



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

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 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. Action Items

1. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-08 Review of Land Use Ordinance Amendment Application from Noel Benson, proposing an amendment to Section 10-18-4 of the Town Code. The proposed amendment would introduce tiered minimum landscape and open space requirements based on the property size in the Village Commercial zone. Staff contact: Niall Connolly
2. Public Hearing: Zone change from the Foothill Residential Zone to the Foothill Residential Zone with the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone at 120 Kinesava Drive, lot S-KARA-1. Applicant: Kathy LaFave. Staff contact: Niall Connolly
3. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-09 Amending Chapter 10-21-8 of the Town Code relating to maintenance and repair of noncomplying buildings and inserting a new section of Code dealing with involuntary removal of a noncomplying building. Staff contact: Niall Connolly
4. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-10 Amending Chapter 10-21 of the Town Code relating to renovation and redevelopment of noncomplying buildings in the commercial zones. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

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

4/15/26

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

11:00am

pm by

R. Emerson

on

04/10/2026

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 REGULAR MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, AT 5:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 5:00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Jennifer McCulloch, Commissioners Terry Kruschke, Paul Zimmerman, and Susan McPartland from Zion National Park.

EXCUSED: Commissioners Tom Kenaston, Kashif Bhatti, Rich Swanson, and Mellisa LaBorde.

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

Approval of the Agenda:

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

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements:

Ms. Sagers announced the Zion Chalk and Earth Fest on Saturday and Sunday, April 18-19, 2026.

Ms. Sagers also announced a free concert at the park gazebo with Eric Dodge on Saturday, April 25, 2026, at 6:00 PM.

Ms. Sagers additionally announced that Navy Day would be on Monday, April 20, 2026, with a concert at 6:00 PM.

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

A. Action Items

1. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-08 Review of Land Use Ordinance Amendment Application from **Noel Benson**, proposing an amendment to Section 10-18-4 of the Town Code. The proposed amendment would introduce tiered minimum landscape and open space requirements based on the property size in the Village Commercial zone. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that the current code required 60% of Village Commercial properties to remain landscaped or natural open space. Under the proposal, properties one-half acre or larger would retain the existing 60% requirement, properties between one-quarter acre and one-half acre would require 50%, and properties smaller than one-quarter acre would require 40%. Staff noted that similar tiered landscape standards already existed in the Central Commercial and Valley Residential zones.

Mr. Connolly reviewed the criteria for amending the town code and explained that the Planning Commission's role was to review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Town Council regarding adoption. Commissioners were also directed to review public comments submitted for the hearing.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Benson explained that his family owned a small Village Commercial property in Springdale and had spent nearly two years trying to determine a feasible development plan for the site. He stated that the current landscaping requirements heavily influenced what could realistically be developed on smaller properties and argued that the existing standards effectively pushed such properties toward very limited types of uses.

He explained that minimal development would likely result in a very small-scale use such as a bike rental business because those uses required limited parking and indoor space. He stated that he did not want to pursue that option. He also explained that creating the type of business he hoped for, specifically a restaurant, would require stacking uses vertically and placing parking underneath, which he felt would overdevelop the property and likely not be financially feasible. The third option, in his view, was to leave the property largely unused despite its current unattractive condition.

The applicant stated that he had tried to work within the goals of the General Plan and believed his proposal aligned with Town priorities. He also noted that his property had recently been reassessed from approximately 0.24 acres to 0.26 acres, placing it just above the proposed threshold for the lower landscaping requirement. He requested that the commission consider adding a 5% administrative tolerance to the tiered standards, explaining that even a small adjustment would make a significant difference in the property's development potential. He also reminded the commission that it had the flexibility to recommend modifications to the proposal rather than simply approving or denying it.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke to open the Public Hearing and move into the Public Comment period. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McCulloch acknowledged the public comment letters that the Commissioners had received, and she thanked the public for those letters.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to close the Public Hearing period. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

Mr. Kruschke expressed general support for the proposal but questioned whether reducing the landscaping requirement to 40% for quarter-acre properties would provide meaningful additional development flexibility due to existing parking and setback requirements. After reviewing calculations, he suggested that a 50% landscaping requirement for smaller properties might be more appropriate and would better align with the Village Commercial Zone's role as a transition between residential and commercial areas.

Mr. Benson responded by stating that reduced landscaping requirements would provide additional design flexibility and could allow the project to remain a one-story development. He explained that the proposal would significantly improve the feasibility of developing the small property, which under current standards could only accommodate a very small building and limited parking. He also noted that parking remained necessary because evening public transportation options were limited and many customers would still rely on vehicles.

After much deliberation on whether to keep the bottom-tier amount at 40% or 45%, and discussion of a 5% administrative tolerance, Commissioners were ready to make a motion.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke that the Planning Commission recommends that the Town Council approve the Ordinance amendment proposed by Mr. Noel Benson, which would revise Section 10-18 of the Town Code by introducing a tiered landscaping requirement in the Village Commercial Zone. This motion is based on the following findings:

- 1. It supports the Land Use and Town Appearance goals, especially Sub-goal 3, where the Planning Commission will update land use Ordinances to make sure it stays true to the intention of promoting mixed use along Zion Park Boulevard, while allowing development that meets the community needs and desires.**
- 2. It also meets the economic Sub-goal A to enhance and support small and independent businesses that are unique to Springdale, and help promote the small town and village character.**

In making this approval, the Planning Commission recommends to the Town Council the following.

- 1. Review of the 0.25-acre minimum of 40% and determine if that should be somewhat different or not.**

Second by Paul Zimmerman

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Hearing: Zone change from the Foothill Residential Zone to the Foothill Residential Zone with the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone at 120 Kinesava Drive, lot S-KARA-1. Applicant: Kathy LaFave. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly presented a public hearing regarding an application submitted by Kathy LaFave for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone at 120 Kinesava Drive. The proposal involved adding a second single-family home to the property, subdividing the lot, and creating an ownership housing unit rather than a rental unit.

Mr. Connolly explained that if the overlay zone were approved, both the existing and proposed homes would be deed-restricted for occupancy by qualified households, meaning residents would need to work at least 30 hours per week in either Springdale or Zion National Park. He reviewed the applicable standards for the overlay zone application and noted that the Planning Commission could recommend approval if the proposal furthered the goals of the General Plan or addressed changing conditions.

Applicant Presentation:

Ms. LaFave expressed strong support for workforce housing in Springdale and stated that the community's General Plan emphasized maintaining a diverse and attainable residential population. She noted that housing in Springdale had become increasingly unaffordable for working residents and explained that the proposal was intended to help provide attainable homeownership opportunities for local workers.

Ms. LaFave stated that her family was willing to subdivide their property, add an additional home, and place deed restrictions on both properties to ensure they remained available to qualified workforce residents. She acknowledged that the deed restrictions would reduce the property's future market value but stated that her family supported the effort because they believed it would benefit the community. The applicant also explained that the proposal would have minimal impact on neighboring properties. She characterized the proposal as a community-focused effort rather than a profit-driven project and expressed support for establishing a positive precedent for workforce housing in the town.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

Mr. Krushke brought up concerns about whether this would be consistent with the rest of the homes in the area, and whether it would be suitable in the neighborhood. Ms. LaFave was reassuring that the home would fit in with the homes in the neighborhood, and she was focused on a smaller footprint and similar exterior features to those around this one.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke to open the Public Hearing and move into the Public Comment period. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Vote on Motion:

Krushke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McCulloch again acknowledged the many public comment letters the Commissioners had received and thanked the public for them.

Public Comments:

Noel Benson: Mr. Benson extended full support for the Applicant. He stated that he has reservations about the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone Ordinance in general, but that this application didn't cause him to have reservations.

No other public comments were made.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke to close the Public Hearing period. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Response from the Applicant: Ms. LaFave expressed her appreciation to the community for their involvement and for writing letters of support.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman that the Planning Commission recommends that the Town Council approves the zone map amendment application which would apply the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone to the property at 120 Kinesava Drive. This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. **The change supports Chapter 3, Housing, of the Town's General Plan under Sub-goal A, "Maintain Springdale's character as a rural residential community", and Sub-goal B, "Promote community character by providing opportunities for more key contributors to the community to live full-time in the community."**
2. **It supports Springdale Town Code Title 10, Chapter 13, Article G, Workforce Housing Overlay Zone, an Ordinance adopted to help facilitate the availability of attainable housing options for employees working in Springdale and Zion National Park. In adopting the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone, the Town found that having employees of local business living in the community strengthens the community and adds to the Town's village character.**
3. **This zone change will resemble two lots and no more, requiring qualified occupancy of actively employed adults in the town supporting Code Ordinances 10-13G-3, 10-13G-4, and 10-13G-5, and are compliant with the town color palette.**
4. **Both lots will be deed-restricted in accordance with the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone.**
5. **A Restrictive Covenant will also be filed with the Washington County Recorder's Office that stipulates the units must be sold or rented to qualified households.**
6. **In accordance with Code Ordinance 10-13G-12, a Development Agreement will be entered into with the Town and recorded with the County of Washington Recorder's Office stipulating the same.**

Motion seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-09 Amending Chapter 10-21-8 of the Town Code relating to maintenance and repair of noncomplying buildings and inserting a new section of Code dealing with involuntary removal of a noncomplying building. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that the discussion originated from a request for the Town Council to interpret language within the non-complying structures chapter of the Town Code. Following that interpretation, the Town Council directed the Planning Commission to review the issue and clarify the definition of ordinary maintenance and repair.

Mr. Connolly stated that the commission had worked for several months to develop ordinance language addressing the issue. The proposed amendments clarified the definition of "ordinary maintenance and repair" and added a new section addressing situations involving "involuntary removal", which applied to circumstances that exceeded ordinary maintenance but did not rise to the level of a catastrophe.

Mr. Connolly noted that the commission had reviewed the draft language at the previous meeting and that revisions had since been made based on commissioner feedback. The Planning Commission was asked to make a recommendation to the Town Council regarding the adoption of the proposed ordinance amendments. See Exhibit A for the proposed amendments.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to open the Public Hearing and move into the Public Comment period. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McCulloch acknowledged the public comment letters received.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to close the Public Hearing period. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

Mr. Kruschke acknowledged that there had been a lot of conversation between the Commissioners on this, and he thinks the draft language looks good. Ms. McCulloch agreed that the draft language and revisions looked good.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed changes to Chapter 10-21-8 and the insertion of a new paragraph 10-21-9 into the Town Code as discussed at the Planning Commission meeting on April 15, 2026. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. **This Ordinance revision clarifies ambiguities in the requirements related to maintenance, repair, alteration, and improvements of non-complying buildings and structures.**
2. **This Ordinance revision also makes allowances for circumstances where a non-complying building or structure has declined over time rather than by a catastrophic event, and requires extensive improvement beyond the definition of ordinary maintenance and repair.**
3. **It defines the requirements and conditions that must be met to allow rebuilding any non-compliant aspects of the previous structure.**

Motion seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026-10 Amending Chapter 10-21 of the Town Code relating to renovation and redevelopment of noncomplying buildings in the commercial zones. Staff contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly explained that the purpose of the amendments was to help preserve the vitality and character of the downtown area while recognizing that many existing buildings in those zones were nonconforming.

The proposed amendments would allow reconstruction of buildings that did not comply with current setback or maximum building size standards, provided the properties were brought into compliance with all other applicable town ordinances. The amendments also addressed nonconforming uses that might be temporarily interrupted during construction.

Mr. Connolly noted that the Planning Commission had previously reviewed the proposed language and that revisions had been made based on feedback from the prior meeting. See Exhibit B for the proposed amendments.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to open the Public Hearing and move into the Public Comment period. The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Motion made by Terry Kruschke to close the Public Hearing period. The motion was seconded by Paul Zimmerman.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

All of the Commissioners agreed that this was a very thorough job, and they are all pleased with the language in these proposed changes.

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed changes to Chapter 10-21 by insertion of new paragraph Chapter 10-21-10 into the Town Code as discussed at the Commission meeting on April 15, 2026. This motion is based on the following findings:

1. It supports the General Plan Chapter 1 Land Use and Town Appearance. Sub-goal A. "Maintain Springdale's identity as unique village with a spectacular scenic setting and preserve the Town's distinctive and small community feel and atmosphere, and Sub-goal B to ensure new development is compatible with the town setting at the entrance to Zion National Park consistent with the Town's architectural heritage and complements the existing development in the area.

Motion seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Discussion of the motion: There was no additional discussion

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Adjourn

Motion made by Paul Zimmerman to Adjourn at 6:32 PM The motion was seconded by Terry Kruschke.

Vote on Motion:

Kruschke: Aye

McCulloch: Aye

Zimmerman: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "April Raddatz", written over a horizontal line.

April Raddatz, Deputy Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jennifer McCulloch", written over a horizontal line.

DATE: _____

The date "6/3/26" is handwritten in blue ink over a horizontal line.

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.

10-21-8: MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, ALTERATION AND IMPROVEMENTS TO NONCOMPLYING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE:

Anything in this chapter notwithstanding, the following shall regulate the maintenance, repair, alteration and improvement of noncomplying buildings and structures. In all cases, where works constitute a substantial alteration of a structure, the works shall include measures, as necessary, to ensure the structure complies with town's current flood hazard reduction provisions, as set out in section 10-13A-8 of this title.

- A. *Ordinary maintenance and repair:* Ordinary maintenance and repair of noncomplying buildings and structures is allowed so long as such maintenance or repair will not result in expansion of any existing nonconformities or creation of new nonconformities. "Ordinary maintenance and repair" means improvements made to a building for the purpose of keeping the structure in a state of repair and protecting the structure from failure or decline. The term shall also apply to the rehabilitation of a building or structure which is in disrepair for the purpose of making the structure safe and sanitary, in accordance with local building code. Further, interior improvements within existing walls, not resulting in additional habitable space, shall be permitted. *Ordinary maintenance and repair does not include extensive construction or reconstruction, such as entirely replacing exterior walls or completely replacing the roof trusses.*
- B. *Alterations:*
 - 1. *Single-family dwellings:*
 - a. A single-family dwelling having nonconforming aspects may be altered or added to if such alteration or addition will not result in expansion of any existing nonconformities or creation of new nonconformities.
 - b. When a single-family dwelling is nonconforming as to setbacks, additions or alterations shall be permitted on the first floor if such addition or alteration will not result in the expansion of any existing nonconformities or the creation of new nonconformities.
 - 2. *Multi-family dwelling or commercial building:* A duplex, multi-family dwelling or commercial building or structure having nonconforming aspects, but having a use that is conforming, may be altered or added to, with the approval of the Town Council, provided such alteration or addition will not result in an expansion of any existing nonconformities or creation of new nonconformities.

(Ord. No. 2023-01, § 2, 2-8-2023)

10-21-9: INVOLUNTARY REMOVAL OF A NONCOMPLYING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE

If a nonconforming building or structure has declined over an extended period, due to circumstances other than a catastrophic event, and extensive improvements are required which exceed the definition of "ordinary maintenance and repair", this may be permitted in the following circumstances:

- A. Planning Commission approval is required for any such improvements. Approval must be received prior to the demolition of the building or structure. Approval will not be given after a building or structure has been demolished.
- B. A written opinion from an engineer or other suitably qualified individual must be provided, stating that the proposed refurbishments are necessary in order to make the structure safe and sanitary, in accordance with local building code. The Town Building Inspector will review this and provide advice to the Planning Commission on the merits of the written opinion.

-
- C. The Planning Commission finds that there is ample justification for allowing the proposed improvements and the existing nonconformities to be retained.
 - D. Building elements above the floor slab or foundation (such as exterior walls or roof trusses) may be entirely reconstructed, as long as the structure with the newly reconstructed building elements does not exceed the size or height of the original structure, the design of the building with the reconstructed building elements is consistent with the design of the original structure, and the setbacks of the structure with the reconstructed building elements matches the setbacks of the original structure, or increases compliance with the required setbacks. Minor deviations from the original footprint may be approved if they would reduce the noncompliance of the structure. Any such improvements shall not result in expansion of any existing nonconformities or creation of new nonconformities.
 - E. Removal of the floor slab or footings will constitute redevelopment of the property, and in such circumstances the noncomplying elements of the building or structure shall not be rebuilt. If a written opinion from an engineer or other suitability qualified individual provides evidence that repairs or replacement of sections of the floor slab or footings is necessary for safety reasons, this may be approved.

