



118 Lion Blvd PO Box 187 Springdale, UT 84767 * 435-772-3434 fax 435-772-3952

AMENDED TOWN COUNCIL NOTICE AND AGENDA

THE SPRINGDALE TOWN COUNCIL WILL HOLD MEETINGS
ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026,

AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UTAH
THE SPECIAL MEETING STARTS AT 4:00 PM. THE REGULAR MEETING STARTS AT 5:00 PM.

A live stream of this meeting will be available to the public on YouTube.

****Please see the YouTube information below.**

*****The amended agenda adds Closed Session item A2 and Oath of Office *****

SPECIAL MEETING

Approval of the Special Meeting agenda

A. Closed Session

1. Strategy Session to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.
2. Discussion of the Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.

B. Action Required by Closed Session

C. Adjourn

Pledge of Allegiance

Oath of Office – Randy Aton

Approval of the Regular Meeting Agenda

A. Announcements/Information/Community Questions/Presentations

1. General Announcements
2. Zion National Park Update – Superintendent Bradybaugh
3. Council Department Reports, Questions, and Comments
4. Community Questions and Comments

B. Consent Agenda

1. 2026 Councilmember Committee Assignments.
2. Review of Monthly Purchasing Report.
3. Appointment of Jack Burns as Mayor pro tempore.
4. Reappointment of Bob Carlton to the Springdale Historic Preservation Commission.
5. Reappointment of Rich Levin to the Springdale Historic Preservation Commission.

C. Legislative Items

1. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-19** Amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by Adding a Requirement for Enhanced Buffering and Screening on Commercial Properties Adjacent to Residential Uses. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
2. **Public Hearing: Zone Change from Valley Residential (VR) To Public Use (PU) On Parcel S-137-C, A Two-Acre Parcel Immediately Adjacent to the East of the Town Hall Property.** Applicant: Town Of Springdale. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
3. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-20** Amending Chapter 10-7A of the Town Code by Adding Medical Offices, Drugstores, Pharmacies, and Medical Clinics as Permitted Uses in The PU Zone. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.
4. **Ordinance Revision 2026-01:** Changes to Section 6-2-9 Adding a Prohibition on Camping in a Vehicle Parked in the Public Right-of-Way. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

D. Administrative Action Items

1. Consideration of a Proposal Made by Jeff McKee to Form a Community Oversight Committee. Staff Contact: Greg Hardman.
2. Audit Presentation for the FY 2024-2025 budget – Caleb Rees, Rees CPA. Staff contact: Dawn Brecke.
3. Consideration and Possible Approval of an Engagement Letter from Rees CPA for Auditor Services for the Fiscal Year 2025-2026. Staff contact: Dawn Brecke.
4. Resolution 2026-01: Adopting a Revised Parking Zone Map for the Town of Springdale. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie.
5. Resolution 2026-02: Amending the Fee Schedule to Include Solar Permits, Agricultural Use Permit, and Administrative Agricultural Use Permit. Staff contact: Kyndal Sagers.
6. Discussion and Possible Approval to Extend the Resignation Period of Town Manager Rick Wixom through March 31, 2026.

E. Administrative Non-Action Items

1. General Council Discussion

F. Adjourn

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

<https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>

APPROVED

Barbara Burns

DATE

1-14-26

This agenda was posted at the Springdale Canyon Community Center and Town Hall at 4:45 am/pm by Robyn Romero on 01/12/2026

NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting should contact Town Clerk Robin Romero (435.772.3434) at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Packet materials for agenda items will be available on the Town website: <http://www.springdaletown.com/AgendaCenter/Town-Council-4>



**MINUTES OF THE SPRINGDALE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026,
AT THE CANYON COMMUNITY CENTER, 126 LION BOULEVARD, SPRINGDALE, UTAH**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Barbara Bruno, Council Members Jack Burns, Randy Aton, Pat Campbell, and Kyla Topham

ALSO PRESENT: Town Attorney Greg Hardman, Town Manager Rick Wixom, Director of Community Development Tom Dansie, Town Treasurer Dawn Brecke, and Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording.

