

From: A [REDACTED] Hyatt <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Jul 20, 2026 at 1:39 PM
Subject: Wilson Parking Lot Expansion
To: Niall Connolly <nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of Luke Wilson's request that his application be evaluated consistently with the requirements that were communicated to him throughout the permitting process.

Although my own project was unrelated to his, I recently completed the Town's permitting process for a grading permit for a backyard patio. Throughout that process, I was told by the Director of Community Development multiple times that a geotechnical report would not be necessary.

When my application came before the Planning Commission, however, the Commission spent approximately forty minutes discussing, among other things, whether a geotechnical report should be required before ultimately approving the permit without one. While I appreciate the Commission's diligence and responsibility to protect public safety, the experience demonstrated how difficult it can be for property owners when requirements appear uncertain or change during the review process.

In my opinion, the issue is not whether geotechnical studies have value—they absolutely do when conditions warrant them. Rather, applicants should be able to rely on the guidance they receive from Town staff and have confidence that the expectations established early in the process will remain reasonably consistent unless new information justifies a different approach.

Regarding Luke's parking lot expansion, it appears that he has stopped work when instructed, obtained the required engineering and grading permit, revised his plans in response to Planning Commission comments, and continued complying with every requirement placed before him.

Additionally, it is my understanding that geologic hazard regulations are generally intended to ensure the safety of buildings and people occupying them. In this case, the property's continued use as a parking lot appears to be precisely the type of use that has historically been considered appropriate because of the known geologic conditions. In fact, as I understand it, the reason the property has remained a parking lot rather than being developed with buildings is because parking is a lower-intensity use that avoids placing occupied structures within or adjacent to the hazard area.

Also, vehicles are already routinely parked along State Route 9 and in other nearby areas adjacent to steeper cuts and similar terrain. While every site should certainly be evaluated on its

own merits, requiring a geologic hazards study for a modest expansion of an existing parking lot appears difficult to reconcile with how similar conditions have historically been treated.

From the perspective of a fellow applicant who has experienced a similar process, I believe fairness, consistency, and predictability are essential to maintaining public confidence in the Town's permitting system. When applicants invest substantial time and money complying with the requirements they have been given, it is difficult to understand why significant new requirements would arise later in the process unless there is a clear, objective reason for doing so.

I respectfully encourage the Planning Commission to carefully consider whether requiring an additional geologic hazards study at this stage is necessary, or whether Luke's application can be evaluated based on the extensive engineering, permitting, and compliance efforts he has already completed.

Thank you for your time, your service to the community, and your thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A [REDACTED] Hyatt