EXHIBIT B

10-21-10 RENOVATION OF NONCOMPLYING BUILDINGS IN THE COMMERCIAL ZONES

A building in the Central Commercial zone or Village Commercial zone that does not comply with the minimum required setbacks, or exceeds the maximum building size, or both, may be completely reconstructed (including removal and replacement of the foundation), provided that all of the following conditions are met:

- A. The reconstructed building must be located entirely within the footprint of the existing noncompliant building. Extensions outside of the existing footprint may be permitted, so long as such an extension would be compliant with all relevant code requirements.
- B. All other aspects of development on the property must be compliant with current land use standards, or be brought into compliance coincident with the reconstruction of the noncomplying building. If compliance with any other land use regulation makes it impossible to reconstruct the building within its original footprint, the noncomplying building must be altered (in a way that does not increase the noncompliant setback or size) to allow compliance with all other applicable land use regulations.
- C. The height of the reconstructed building must not exceed the height of the existing building. An additional two feet in height may be approved if evidence is provided that shows the additional height would be necessary to comply with Building Code requirements. In all cases, building height must comply with the current maximum building height allowed in that zone.
- D. All other aspects of the reconstructed building must comply with current land use regulations.
- E. All noncompliant aspects of a property in the Central Commercial or Village Commercial zones, other than building size and setback, must be brought into compliance when a property is redeveloped.
- F. A noncompliant building reconstructed pursuant to the standards above retains its noncomplying building status and will continue to be regulated as a noncompliant building.
- G. After May 13, 2026, a noncompliant building may only be reconstructed once pursuant to the standards above. After one reconstruction of a noncompliant building, all future reconstruction or redevelopment must conform with all applicable land use standards.
- H. A noncompliant building reconstructed pursuant to the standards above that also houses a nonconforming use retains the nonconforming use status. The use shall not be found to be abandoned if the reconstruction takes longer than one year. However, to retain the nonconforming use status, the use must be reestablished within 90 days of issue of the certificate of final inspection. In addition, it will continue to be regulated as a nonconforming use.
- I. If a building in the Central Commercial or Village Commercial zones that does not comply with the minimum required setbacks and/ or exceeds the maximum building size is proposed to be reconstructed in a manner which does not follow the standards listed above, it must be constructed to meet all current land use regulations.

10-21-119: ZONE CHANGES:

If the Town changes the zoning on a parcel, this chapter will apply to any nonconforming uses created by the zone change.

10-21-120: NONCOMPLYING SIGNS:

Any sign or sign structure that was legal when created, but because of subsequent changes in the regulations, no longer conforms with the regulatory ordinances of the Town, is considered noncomplying.



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please print your name below

Meeting: Planning Commission

Date: 04/15/2026

ATTENDEES:

Kathy LaFare
Name (please print)

Title (please print)

DAVID KASZEWski
Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Noel Benson
Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Bethia Lindsy
Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)

Name (please print)

Title (please print)



Robin Romero <rromero@springdale.utah.gov>

Application For Workforce Housing Overlay Zone on Kinesava Drive Property - Applicant Kathy LaFave

1 message

Teresa Silcox [REDACTED]

Mon, Apr 6, 2026 at 4:32 PM

To: nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov

Cc: "rromero@springdale.utah.gov" <rromero@springdale.utah.gov>, Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Good afternoon. My name is Teresa Silcox. I own the home at [REDACTED], directly across the private road from Applicant Kathy LaFave's property upon which she seeks a zoning change from Foothill Residential to Foothill Residential Workforce Housing Overlay. I understand that Applicant LaFave seeks the zoning change to construct one, freestanding residential unit to be occupied by a Springdale worker who meets or will meet the requirements of the zone. I also understand that the proposed residential unit has been designed in such a way as to be unobtrusive, not impede views from my or other neighboring properties, and will be finished in a style generally similar to the existing LaFave residence and my residence at [REDACTED]. I wholeheartedly support the Planning Commission's approval of the overlay based on my understandings summarized above. I no longer reside in the residence at [REDACTED]. I moved back to Salt Lake City about 18 months ago. My son, [REDACTED], his partner [REDACTED], and an adorable [REDACTED] [REDACTED], now live in my home and intend to stay there on a long term basis. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both work full-time in Springdale. [REDACTED] will be attending kindergarten at Springdale Elementary beginning in August. They are also in support of the workforce overlay on La Fave's property. Springdale is a wonderful community but a rapidly aging one. I do not believe a town mostly comprised of well heeled retirees and part-time residents will prosper or thrive. Absent a tiny sacrifice by those already fortunate enough to own a piece of paradise, Springdale will lose a good part of its charm and character. I believe granting the workforce housing overlay on the LaFave property is a step in the right direction for Springdale. I do not plan to attend the public hearing so please let me know if you have questions or comments about my support. I assume you will get the members of the PC a copy of this e-mail but let me know if I need to distribute it further.



