pioneer Cemetery due to the delicate nature of the gravestones. Mayor Bruno suggested posting a sign asking visitors to observe from a certain point. Ms. Sagers said a commemorative wall would be installed at the Pioneer Cemetery and suggested the tour could lead visitors to it. Mr. Burns suggested linking the Springdale app tour to a historic photo archive. He expressed appreciation for all the Historic Preservation Commission had done in the last few years.

Mr. Campbell said he had not found an immunity clause in the agreement and that it did not specify who would own the content. He expressed concern with allowing the Historic Preservation Commission to edit the content, and said the agreement did not address accessibility (Americans with Disabilities Act). Mr. Burns said there were app-based historic tours available all over the Country, and that ADA acknowledgements could probably be easily added to the document. Ms. Topham said she personally benefited from ADA accommodations and appreciated the need for equal opportunity, but said she would not want the app tour to stall because of unknown accommodations. Mayor Bruno pointed out that the Preservation Utah Tours App was a State app that would comply with ADA requirements. She said she was comfortable moving forward.

Jack Burns made a motion to approve the Partnership Agreement between the Town of Springdale and Preservation Utah and authorize the Mayor to sign. Pat Campbell seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

E. Administrative Non-Action Items

1. General Council Discussion

The Council and staff scheduled a Special Meeting on February 20, 2026.

Responding to a question from Ms. Topham, Mr. Dansie said the Red Cliffs Lodge was governed by a 2015 Development Agreement and Town Ordinance. He said Red Cliffs Lodge lighting was in compliance with the Town Ordinance as it existed in 2015. In 2021, the Town adopted a new lighting ordinance with a seven-year amortization period, meaning that by 2028, the property must comply with the current ordinance, regardless of the 2015 Development Agreement. Mr. Dansie said there would likely need to be a change to the total number of lumens on the property prior to 2028. He said the information had been explained to Mr. Roseman.

F. Adjourn

Kyla Topham made a motion to adjourn at 7:07 pm. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

_____
Robin Romero, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____ DATE: _____

A recording of the public meeting is available by accessing the Town's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings.