

1. Agenda

Documents:

[020426.PCWM.NEIGHBOR.PDF](#)

2. Packet Materials

Documents:

[ITEM B1 - DISCUSSION FOLLOWING DIRECTION FROM TOWN COUNCIL TO  
REV CHPT 10-21 TOWN CODE RELATING TO REPAIR\\_REFURBISHMENT OF  
NONCOMPLYING BLDGS.PDF](#)  
[ITEM B2 - DISCUSSION OF RENOVATION OF NONCOMPLYING BUILDINGS IN  
THE COMMERCIAL ZONES.PDF](#)



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

**PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE AND AGENDA**  
**THE SPRINGDALE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A WORK MEETING**  
**ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 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. Oath of Office**

1. Terry Kruschke, Commissioner

**B. 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.
2. Discussion of Renovation of Noncomplying Buildings in the Commercial Zones. Staff Contact: Tom Dansie.

**C. Adjourn**

**\*To access the live stream for this public meeting,  
please visit or click the link below:**

**<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeeting>**

---

This notice is provided as a courtesy to the community and is not the official notice for this meeting/hearing. This notice is not required by town ordinance or policy. Failure of the Town to provide this notice or failure of a property owner, resident, or other interested parties to receive this notice does not constitute a violation of the Town's noticing requirements or policies.

**NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Robin Romero at 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>



## **Memorandum**

**To: The Planning Commission**

**From: Niall Connolly**

**Date: Jan 30th, 2026**

**Re: Definition of “ Removal” and “ Ordinary Maintenance and Repair” Relative to Noncomplying Buildings**

---

### **Introduction**

At a recent meeting, the Planning Commission considered a number of hypothetical scenarios relating to the “removal” or “ordinary maintenance and repair” of noncomplying buildings. The purpose of this exercise was to help the Commission to articulate their views on noncomplying buildings. This follows a series of meetings in which the Commission has been discussing noncomplying buildings - and in particular, what constitutes “removal” or “ordinary maintenance and repair” of such buildings.

At this meeting, it was determined that a preferable way forward could be to amend the minimum setbacks, neighborhood by neighborhood, to accommodate nonconformities which have existed for many years, but are not negatively impacting the character of the community. In doing this, it may be possible to avoid overly complicating the definitions of “removal” and “ordinary maintenance and repair”. Significantly, it would mean that property owners could rebuild within the same footprints of their existing homes.

It is primarily in the older, or pre 1992 subdivisions that these setback nonconformities exist. Staff has done an analysis of the following neighborhoods<sup>1</sup> to identify the nonconforming setbacks which exist:

- Canyon View Drive/ Watchman Drive
- Zion Shadows Circle
- Manzanita Drive
- Hummingbird Lane
- Foothill Lane
- Residentially zoned properties on Big Springs/ Sundance Lane/ Juniper Lane
- Quail Ridge Road
- Apple Lane
- Dixie Lane
- Valley View Drive
- Kinesava Drive

---

<sup>1</sup> There are other neighborhoods where the prevailing development pattern does not comply with standards in the ordinance. However, in these other neighborhoods there has already been an adjustment to the standards such that the properties are not technically noncompliant. These include: Anasazi Plateau, Canyon Point, Claret Cup, Kinesava (subdivision), Canyon Springs.

Based on this information, the Planning Commission may wish to propose amendments to the minimum setbacks in individual neighborhoods, to reflect the reality of what is existing in those neighborhoods. The appendix to this report includes tables which provide the details of this analysis. However, it is summarized below. Note: this analysis was done using measurement tools on online mapping. These are not survey accurate measurements. The information below is presented in concept format. More detailed/ accurate analysis would be advisable before changing ordinances based on this information. Also, these setbacks were measured from the main residence on each property, and not accessory buildings/ detached garages etc.

### 1. Canyon View Drive/ Watchman Drive

The minimum setbacks here would change as follows:

	Front Setback		Side Setback		Side Setback (Corner Lot)		Rear Setback	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-S Lots	30 ft/50 ft	No change	10 ft	5 ft	30 ft	10 ft	20 ft	15 ft
VR-A Lots	30 ft	15 ft	10 ft	5 ft	30 ft	5 ft	10 ft	No change
VR-B Lots	15 ft	No change	10 ft on one side, 5 ft on the other	No change	15 ft	10 ft	10 ft	No change

### 2. Zion Shadows Circle

The minimum setbacks here would change as follows:

	Front		Side		Side (Corner)		Rear	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-B lots	15	9	10/5	4	15	No change	10	6
VR-S lot	30/50	27	10	No change	30	No change	20	No change

### 3. Manzanita Drive

The minimum setbacks here would change as follows:

	Front		Side		Side (Corner)		Rear	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-B lots	15	10	10/5	0	15	N/A	10	4

### 4. Winderland Subdivision (Foothill Lane Neighborhood)

The minimum setbacks here would change as follows:

	Front		Side		Side (Corner)		Rear	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-B lots	15	No change	10/5	No change	15	No change	10	No change
VR-A lots	30	15	10	2	30	No change	10	No change

### 5. Big Springs/ Sundance/ Juniper Lane residential properties

	Front		Side		Side (Corner)		Rear	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-A lots	30	26	10	0	30	No change	10	No change

### 6. Quail Ridge Road

These properties are all in the Foothill Residential (FR) Zone. The setback requirement in the FR zone is that the average of all setbacks should be no less than 30 ft, and that no individual setback should be less than 20 ft. In all cases but one, the homes on Quail Ridge Road comply with the minimum setbacks. In the one noncomplying case, the house is about **14 ft** from the property line in one location.

### 7. Valley View Drive

These properties are all in the Foothill Residential (FR) Zone. The setback requirement in the FR zone is that the average of all setbacks should be no less than 30 ft, and that no individual setback should be less than 20 ft. There is a house which is about **12 ft** from the property line.

## **8. Kinesava Drive**

All of the properties on Kinesava Drive comply with the minimum setbacks. No changes would be necessary.

## **9. Dixie Drive**

These properties are all in the Foothill Residential (FR) Zone. The setback requirement in the FR zone is that the average of all setbacks should be no less than 30 ft, and that no individual setback should be less than 20 ft. There are two houses which are about **5 ft** from the property line.

## **10. Apple Lane**

One of the Valley Residential A properties here has a front setback of **20 ft** (the minimum is 30 ft).

## **11. Hummingbird Lane (residential parcels)**

One of the Valley Residential A properties which faces onto SR-9 has a side setback of only a couple of feet (the minimum is 10 ft).

## **Recommendations**

The Planning Commission should review this information, and consider whether or not it could be beneficial to adjust the minimum setbacks, neighborhood by neighborhood, to reflect the reality of existing development. This would allow property owners to redevelop within their existing footprints. Some points for the Commission to consider include:

- Would adjusting the minimum setbacks have a positive, negative or neutral impact on the community character?
- Would adjusting the minimum setbacks have a positive, negative or neutral impact on residential amenity in these neighborhoods?
- Would such an approach be preferable to creating a more detailed definition of “removal” and “ordinance maintenance and repair” of a building. (Note, as per the Town Council direction, the Planning Commission will still need to define these terms, but such an approach may help simplify these definitions.

## Appendix: Details on Setbacks in Individual Properties

### Analysis of Individual Subdivisions

#### 1. Watchman Drive/ Canyon View Drive

Zone	Min. Front Setback	Min. Side Setback	Min. Side Setback on a Corner Lot	Min. Rear Setback	Existing Non-compliant Setbacks (note: these are based on measurements made using the Washington County online maps and are not survey accurate)
<b>Valley Residential - (Standard)</b>	30 ft (or 50 ft for larger parcels on SR-9 where the buildings are taller than 18ft)	10 ft	30 ft	20 ft	<p><b>Parcel S-119-A:</b> Corner setback should be 30 ft, but is 10ft. Side setback should be 10 ft. There appears to be a shed which is about 5 ft from the property line. Rear setback should be 20 ft, but is actually about 15 ft.</p> <p><b>Lots S-LAWS-1 and S-LAWS-3</b> are undeveloped.</p> <p><b>Lot S-LAWS-2</b> has been developed within the last few years, and is compliant with the minimum setbacks.</p>

<b>Valley Residential -A</b>	30 ft	10 ft	30 ft	10 ft	<p><b>Lot CSD-1:</b> does not comply with the side setback on one side (is built within a couple of feet of the property line.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-2</b> is undeveloped.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-3:</b> The front setback is noncompliant. Should be 30 ft, but is about 23 ft. The side corner setback is about 9 ft, but should be 30 ft.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-4:</b> Front setback is about 25 ft, should be 30 ft.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-5:</b> Side setback appears to be about 6 ft, but should be 10 ft.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-6:</b> Front setback is about 26 ft, should be 30 ft.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-7:</b> Front setback is about 23 ft, should be 30 ft.</p> <p><b>Lot CSD-8 and 9:</b> These two lots are developed as a single lot - with the house</p>
------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---



					<p>straddling the property line. If considered as one single lot, the front setback is about 23 ft (should be 30 ft) and the side setback (shed) is about 7 ft (should be 10 ft).</p> <p><b>Parcel S-119-B:</b> The front setback is 17 ft (should be 30 ft). The side setback is about 6 ft (should be 10 ft).</p>
<b>Valley Residential -B</b>	15 ft	10 ft on one side, 5 ft on the other, except that no building can be closer than 10 ft to development on an adjacent parcel.	15 ft	10 ft	<b>Parcel S-120:</b> The side (corner) setback is 11 ft. Should be 15 ft.

