



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING ON  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2026, AT 5:00 PM  
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,  
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

**The meeting convened at 5:01 PM.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Jennifer McCulloch, Commissioners Paul Zimmerman, Terry Kruschke, Kashif Bhatti, Tom Kenaston, and Matt Fink from Zion National Park.

**EXCUSED:** Commissioners Rich Swanson and Mellisa LaBorde.

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

Ms. McCulloch designated Mr. Bhatti as voting member in the absence of the excused Commissioner.

**Approval of the Agenda:**

**Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.**

**Vote on Motion:**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Kruschke: Aye**

**McCulloch: Aye**

**Zimmerman: Aye**

**Bhatti: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**General Announcements:**

Ms. Sagers announced that the current week is Local's Week and it runs until Friday. She continued that there would be a Town Birthday on Friday at the Community Center from 2 PM-4 PM, and that all are invited to come, and all are invited to participate in Local's Week.

Mr. Dansie announced that there are currently two surveys for the town. One is the community well-being survey. The survey is put on by Utah State University. It is the same survey that the town participated in two years ago. The survey asks residents about their perceptions of personal and community well-being. The survey is part of a statewide project that about 40 other communities are participating in, and it allows Springdale to compare the results for the current year to the results two years ago, and also compare to other communities across the state. The second survey is for the Messaging Initiative. The Message

Initiative was a community presentation, and Mr. Dansie expressed hope of community participation in that survey.

Ms. Romero also made a statement reminding Commissioners that Ms. McCulloch is the chair, so if there is any information that needs to be shared with her to reach out to her.

**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: Niall Connolly.

**Staff Presentation:**

Several months earlier, the Planning Commission had been instructed by the Town Council to clarify the rules regarding the repair and refurbishment of non-complying buildings. The Commission had explored various options and determined that the intent was to retain the requirement for redevelopment of such properties to comply with the current code. At the same time, the Commissioners recognized that some non-compliant buildings might need to be substantially reconstructed due to involuntary circumstances. At the time of the meeting, the code addressed certain scenarios—such as catastrophic events like floods, fires, and earthquakes—where rebuilding was permitted, as well as situations involving ordinary maintenance and repair. Discussions over the preceding months revealed scenarios that fell between these categories. Mr. Connolly noted that it would be helpful to include language defining “involuntary removal” of a non-compliant building, and he drafted proposed ordinance language to address this issue, included as Exhibit A.

**Commission Questions and Discussion:**

The group discussed proposed zoning language regarding building setbacks and reconstruction, focusing on whether rebuilt structures should have been required to match original setbacks or simply not exceed them. One suggestion aimed to provide flexibility by allowing buildings to be moved into better compliance rather than forcing them to remain in the exact same footprint. There was discussion about whether the wording unintentionally required rebuilding within the same envelope despite prior allowances for modifications. The current ordinance allowed additions to non-complying structures as long as the nonconformity was not increased. There was also discussion about whether changes to a building’s foundation—even if reducing nonconformity—would have caused a project to be considered new construction rather than maintenance and repair. Additionally, the ordinance allowed plumbing to be moved and openings to be made in the slab with a building permit.

2. Discussion of Renovation of Noncomplying Buildings in the Commercial Zones. Staff Contact: Niall Connolly.

**Staff Presentation:**

Mr. Connolly introduced drafted language from staff regarding the renovation of noncomplying buildings in the Commercial Zones. There has been discussion for the last several months about what verbiage should be included in the Ordinance. The Commission discussed proposed language to renovate non-compliant commercial buildings, allowing them to be rebuilt within their existing footprint while meeting

current code requirements in other areas. Additions outside the footprint were not permitted, though a one-time height increase of up to two feet was allowed. The provision could only be used once, and property owners still retained the option to fully redevelop under current zoning regulations. The discussion also acknowledged the role of older, non-conforming buildings in contributing to the town's character.

**Commission Questions and Discussion:**

There was discussion on non-conforming use, and the idea that if rebuilding took longer than a year, the non-conforming use could be maintained. A concern was raised that this could have created a loophole allowing indefinite continuation of a non-conforming use. To address this, it was suggested to add a timeframe requiring the non-conforming use to be reestablished within a certain amount of time after reconstruction was complete, ensuring it was actively resumed rather than delayed indefinitely. It was also proposed to clarify that once reestablished, the non-conforming use would continue to be regulated as such, preventing any misunderstanding that it would be treated differently in the future. There was also a suggestion that the two-foot roof increase would require justification for an increase in height.

**B. Adjourn**

**Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to Adjourn at 5:44 PM The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.**

**Vote on Motion:**

**Kenaston: Aye**

**Kruschke: Aye**

**McCulloch: Aye**

**Zimmerman: Aye**

**Bhatti: Aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

---

April Raddatz, Deputy Town Clerk

**APPROVAL:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

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