



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE ART REVIEW BOARD SPECIAL MEETING ON
MONDAY, JULY 06, 2026, AT 12:00 PM
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER,
126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UT 84767**

The meeting convened at 12:08 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Jack Burns, Board Members Lisa Benham, Kathy LaFave, Mike Alltucker, and Jim Walshe

EXCUSED: N/A

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

Approval of the Agenda:

Motion made by Kathy LaFave to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mike Alltucker.

Vote on Motion:

Benham: Aye

LaFave: Aye

Alltucker: Aye

Walshe: Aye

Burns: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

General Announcements:

Niall Connolly introduced and welcomed David Walpert as a new employee of the Town.

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

A. Action Item

1. Application for a mural at Iceberg Restaurant, 849 Zion Park Blvd. Staff Contact: Niall Connolly

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly stated that the Art Review Board considered a mural application for the Iceberg restaurant at 849 Zion Park Boulevard. The board had previously reviewed the application and tabled its decision to allow members the opportunity to view the mural after dark.

During the discussion, the board deliberated on the application and considered three primary factors: the mural's color palette, whether it qualified as a work of art rather than advertising in accordance with the policy, and whether the mural was illuminated. Board members had since viewed the mural at night and used those observations in their deliberations. He mentioned that the Applicant and Business Owner, Armin Bucad, was present for questions.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

Ms. LaFave began by commenting on the mural's color palette, stating that if an image accurately depicting the colors of Zion National Park did not fit within the Town's approved color palette, then the palette itself should be reconsidered. She felt strongly that encouraging public art in the community required allowing realistic representations of the surrounding landscape.

She noted that previous discussions about public art had included ideas such as incorporating photography and paintings into public spaces, including along the artificial stone walls. Regarding the Iceberg Drive-In mural, she acknowledged having mixed feelings but believed it had been created tastefully and artistically. She also felt the mural served as a nostalgic tribute to the restaurant's history. While she recognized there could be concerns about setting a precedent for future murals and what types of wording might be acceptable, she believed those issues would need to be addressed separately.

Ms. LaFave also observed that other businesses in town displayed a significant amount of advertising text on their windows. She questioned whether the concern with the Iceberg mural was simply because the wording appeared as part of a mural or artwork, noting that other businesses also contained prominent text.

Mr. Walshe stated that after viewing the installation and researching the definition of a mural, he concluded that it should be considered a sign rather than a mural. He believed the application should be referred back to the Town for review under the sign regulations, noting that the Town could make exceptions if appropriate. He explained that his opinion was based on the presence of advertising and his view that the installation did not fully comply with the established color palette. Mr. Walshe concluded that the matter was outside the Art Review Board's authority and recommended that it be returned to the Town for consideration as a sign rather than a mural.

Ms. Benham stated that, from a functional standpoint, the installation served as a window covering intended to block the view of a large kitchen window from the town. She noted that, regardless of how it was classified, it served a practical purpose and should not be penalized for doing so. She acknowledged that she was not as familiar with the Town's exceptions related to window coverings but believed the functional aspect should be considered. From an artistic perspective, Ms. Benham expressed her appreciation for the design, noting that the image playfully depicted a large billboard in a location where it would never be permitted in reality, creating an interesting artistic contrast. She believed the mural had significant artistic merit and expressed concern that the project should not be rejected solely because of technicalities or uncertainty about how it should be classified.

Mr. Alltucker noted that the Art Review Board had been told from the outset that the application was for a mural and had already spent three meetings discussing issues such as whether it was a mural or a sign, its size, and other related concerns. He expressed concern that referring the application back to the Town would unnecessarily prolong the process with additional meetings. He stated that he believed the board generally supported the project and encouraged the board to either follow its policy and approve the mural with appropriate conditions or deny the application outright, rather than sending it back for further review.

Addressing the three key issues identified by staff, Mr. Alltucker stated that he believed the illumination was not a concern, as board members had viewed the mural at night and appeared to agree it was acceptable. He also believed the mural complied with the Town's color palette policy, citing the provision allowing less significant colors that are compatible with the existing surroundings. He concluded that the remaining issue was whether the mural constituted advertising, noting that the board had previously taken a strict approach to signage and emphasizing that the decision would establish a precedent for future applications.

There was discussion among the Board members of whether this was signage, a mural, or if could be classified as public art. Mr. Connolly recommended that the Art Review Board make a decision on the application during the current meeting to ensure a fair process for the applicants. He explained that determining the installation was signage would require the applicants to submit a new permit application, which he believed would likely not be approved and would be unfair to them.

He recommended that the board continue evaluating the application as a mural and base its decision on the three criteria previously identified: compliance with the color palette, whether the artwork functioned as advertising, and whether it was illuminated. He encouraged the board to determine whether the mural met those standards in accordance with the Town's adopted policy.

Mr. Walshe asked Mr. Connolly who defined this as a mural. Mr. Connolly responded that based on the mural definition, the mix of colors, designs, shapes, and other design elements painted or permanently fixed onto a vertical or near-vertical surface of a structure, staff had determined that this was a mural.

Ms. LaFave asked if the wording could be removed and turned into red rock. Mr. Bucad stated that they would not be fixing the wording and that if they had to remove the image to alter it, they would remove the image and not replace it. He expressed that the window covering served a second purpose: keeping the back room cooler.

Mr. Walshe asked whether, if the installation were determined to be a sign, the applicants would be required to submit a new application and pay additional fees, and whether any such fees could be waived. He also asked which body would have authority to approve a sign application. Mr. Connolly responded that sign applications of this type would be reviewed administratively by staff rather than by the Planning Commission. He explained that the Town's code limits window signs to 25% of the total window area, while the proposed installation covered the entire window. As a result, he stated that he would not recommend the applicants submit a sign application because it would not comply with the code and would be denied.

Mr. Burns states that if the board makes an exception for this agenda item, then they're in the position of the next business that has a similar issue to make an exception for that business as well.

Mr. Connolly stated that if the board determined the installation was not a sign, staff could review the Town's sign regulations to determine whether there was another way for it to comply and remain in place. He also noted that if the board wished to revise the applicable policy, that discussion could be brought back for consideration at a future meeting.

Motion made by Kathy LaFave that The Art Review Board has determined that the application from Iceberg with respect to the image that was placed on their window is not in fact a mural, and is determined to be more of a window covering as opposed to a window ad or a mural.

Second by Jim Walshe

Vote on Motion:

Benham: Aye

LaFave: Aye

Alltucker: Nay

Walshe: Aye

Burns: Aye

B. Discussion / Non-Action Item

1. Workshop session on Springdale's Draft Public Art Plan

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Connolly introduced the next agenda item as a workshop session focused on advancing the Public Art Plan. He explained that he had prepared discussion materials and questions for board members to review and respond to in a more interactive format. The workshop was intended to encourage discussion and gather feedback to help guide the development of the plan. He noted that the workshop portion of the meeting would not be recorded and invited board members to participate.

Commission Questions and Discussion:

N/A

C. Consent Agenda

1. Approve 05/18/2026 Draft minutes

Motion made by Jim Walshe to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mike Alltucker.

Vote on Motion:

Benham: Aye

LaFave: Aye

Alltucker: Aye

Walshe: Aye

Burns: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Adjourn

Motion made by Jim Walshe to Adjourn at 1:40 PM The motion was seconded by Mike Alltucker.

Vote on Motion:

Benham: Aye

LaFave: Aye

Alltucker: Aye

Walshe: Aye

Burns: 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://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings). For more information, please call 435-772-3434 or email springdale@springdale.utah.gov.