**Table 1.** Required Setbacks compared with actual setbacks on existing properties.

	Front Setback		Side Setback		Side Setback (Corner Lot)		Rear Setback	
	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose	Existing	Propose
VR-S	30 ft (or 50 ft for larger parcels on SR-9 where the	No change	10 ft	5 ft	30 ft	10 ft	20 ft	15 ft

	buildings are taller than 18ft)							
VR-A	30 ft	15 ft	10 ft	0 ft-5 ft To bring all the properties into compliance, the setback would need to be close to 0 ft. However if it was at 5 ft, most properties would then comply.	30 ft	5 ft	10 ft	No change
VR-B	15 ft	No change	10 ft on one side, 5 ft on the other	No change	15 ft	10 ft	10 ft	No change

**Table 2.** Adjustments to the Code that would be necessary to bring these properties into compliance with minimum setbacks.

## 2. Zion Shadows Subdivision

Parcel Number	Front	Side	Rear	Notes
Valley Residential B Lots				
S-98-A	19	7	10	
S-ZSS-1	15	4	15	County Assessors online mapping

				maybe inaccurate
S-ZSS-2-A	14	4	10	
S-ZSS-3	27	7	9	
S-ZSS-4	13	7	7	
S-ZSS-5	15	6	6	
S-ZSS-6-A	15	4	11	
S-ZSS-7-A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Undeveloped
S-ZSS-8	14	4	7	
S-ZSS-9-A	15	5	2 (for accessory building) 28 for main house)	
S-ZSS-11	21	38	33	
S-ZSS-12	19	8	14	
S-ZSS-13	15	4	10	
S-ZSS-14	11	11	38	
S-ZSS-15	12	10	23	
S-ZSS-16-A	15	10	10	
S-98-C	8	10	8	
S-98-D	10	7	15	
S-98-F	17	9	10	
S-98-E	9	15	15	
Valley Residential (Standard) Parcels				
S-99-B-1	27	50 (for main house) 9 (from accessory building	112 (from main house) 30 (from accessory building)	

### 3. Manzanita Drive Neighborhood

Parcel Number	Front	Side	Rear	Notes
Valley Residential B Lots				
S-WS-1	68	3	4	This is a trailer home, and so if the lot was redeveloped, it wouldn't automatically make most sense to redevelop within the same footprint.
S-WS-2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Undeveloped
S-WS-3	26	0	63	
S-WS-4	10	0	12	
S-WS-5	31	15	26	
S-WS-6	N/A	N/A	N/A	Undeveloped
S-WS-7	25	11	48	

#### 4. Winderland Subdivision (Foothill Lane Neighborhood)

Parcel Number	Front	Side	Rear	Notes
Valley Residential B Lots				
SW-1-A-4-A	44	17	21	
S-W-1-A-5-A	15 (ADU) 47 (main house)	10	10	
Valley Residential A Lots				
S-W-1-A-1	30	20	21	
S-W-1-A-2	29	13	30	
S-W-1-A-3	50	5/10	20	

S-W-1-A-6-A	31	5/10	14	
S-W-1-A-7-A	15	5/25	17	
S-W-1-A-8-B	36	3/19	40	
S-W-1-A-9-A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Undeveloped
S-W-1-A-10-A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Undeveloped
S-W-1-A-12	36	25	60	
S-160-A	23	5/10	41	
S-53-A	30	2	55	

5. Big Springs Road/ Sundance Lane/ Juniper Lane Neighborhood

Parcel Number	Front	Side	Rear	Notes
Valley Residential A Lots				
S-30-B-1	33	17	20	
S-24-A	38	9/15	50	
S-24-D	116	16	17	
S-30-C-1	36	20	36	
S-88-B	27	14	45	
S-33-A	26	35	108	
S-34	45	10	19	
S-29-A	37	0	53	

6. Quail Ridge Road

Parcel Number	Least Setback	Notes
Foothill Residential Lots		
S-160-A-10-B	N/A	Undeveloped
S-161-A-10-C	40	
S-161-A-10-A	14	
S-161-A-2	20	
S-161-A-4	20	
S-CRD-2	20	
S-CRD-1-A	32	
S-161-A-5	N/A	Undeveloped
S-161-A-1-C	N/A	Undeveloped
S-161-A-13-A	45	

#### 7. Valley View Drive

S-135-B-NP: 14 ft

S-167-J: 12 ft

All others comply.

