

Fwd: draft 3

3 messages

Niall Connolly <nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>

Mon, Aug 17, 2026 at 4:18 PM

To: April Raddatz <araddatz@springdale.utah.gov>, Kyndal Sagers <ksagers@springdale.utah.gov>

FYI, public comment

**NIALL CONNOLLY***Director of Community Development*

☎ (435) 522-4130

✉ nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov

📍 118 Lion Blvd. Springdale, UT 84767

🌐 springdale.utah.gov

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

From: G [REDACTED] >

Date: Mon, Aug 17, 2026 at 3:56 PM

Subject: Fwd: draft 3

To: jmcculloch@springdale.utah.gov <jmcculloch@springdale.utah.gov>, nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov <nconnolly@springdale.utah.gov>

Sorry about the draft title. I fat fingered send before I had a chance to change it

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

From: G [REDACTED] >

Date: Mon, Aug 17, 2026 at 3:26 PM

Subject: draft 3

To: G [REDACTED] >

To whom it may concern,

This letter is meant to serve two purposes, The first is to address the letters you received from A [REDACTED] Hyatt on July 20, 2026 and F [REDACTED] Campbell. The second is to provide additional information that was part of the Town of Springdale's history file for [50 Zion Park Blvd.](#)

In response to the letter from A [REDACTED] Hyatt. While it is admirable that A [REDACTED] is supporting someone navigating the Town's permit process, a number of A [REDACTED]'s statements and assumptions about Luke's permit application were incorrect. In A [REDACTED]'s first paragraph, A [REDACTED] refers to Luke 's permit application. A [REDACTED] assumed that Luke had applied for a permit. This is the basic problem. Luke never applied for a permit. Had Luke applied for a permit, the Town would have advised Luke of the Town's requirements. In A [REDACTED]'s 3rd paragraph, A [REDACTED] mentioned inconsistencies in the permit process. In my humble opinion, it wouldd be impossible to be consistent with the process when the applicant (Luke) didn't bother to follow the process by NOT filing for a permit. In A [REDACTED]'s 4th paragraph and the rest of the letter,

A [REDACTED] mentions geological studies and the fairness of making Luke comply with having a geological study completed. A geological study is standard operating procedure when cutting into a hill that is greater than 30% in a known slide area. Lucky for the Town, a topographical map was completed in 2016 and was found in the history file for [50 Zion Park Blvd.](#)

F [REDACTED] Campbell also sent the Planning Commission a letter expressing some of the same concerns as well as an idea to spread the cost of a geotechnical study across multiple properties in the slide area. While F [REDACTED] Campbell's letter is well written and well argued, it does not address the main point of contention. The main point of contention is that Mr. Wilson made a large cut into the toe of a hill with a greater than 30% slope in a known slide area without a permit, a grading permit, a geotechnical study to determine the stability of the slide area, or any engineering to determine the type, size or location of any retaining walls. According to my research, Mr. Wilson has severely weakened the stability of this slide area. Why would other property owners in this area need to contribute to a geotechnical study for a problem that Mr. Wilson introduced as part of his non-preapproved actions?

Which brings us to the second purpose of this letter. To advise the Planning Commission of some of the details found in the Town's file for [50 Zion Park Blvd.](#) There are 3 files of particular interest.

The first file of interest is a topographical map completed by Mark Schraut in 2016. The map shows the topology of the hill before Mr. Wilson cut into it to expand his parking lot. Per the map's legend, the shaded area shows the area where the slope is greater than 30% (which Mr. Wilson assured the Planning Commission more than 6 times was less than 30%.)

The second interesting document is from December 10, 2025 created by Rosenberg Associates. When comparing the first and second documents with each other, it is obvious that Mr. Wilson cut into the shaded areas on the first document (greater than 30%) to expand his parking lot.

The 3rd document is a Site Plan for this parking lot created by Mark Schraut. This Plan shows the previous parking spaces on the lot. In comparing this drawing to the present day configuration of the lot, (please see 4th attachment) 8 additional spaces have been created in the back left of the lot. And an additional 9 spaces have been created on the rear of the lot. Although Mr. Wilson told the Planning Commission that he closed off the 15 additional parking spaces he created until the permit was approved, this statement is not accurate. There were 4 additional parking spaces added on the left rear of the lot that are NOT blocked off. Also, the barrier used to block the access to the rest of the new spaces actually allow Mr. Wilson to park 4 additional vehicles in his expanded lot. Please see the 5th attachment. The yellow line indicates where Mr. Wilson installed the barrier and the orange line indicates where he told the Planning Commission that he would install the barrier so that the new parking spaces could not be used. The bottom line is that Mr. Wilson only restricted himself from using 9 parking spaces and that he is able to use 8 new spaces in the current configuration.

In discussing this parking lot expansion with other Springdale residents, our primary concern is about the safety of the residents and visitors of Springdale.

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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]