The Special Meeting convened at 4:01 PM.

Approval of the Special Meeting agenda

Randy Aton made a motion to approve the Special Meeting Agenda. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

A. Closed Session

Jack Burns made a motion to enter a closed session for a strategy session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation and to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Action Required by Closed Session

Kyla Topham made a motion to take the action discussed in the closed session. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjourn

Jack Burns made a motion to adjourn the special meeting at 05:04 pm. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Barbara Bruno, Council Members Jack Burns, Randy Aton, Pat Campbell, and Kyla Topham

ALSO PRESENT: Town Attorney Greg Hardman, Town Manager Rick Wixom, Director of Community Development Thomas Dansie, and Town Clerk Robin Romero, recording.

The Regular Meeting convened at 5:10 PM.

Mayor Bruno led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Town Clerk Robin Romero administered the Oath of Office to Randy Aton, who was elected to serve as Council Member for the Town of Springdale.

Approval of the Regular Meeting Agenda

Kyla Topham moved to approve the Regular Meeting Agenda. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:
Campbell: Aye
Aton: Aye
Bruno: Aye
Burns: Aye
Topham: Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

A. Announcements/Information/Community Questions

1. General announcements

Parks and Recreation Director Ryan Gubler announced the following upcoming events:

- Blood Drive on January 16, 2026
- Dark Sky lecture and star gazing on January 22, 2026
- Revegetation project on January 31, 2026

2. Zion National Park update – Superintendent Bradybaugh

Superintendent Bradybaugh reported that total attendance at Zion National Park in 2025 was 5,006,425 visitors, up by less than 1% compared to 2024. He provided an update on the FY2026 Park Budget, reported Zion was

still under a hiring freeze for any positions other than seasonal employees or emergency services personnel, and said he suspected the Park would be down significantly in terms of permanent staff in 2026. Superintendent Bradybaugh spoke of increased entrance fees, particularly for non-resident and international visitors, and answered questions from the Council.

3. Council Department Reports Questions and Comments

Randy Aton introduced Dave Harmon, new Wildland Chief for Hurricane Valley Fire District.

Hurricane Valley Fire District Battalion Chief Tyler Ames reported just over 6,300 calls received by the District in 2025, with 70% of the calls for EMS. He said the District was looking to expand paramedic capabilities with new medical facilities expected in District boundaries.

4. Community Questions and Comments

Cliff Roseman, Springdale resident, recognized the staff for trying to take care of issues he had with hotels. He requested fifteen minutes on a Council meeting agenda to expound on seven issues, all of which had been cited but not enforced. He said the issues represented blatant disregard to the Town and repeated requests.

Mayor Bruno told Mr. Roseman the Council did not typically get involved with Code Enforcement issues, and suggested he submit a proposal to the Council of what he wanted to present. Mr. Roseman said he submitted a proposal some time ago at the suggestion of staff, but would be happy to do so again.

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, said just so everyone here knows, the public can only give input for items that are marked public hearing on the agenda, so when items are being discussed like C1, C2, and C3 on today's agenda, you can come up and make comments. If they are not marked 'public hearing,' now is your only time to make a comment. Therefore, if you want to talk, for instance, about the community oversight committee, now is when you do it. At this time, therefore, I would like to voice my strong support for that proposal. When it was first brought up, I doubted its need, but felt it was worth considering. All the examples I have been able to find about municipalities who do that were positive. Leadership liked it as well as the community. It seems like it can only help.

Second, Mr. Wixom and Mr. Hardman have clarified for me in their emails that the town automatically puts agenda items as public hearing only when mandated by law. I would suggest the opposite. Put all items in as public hearing ones unless forbidden by law, or at least give some thought as to whether things should be public hearing even if they do not have to be. I have come three times, and every time there were at least three other people there expecting to be able to comment, but the item was not marked public hearing, so we could not. I feel adamantly that labeling more things as public hearing would be tremendously valuable. It would encourage public involvement. It would enhance transparency. It is much more logical to make the discussion of, for instance, the oversight committee, when it is being discussed by the Council rather than at the beginning of the meeting, when it is more likely to be forgotten when the topic actually comes up.

She wanted on the record a quick thank you to Kyla Topham. I emailed Town Council Members individually, and she responded quickly. After she referred the question to Mr. Wixom, he copied all the other Members who then would have seen no need to respond, so perhaps some of them would have eventually done so. But Kyla was prompt, professional, polite, and it is very much appreciated. The reason I could even reference Mr. Wixom and Mr. Hardman earlier in my comments is due to her responding to a citizen's question. In summary, yes to a community oversight committee, yes to making more agenda items public hearing, and if anyone else wants to comment about an agenda item not marked public hearing today, it is now or never.

B. Consent Agenda

1. 2026 Councilmember Committee Assignments.
2. Review of Monthly Purchasing Report.
3. Appointment of Jack Burns as Mayor pro tempore.
4. Reappointment of Bob Carlton to the Springdale Historic Preservation Commission.
5. Reappointment of Rich Levin to the Springdale Historic Preservation Commission.

Randy Aton made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

C. Legislative Items

1. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-19** Amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by Adding a Requirement for Enhanced Buffering and Screening on Commercial Properties Adjacent to Residential Uses. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Director of Community Development Tom Dansie said the proposed ordinance was developed by the Planning Commission in response to direction in the General Plan about additional measures to protect residential uses adjacent to commercial properties. The proposed ordinance would add a landscaped buffer yard requirement for all new commercial development adjacent to residential properties, with three options (below). The commercial property owner would be required to consult with neighboring residential property owners. He said the Planning Commission considered that commercial property in Springdale could be developed for commercial or residential use, and recommended that a landscaped buffer yard only be required on a commercial property adjacent to residential if the commercial property were developed for commercial use.

Buffer Yard Option 1

This buffer yard is the narrowest concept. It is intended to allow development flexibility on smaller lots that do not have enough space for larger buffer. Given the narrow nature of the buffer, it requires a taller fence and more dense vertical vegetation to mitigate the negative impacts of the commercial use.

Buffer Yard Option 2

This option requires a mix of berms, fences, and vegetation. The average required width is 20 feet; however, the buffer yard can vary in width from a minimum of 15 feet to a maximum of 25 feet to allow flexibility and creativity in design. (Note: the property owner could choose to make the buffer wider than 25 feet, but would only get credit for 25 feet of width. This prevents a situation where a property owner could use a wide section of buffer to average out more narrow buffers and still meet the 20-foot average requirement.)

Buffer Yard Option 3

This is the widest buffer. It uses additional width and increased vegetation to mitigate the impacts of the adjacent commercial use. Like Option 2, the width of the buffer yard can vary, as long as the average is 35 feet.

Questions from the Council:

Mr. Burns referred to proposed language stating increased height may be required for fencing, and asked if specific height standards were included. Mr. Dansie said the first option for a buffer yard included requirement for a fence no shorter than six feet and no higher than eight feet.

Ms. Topham asked if a residential use on a commercially zoned property next to a commercial use on a commercial zoned property would be protected. Mr. Dansie said it would not. He said a landscape buffer yard would be required on a commercial property in the CC or VC Zone developed with a commercial use adjacent to a property in the FR or VR Zone, including FR or VR subzones or any overlay zone with a primarily commercial use.

Questions from the Public:

Cliff Roseman, Springdale resident, asked what materials could be used for the buffer yard, and asked if the requirement would only be applied moving forward, or if it would be applied retroactively.

Mr. Dansie responded that land use ordinances looked forward, and were rarely retroactive. He said there were three broad categories of buffer yards, each with different requirements spelled out.

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, asked if apartment buildings were considered commercial. Mr. Dansie responded that multi-family residential development was considered residential, not commercial.

Jack Burns made a motion to open a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

Jack Burns made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Council Deliberation:

Mayor Bruno said she thought it was interesting that commercial property owners would be required to talk with a neighboring residential property owner, but not required to do what the residential property owner wanted. Mr. Dansie responded that the Town was the land use authority, and land use regulation should be predictable and consistent. He said allowing an adjacent property owner to choose would remove predictability and transfer land use authority from the Town to the adjacent property owner, which would be problematic. She said she liked that there were three different options available.

Mr. Campbell commended the Planning Commission for the time they put into the proposed amendment, and said he thought they did a really good job. Mayor Bruno said she agreed, and said she was glad the Planning Commission included transient lodging as a commercial activity instead of residential.

Ms. Topham expressed concern with the last-minute change by the Planning Commission to address whether a commercial property was developed for commercial or residential. She said a commercial property developed for residential use may not leave enough space for all of the buffer yard options despite the potential for a future change to commercial use. She suggested allowance should be made to incorporate some of the buffer yard options. Ms. Topham expressed the opinion that the last-minute language was not as clear as it could be, and said she would like staff to make a few clarifying changes.

Ms. Topham referred to situations in which a commercial property was surrounded by residential property, and expressed concern that the proposed ordinance would lead an applicant toward completely fencing a property and adding a gate. She said she was not sure that was the desired direction. Mayor Bruno said she had a hard time picturing a situation in which a commercial property would want to put a fence around the entire property. Ms. Topham said she believed the situation would be possible for transient lodging, and said a residential property could be fenced, but not gated. Mr. Dansie clarified that a subdivision could not be gated, but an

individual residential property could be gated. Mr. Aton said he was not sure he would be bothered by a completely fenced property.

Mayor Bruno said she agreed with the suggestion to clarify the drafted language. Ms. Topham recommended the Council table the proposed ordinance for clarification. Mr. Dansie expressed the opinion that the language drafted by the Planning Commission was fine as it was, but it could be clarified.

Kyla Topham made a motion to table Ordinance 2025-19, amending Chapter 10-18 of the Town Code by adding a requirement for enhanced buffering and screening on commercial properties adjacent to residential properties. The Council would like to see a clarification in the Code referencing residential uses on commercial properties and transient lodging not applying as a residential use. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Public Hearing:** Zone Change from Valley Residential (VR) To Public Use (PU) On Parcel S-137-C, A Two-Acre Parcel Immediately Adjacent to the East of the Town Hall Property. Applicant: Town Of Springdale. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Mr. Dansie presented a proposal to change the zoning designation of a two-acre Town-owned property adjacent to Town Hall from the Valley Residential (VR) Zone to the Public Use (PU) Zone, in anticipation of development of a medical clinic on the property. Mr. Dansie said, if developed, the medical clinic would not occupy the entirety of the site, and encouraged the Council to consider whether the PU Zone was a good fit for the property in general. Town Code included three criteria, one or more of which must be met to justify a zone change: (1) the proposed zone change would promote the goals and objectives of the General Plan and Land Use Ordinance; (2) the proposed zone change would accommodate substantial changes in conditions; (3) the proposed zone change would correct a manifest error.

Mr. Dansie said several public comment letters were submitted prior to the Planning Commission meeting, and three additional public comment letters were received prior to the Council meeting that evening.

Questions from the Council:

Mr. Campbell said the Planning Commission motion stated the requested amendment would accommodate substantial changes, and asked if the Planning Commission mentioned what the changes were and how they would relate to a medical center. Mr. Dansie said the motion stated the substantial changes in conditions were related to a growing community of residents, businesses, and visitors, providing needed services as a result. Mr. Dansie said in the request for the zone change, the Town's justification referenced some of the changing conditions and the changing needs of the community for a medical clinic. Mr. Dansie said quantifiable data and statistics were not provided in the staff report, but it was thought a medical clinic would respond to the changes generally. Mr. Campbell asked if the Planning Commission was involved at all in the decision that a medical center was needed. Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission was not involved in the specific proposal, but was involved inasmuch as the General Plan referenced the need for expanded medical services.

Mr. Campbell asked if the Planning Commission were given depictions of how the proposed medical facility would look beyond the photographs of other buildings in the area included in the staff report. Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission received the same packet provided to the Town Council. Mr. Campbell said the Planning Commission statement that the building would match surrounding design had no basis since no design for the building was provided. Mr. Campbell said the Planning Commission never asked about

actual medical need, level of care that would be provided, caseload of the current medical center, smaller alternatives, or alternatives for public use. He asked if the Planning Commission asked any questions about design, and Mr. Dansie said no questions along the lines described were asked.

Mr. Campbell said the staff report mentioned the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and read aloud from the FLUM that the property was for higher density residential uses, including multi-family, as well as small-scale commercial development. Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Dansie if he believed a 4,000 square foot building was small-scale compared to what the Town had. Mr. Dansie explained that, to put it in context, in Residential Zones, 3,000 square foot structures were allowed which could be increased up to 5,000 square feet with a design bonus. In the Central Commercial Zone, up to 8,500 square feet were allowed, which could be increased to 12,000 square feet. In the Village Commercial Zone, up to 5,000 square feet were allowed which could be increased up to 8,000 square feet. In the context of those other allowable building sizes, 4,000 square feet was on the lower end of what was allowed in Springdale. Mr. Campbell asked if the Planning Commission was aware of a committee talking about the design of the proposed medical facility. Mr. Dansie said the Planning Commission had not specifically been informed of the committee. He said the committee was composed of the Mayor, Randy Aton, Lori Wright from Family Health Care, Rick Wixom, Ryan Gubler, and himself. Mr. Campbell pointed out the committee did not include anyone from Planning or any residents. Mr. Dansie noted that the Mayor and Mr. Aton were residents.

Ms. Topham asked where the Town was in the design process for the medical facility. Mr. Dansie said the Town had received a grant for the facility, as the Council knew, and had engaged VCBO Architects to help with the process. He said VCBO had provided an initial draft, which was shown in the Council packet. A final design and development had not been completed.

Questions from the Public:

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, asked if there was a commitment from Family Health to be in the new medical center. Mr. Wixom said Family Health Care understood the existing lease for the existing building would transfer to the new building. He said he did not recall the term of the existing lease. Ms. Cutler said it had been assumed that increased National Park attendance would mean increased need, but increased Park attendance had not resulted in increased overnight rental usage. She asked if there was any data to support the statement that the growing community needed a new medical center. Mr. Dansie said there was no objective data to support the conclusion, but there were general observations.

Robyn Chancey, Springdale resident, asked what would happen if Family Health Care bailed out. Mr. Wixom said there were other providers and opportunities, but said he appreciated that Family Health Care was a community health organization. They had discussions with the Piute Tribe, who operated a clinic in Cedar City and expressed interest. Mr. Wixom said the Town had options by owning the building.

Town Attorney Greg Hardman said the lease with Family Health Care was entered into on November 8, 2023 for an initial term of three years, with two options to extend for five-year periods.

Jack Burns made a motion to open a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Robyn Chancey, Springdale resident, said she supported access to medical care in Springdale, and supported maintaining a clinic, but did not support the assumption that the Town required a brand new 4,000 square foot medical facility on newly rezoned land. Ms. Chancey read aloud a prepared statement

(Attachment 1), expressing the opinion that the Town had moved too quickly without adequately evaluating alternatives. She asked the Council to slow the process down and reconsider whether renovation or redevelopment of the existing site had been fully explored, and carefully evaluate whether the proposal primarily served residents, or shift the burden of tourism infrastructure onto them.

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, said she frequently watched Planning Commission meetings, and was often astounded at the amount of time they spent giving special attention to so many details. She said the Planning Commission spent more time deciding whether a portable sign could have a balloon on it than they did discussing the proposed PU Zone change. Ms. Cutler urged the Council to slow down. She said the Planning Commission had not discussed whether the zoning change should occur, only discussed whether the planned building would fit. She said they never discussed whether it was necessary.