#### 8. Dixie Drive

S-161-A-1-B-1: 5 ft setback (should be 20 min)

S-161-A-11: 5 ft setback (should be 20 min)



## ***Memorandum***

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Thomas Dansie, Director of Community Development  
**Date:** January 30, 2026  
**Re:** Renovation of Noncomplying Buildings in the Commercial Zones

---

### ***Introduction and Background***

The Commission has discussed noncomplying structures in the commercial zones during the previous several meetings. The following is a short summary of those discussions:

- Many properties in the commercial zones are non-compliant with at least one land use standard.
- Per Town Code, if these properties are redeveloped they must be brought into compliance with all current land use regulations.
- In many instances, the properties are more financially viable in their current noncompliant state than they would be if they were redeveloped in compliance with current standards.
- Given all the above findings, it will likely be many years (or decades) before most of the properties in the commercial zones are compliant with current land use regulations.

Considering the situation summarized above, the Commission discussed what (if anything) could and should be done relative to redevelopment of aging properties in the commercial zones. The Commission considered three general options:

1. Do nothing and wait (potentially for many years until properties are proposed for redevelopment for them to come into compliance).
2. Incentivize properties to redevelop more quickly with incremental progress towards full compliance.
3. Change zoning standards in the commercial zones to reduce the number of non-compliant properties (perpetuate existing conditions indefinitely).

During the January 7 meeting the Commission discussed a strategy that encompasses parts of all three of these options. The Commission determined that some aspects of existing noncompliant buildings contribute to the Town's character and could be continued, even when a property is redeveloped. Other aspects of noncomplying buildings do not contribute to the community character and should be phased out.

Specifically, the Commission found that a building with noncompliant setbacks could be rebuilt in the same footprint (i.e. size and setbacks), as long as the general scale and character of the building were retained. Other noncompliant characteristics of a property should not be perpetuated (e.g. insufficient landscape, parking not meeting the setback requirements, building height).

Staff has prepared the following framework for a strategy to accomplish the direction the Commission gave in the January meeting. This strategy is presented below in concept. The Commission should give staff feedback on this concept. Staff will then revise the concept and develop ordinance language.

### ***Noncomplying Commercial Buildings Concept Strategy***

- A building in the CC or VC zone that is noncompliant with setbacks and/or building size may be completely reconstructed (including removal and replacement of the foundation), as long as all of the following conditions are met:
  - The reconstructed building must be located entirely within the footprint of the existing noncompliant building. Extensions of the reconstructed building outside the existing footprint building are not allowed, even if said expansion would be compliant with setback or size requirements.
  - All other aspects of the reconstructed building (height, design, materials, outdoor lighting, etc.) must comply with current land use regulations.
  - All other aspects of development on the property must be compliant with current land use standards (e.g. landscape, parking, parking area setbacks, etc.). If compliance with any other land use regulation makes it impossible to reconstruct the building within its original footprint, the size and/or setback of the noncomplying building must be altered (in a way that does not increase the setback or size noncompliance) to allow compliance with all other regulations.
  - The height of the reconstructed building must not exceed the height of the existing building plus two feet (and in all cases must additionally comply with the current building height).
- If a building in the CC or VC zone that is noncompliant with setbacks and/or building size is proposed to be reconstructed other than listed above, it must meet all current land use standards.
- A noncompliant building reconstructed pursuant to the standards above retains its noncomplying use status and will continue to be regulated as a noncompliant building.
- A noncompliant building reconstructed pursuant to the standards above that also houses a nonconforming use retains the nonconforming use status, and the use shall not be found to be abandoned if the reconstruction takes longer than one year.
- All noncompliant aspects of a property in the CC or VC zone other than size and setback must be brought into compliance when a property is redeveloped.

The aerial image below shows how the above strategy would work on a noncompliant property in Springdale. The property (outlined in orange) is noncompliant with a number of land use regulations (setbacks, building size, parking area setback, landscape, transient lodging unit density). Under the proposal detailed above the property could be redeveloped by completely reconstructing one or all of the existing buildings (outlined in red). However, there would need to be changes to the parking area setback, there would need to be additional landscape, and the number of transient lodging units would need to be reduced. This would likely mean not all of the buildings on the property would be able to be



rebuilt to the extent they exist now -- it is likely that additional area would be needed for landscape and parking that met the setback requirement.



***Commission Action***

Staff recommends the Commission discuss the proposed strategy for noncompliant buildings and give staff feedback.