Robin Romero <rromero@springdale.utah.gov>

Public Hearing: Ordinance 2026 08 Review of Land Use Ordinance Amendment Application from Noel Benson. He has proposed an Amendment to Section 10-18-4 of the Town Code. He has suggested that Tiered Minimum Landscape and Open Space Requirements be Based on the Property size.

1 message

Mike & Helen McMahan [REDACTED]

Tue, Apr 14, 2026 at 2:56 PM

To: "nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov" <nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>, "rromero@springdale.utah.gov" <rromero@springdale.utah.gov>

At the present time, Village Commercial is the only valley zone that applies a flat 60% landscaping requirement, regardless of property size. Tiered landscape ordinances already exist for Valley Residential and Central Commercial. It seems reasonable and fair that when a small lot of less than 1/2 acre is being considered for commercial development, an allowance should be made for landscape vs. open space. Mr Benson has suggested that with a 1/4 acre lot size or smaller, an amendment be made for 40% Landscape and 20% open. This would allow for adequate parking and pedestrian access and would enhance the appearance and appeal of the commercial lot. Thank you for considering our comments.

Respectfully,

Mike McMahan
Helen McMahan

April 8, 2026

To: Springdale Planning Commission/Town Council

Kathy LaFave and David Karaszewski have made us aware of their application for a rezone of their property at 120 Kinesava Drive from Foothill Residential to Workforce Housing Overlay Zone. We have seen their proposal to subdivide their property into two lots, with accompanying deed restrictions on both resulting lots. This seems reasonable to us, as it would create potential additional opportunities for workforce housing. They do not appear to us to be applying in furtherance of a profit motive, as if anything, the deed restrictions they agree will be imposed would more than likely decrease the value of their current property. We also understand that their immediate neighbors not only do not oppose the application, but have submitted their support of it in writing to the Town. We urge you to give their application the serious consideration it deserves.

Sincerely,



Ira Rubinfeld



Willamarie Huelskamp



April 9, 2026

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing today regarding the application by Kathy LaFave and Dave Karazewski for the Workforce Housing Overlay Zone which would allow them to subdivide their property,

We were recently able to acquire a home which is regulated by affordable income standards in the Redhawk subdivision. Without that opportunity we would not have been able to stay in Springdale, our home for many years.

We support this application which will give members of our community the opportunity to live and work here. We encourage you to approve it.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barbara Ellard". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "B".

Ellen McKenna
Barbara Ellard



From: **Elizabeth Cutler**

Date: Mon, Apr 13, 2026, 2:42 PM

Subject: for PC meeting

To: Robin Romero

Dear Planning Commission Members,

Two small thoughts about two different agenda items:

1. If Utah definitions and codes allow, which it doesn't sound like it would, perhaps the easiest thing in regards to item A3 would be to include significant structural degradation including, but not limited to: dry rot, black mold, unsafe foundational cracks, etc as natural disasters thus allowing for replacement as if it were a flood, fire, earthquake. (It certainly feels like a natural disaster to an affected homeowner. I mean, it's natural with time and it's certainly disastrous.)
2. Kathy LaFave's request for the application of the workforce housing overlay zone seems about as benign a use for it as could possibly be imagined. I hesitated to say anything thinking those who live there should be the most listened to. Still believing that, I was quite happy to see 3 letters of support for her request. I support their support for this most conservative and thoughtful request.

Regards,

Elizabeth Cutler



Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov>

Re: 04/15/2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Notice & Packet Materials

jonathan zambella [REDACTED]
To: Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov>

Fri, Apr 10, 2026 at 6:12 PM

I would like to add public comment on the following items since i am not able to make it to the actual meeting.