Randy Aton made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Council Deliberation:

Mayor Bruno said the next agenda item addressed whether to add medical office use to the PU Zone. She said the property was owned by the Town of Springdale, and said the PU Zone was more restrictive than the current zone. Mayor Bruno expressed the opinion that a change to the PU Zone made sense, since the property was acquired by the Town for public use. She said the proposed zone change was not about whether to build a medical clinic, but whether to change the property to the PU Zone. She explained that they could build a Town Hall, Council chambers, etc. to future proof the campus. The zone change was not about the medical clinic but whether they wanted to change a property the town owned to public use. As to the need for a medical building, Mayor Bruno said the Town was in the process of planning a medical building and hoping for funding from Transient Room Tax which was geared to visitor amenities, but said a clinic would benefit residents and the community. She said Springdale had had a medical clinic for decades, and when the Town had been at risk of losing the clinic, it seemed harmful to the community. Family Health Care was recruited by the former providers to provide the service in the existing building until an appropriate facility could be built. Mayor Bruno expressed the opinion that the property owned by the Town should be rezoned PU.

Ms. Topham said she agreed the Town owned the property and that the PU Zone made sense for the possible uses that had been discussed. She said she agreed the rezone would be a down-zone, not an up-zone. Ms. Topham said she valued the comments about whether a 4,000 square foot facility was necessary. She pointed out when the Town offices were built in the 1990s it was thought they would be sufficient for a very long time, but it had turned out they were not as the community grew. Ms. Topham said a 4,000-square-foot medical facility may not be needed today, but may turn out to be needed in ten or fifteen years, and in ten or fifteen years it may be too late to build it. She said the Town did not have a crystal ball, but needed to take steps to create the future the Town wanted to see. Ms. Topham said the existing clinic was a trailer, and said she did not think expanding a trailer would be practical; however, she said she agreed with considering whether the property could be utilized differently. She said she hoped the firm with which the Town was working was kept an open mind and looked at all the options. Ms. Topham said the proposed zone change seemed straightforward in that the Town owned the property and needed to be thinking of the future.

Mr. Campbell asked if Planning ever looked at what else the property could be used for, and suggested affordable housing or workforce housing would be a better use for the property. He said a medical clinic could still be incorporated with the correct zone.

Mr. Aton said the Council had talked a lot about a desire for affordable housing and workforce housing, and had made an early decision that the Town was not going to get involved in managing affordable housing. He expressed the opinion that changing the property to the PU Zone made sense, because public use was the purpose for which the Town purchased the property. He said he appreciated Family Health Care, and would appreciate the addition of a pharmacy in the proposed new facility. Mr. Campbell asked if Mr. Aton felt it was okay to have retail in the PU Zone. Mayor Bruno said the pharmacy would be a federally chartered pharmacy for clinic customers, like the existing pharmacy associated with the Family Health Care clinic in Hurricane. Mr. Campbell emphasized that a pharmacy was a retail business.

Mr. Burns said the question was whether to change the zone, which was not a new conversation. He said the proposed change had been in the works for several years. Mr. Burns spoke of the negotiation process to purchase the property, and said the intent for which the property was purchased was public use, which correlated to the price paid. He said the Town needed to be true to what was told the former owner of the property. Mr. Burns said the need for a medical clinic had been identified, and expressed the opinion that trying to modify the existing inadequate medical facility would not be money well spent. He said he believed the questions being asked would be helpful in determining what the ultimate size of the clinic would be.

Ms. Topham asked if the Council thought the proposed rezone was supported by the General Plan. Mayor Bruno said she agreed with the Planning Commission that the proposed zone change met two of the three General Plan categories: substantial changes in conditions due to a growing community, and promoting the goals and objectives by promoting community health. Ms. Topham said she agreed keeping a medical clinic in Springdale was important, and said she agreed with the statement that the General Plan supported the change in zone. Ms. Topham said the existing clinic had been in place since the mid-1980s, and the community had changed substantially in that time. Mr. Aton expressed agreement.

Mr. Burns said the decision was not based on whether visitation in Zion National Park was increasing or decreasing, but on a reliable metric that throughout the busy season, on any given day, there were between 15,000 and 17,000 people in Springdale and Zion National Park, and over 30,000 people on busy holiday weekends.

Mr. Campbell asked how many patients the medical clinic saw in a week. Mayor Bruno responded the number of patients varied. Mr. Campbell said the staff report stated the zone change was requested with the intent of putting in a medical clinic. Mayor Bruno responded that a medical clinic was the first thing planned for the property, but not the only public use for which the property would be used. Mayor Bruno said the committee tried to design a 3,000 square foot building with a 1,000 square foot rec room, but it had not worked.

Mr. Campbell said the entire less-than-ten-minute Planning Commission discussion was surrounding the fact that the property would be used for a medical clinic. He said if the Planning Commission had asked more questions, they may have concluded that the PU Zone was not the best use for the property. Ms. Topham said the Planning Commission made the recommendation, and asked Mr. Campbell his opinion. Mr. Campbell said he was not opposed to a medical clinic, but believed the size was astronomical. Mr. Campbell expressed the opinion the facility could be much smaller. He questioned whether Family Health Care would be able to afford the monthly lease. Mr. Campbell said the Town wanted to build a Town Hall, said he had heard suggestions of a post office on the subject property, and said he believed the Planning Commission could have done a better job figuring out what would go on the property to give him a better handle on why it should be zoned PU.

Mr. Aton asked what Mr. Campbell would put on the property. He referred to the comment from Mr. Burns that the purchase price of the property had been linked to the intent of public use. Town Attorney Greg Hardman said the property was acquired by the Town under threat of condemnation, and the property owner sold the property at fair market value. Under statute, if the Town did not develop the property for the use for which it was purchased, public use, the seller would have the right to purchase the property back from the Town. Responding to a question from Mr. Campbell, Mr. Hardman said the decision was previously made to acquire the land as public property to expand the municipal campus to provide public amenities.

Jack Burns made a motion to approve the recommendation by the Planning Commission on December 3, 2025, for a proposed zone change from Valley Residential (VR) to Public Use (PU) on Parcel S-137-C, located immediately to the East of the Town Hall Property, as discussed at the January 14, 2026, Town Council meeting. The motion is based on the following findings:

1. The change in zone from Valley Residential (VR) to Public Use (PU) is consistent and furthers the goals and objectives of the General Plan and is consistent with the purchase of the property for a use as was intended.
2. In accordance with Section 10-3-2(A) of the Town Code, the requested zone change meets not only one necessary requirement, but meets two requirements for a zone change: (1) the zone change will accommodate substantial changes and conditions due to a growing community of residents, businesses, and visitors, providing needed services as a result. (2) promote the goals and objectives of the General Plan by promoting community health and wellness, facilitating first-class medical facilities and care, and other amenities.

The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: No

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed 4:1.

3. **Public Hearing: Ordinance 2025-20** Amending Chapter 10-7A of the Town Code by Adding Medical Offices, Drugstores, Pharmacies, and Medical Clinics as Permitted Uses in The PU Zone. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Mr. Dansie explained that the proposed ordinance had two parts, one concerning the use of medical clinics, and the other concerning the use of pharmacies as permitted uses. Mr. Dansie said medical clinics were not currently listed as a permitted use in any zone. The proposed language would designate medical clinics as permitted uses in the Central Commercial, Village Commercial, and Public Use Zones. Mr. Dansie said pharmacies and drug stores were currently permitted uses in the Central Commercial and Village Commercial Zones. As originally proposed to the Planning Commission, the ordinance would have extended pharmacies as a permitted use in the PU Zone. The Planning Commission discussed a public comment letter that expressed concern about a stand-alone pharmacy or drug store in the PU Zone. Following that discussion, the Planning Commission recommended revising the proposed ordinance so that stand-alone drugstores would continue to be allowed as a permitted use in the CC and VC Zones, and drugstores or pharmacies operated in connection with a medical clinic would be permitted in the PU Zone as well as the CC and VC Zones.

Questions from the Council:

Ms. Topham asked if the Town could further regulate what pharmacies or drug stores in the PU Zone would be able to sell. Mr. Dansie said the Council could define the scope and scale of a pharmacy operated in conjunction with a clinic versus a standalone pharmacy, but he was not sure the Council could control items offered for sale.