1. I do support the general idea of tiered landscape requirements and it is applicable to the VC zone. I think the bigger picture that is more important, is that there are several non-conforming VC lots in Springdale that would benefit from redevelopment but the town standards are restrictive enough that great development is not possible without certain allowances, thus requiring variances. Decent options are available for development under the current ordinances but not great options when lots are tiny, eg less than 1/2 acre. The downside of changing the ordinances may be that because of lower landscape requirements, future small lot buildings could be pushed to max size without great design elements. As we have seen with several buildings in town (across all zones), even under our very thoughtful ordinances, they still don't eliminate bad taste. I believe it is appropriate to change ordinances when doing so aligns with the beautification of the town, enhances property values and provides for needed services that can prosper. This ordinance idea aligns with all three of those.

2. I recall one lot behind the Bit n Spur being granted the WHOZ in the FR zone. That case was unique in that it sits right next to large commercially used parcels (LaFave North and the Bit). But this one I question whether we open the door to allow subdivisions of every lot in the FR zone in the name of workforce housing? Even when deed restricted, who is going to enforce this? I believe the applicant's intent is pure, but they may not be the forever owners of the lots. Future owners who want to live in Springdale simply need to demonstrate that they work while they live here and then its workforce housing. Their job could be a "consultant" and work "in" Springdale, but not actually serve any of the businesses in town. Will their tax returns and W2s be reviewed? A home built on that lot is unlikely to be affordable housing. The current residence is a multi-million dollar home in today's market, and the build on the next lot will likely not be cheap. This is not the fault of the applicant at all, and this issue is likely an infirmity in the Workforce housing ordinance. Consider if the owners in the Watchman Subdivision with 2- 5 acre lots would apply for the Workforce overlay, is this appropriate type of development on these lots? Any lot in the FR-2 zone could have an ADU, which would be affordable employee housing for 2 people and not require and overlay zone or subdivision.

Thank you,

Jonathan Zambella
[REDACTED]

Sent from my mobile tether...please pardon my brevity...

On Apr 10, 2026, at 11:09 AM, Springdale Town <springdale@springdale.utah.gov> wrote:

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

PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA
THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A REGULAR MEETING
ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 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****



April Raddatz <araddatz@springdale.utah.gov>

Fwd: Public Hearing on Planning Commision

Niall Connolly <nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>

Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 11:09 AM

To: Robin Romero <rromero@springdale.utah.gov>, April Raddatz <araddatz@springdale.utah.gov>

Cc: Thomas Dansie <tdansie@springdale.utah.gov>

Hi Robin and April

See below letter of support for the zone change application this Wednesday.

Thanks!

Niall



NIALL CONNOLLY

Director of Community Development

📞 435-522-4130

✉ nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov

📍 118 Lion Blvd. Springdale, UT 84767

🌐 springdaletown.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, Apr 10, 2026 at 9:17 PM

Subject: Public Hearing on Planning Commision

To: <Nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>

Hi Niall,

I wanted to write a letter in support of the zone change for Kathy Lafave for the workforce housing overlay zone from Foothill Residential. As a business and person who has applied for this exact change and got it, I applaud anyone that is trying to help gain more housing for people who work in Springdale to be able to live in Springdale. With this exact property I see Kathy is only applying for two units, one being her existing home of many years, so while 16 units are available she is still looking at low impact in the zone. It's so refreshing to see a resident trying to make a difference in the housing crunch here. Even though this is small, I think every instance is one step closer to making big, lasting change. It's a step in the right direction and I am in favor of this zone change.

Thanks, Trish Jennings Owner, Bit and Spur Restaurant, Springdale, UT

CONFIDENTIALITY & PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or legally privileged information that may be protected or classified under applicable law, including the Utah Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA). This communication is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Unauthorized review, use, disclosure, distribution, or copying is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete this message and any attachments. Please note that this email and its contents may be subject to public disclosure pursuant to GRAMA.

April 7, 2026

Town of Springdale
PO Box 187
Springdale, UT 84767

On Wednesday, April 15, the Planning Commission will review an application for the workforce housing zone. The application is by Kathy LaFave and [REDACTED]

I am fortunate to be a resident of Springdale. I am also employee at [REDACTED] here in town. I recently lost the apartment I was living in because the building sold. Thankfully I was able to [REDACTED] so I didn't have to leave Springdale.

There is not enough housing for town employees. I think this application should be approved. It is a rare opportunity for someone that works here to be able to own a home here.

Tiffany Davis
[REDACTED]



RECEIVED

APR 16 2026

Town of Springdale
By RA