Mr. Campbell expressed the opinion that the Planning Commission misread the Code regarding quasi-public use. He read aloud the following: "quasi-public use: a use operated by a private nonprofit educational, religious, recreational, charitable, or philanthropic institution..." Mr. Campbell said he believed the Planning Commission used "private nonprofit" as the noun in the definition, when it was actually the adjective qualifying the kind of institution. He pointed out that medical was not included. Mr. Campbell asked staff if "private nonprofit" was the noun in the definition or the adjective. Mr. Dansie said the definition continued from where Mr. Campbell left off, "...such use having the purpose of primarily serving the general public." Mr. Dansie expressed the opinion that the proposed ordinance tried to promote the uses as having the

purpose of primarily serving the general public. Mr. Campbell said he understood what Mr. Dansie was saying, but did not share the view.

Questions from the Public:

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, said she had no problem with a medical center. She said she was aware the State had addressed what was allowed on public use lands, and asked if anyone had researched things that could be done to make a pharmacy appropriate for public land. Ms. Cutler suggested the Council table the matter until such research had been done.

Jeff McKee, Springdale resident, asked if they could do eminent domain for a specific use. Town Attorney Greg Hardman explained that it had to be for a public purpose. The State law identified permissible public purpose and said municipalities had broad discretion in determining what constituted a legitimate public purpose. He said the subject property was acquired for public use, and said if the Town established public use on the property things would be fine.

Jack Burns made a motion to open a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth Cutler, Springdale resident, said she had no problem with the change to the PU Zone. She said she believed residents were concerned that proposed Ordinance 2025-20 would be railroaded through. Ms. Cutler said allowed uses on public use land were very restricted, and retail establishments were not among them. She expressed the opinion that more discussion was needed regarding how much, how big, and whether a new clinic was needed. She said the Town needed data and to provide answers to the questions, and emphasized the need to slow down. Ms. Cutler stated a drug store should not be allowed, and a pharmacy should only be approved with limits. She stated the Town needed to research the wording as to what to allow on public use lands.

Kyla Topham made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Council Deliberation:

Ms. Topham said she believed the Planning Commission had started the ball rolling, but there was more work that could be done. She thought this could be tabled and fleshed out a little bit better.

Mr. Campbell said he believed the Planning Commission conflated public use with public benefit. He said a medical clinic certainly served a public benefit, but said he did not think a medical clinic was appropriate for the PU Zone. He expressed concern with a separate entrance for the proposed pharmacy, which would bring in a retail aspect that would open the door for other organizations to use the loophole to sell retail on public use land. He said if this were approved, the whole dynamic of the medical clinic would evolve. He quoted from the General Plan regarding public health, seeking to provide 24-hour access to critical supplies, and investigate "a combination of incentives and direct financial support to accomplish the goal." Mr.

Campbell spoke of Town subsidization, and said he did not know how to unhook the definition from what could conceivably happen. He questioned whether Family Health Care would be able to continue to afford operations based on the numbers provided by Mr. Hardman. Mr. Campbell said he thought it was a stretch to say that because a medical clinic was a public benefit, it was appropriate for public use land.

Mayor Bruno said the existing medical clinic was on public use land. Mr. Campbell responded that the existing clinic was nonconforming. Mayor Bruno said the Town was still in the planning stage for a new medical clinic with grant funds from the State. She said the question was whether to continue to allow medical clinics that met the standard of private nonprofit in the PU Zone. She said she agreed that it shouldn't be a retail pharmacy and pointed out that the pharmacy serviced clinic patients. The Town could have any parameters that it desired. Mayor Bruno spoke of the services that could be provided to visitors who may have forgotten a prescription medication.

Mr. Burns asked if a medical clinic in a commercial zone would make more sense. Ms. Topham said a nonprofit medical clinic did not make more sense in a commercial zone. Mayor Bruno explained that they were specifically discussing private non-profit because they certainly would not want a for profit medical clinic in the PU Zone. Mr. Campbell stated the definition of quasi-public needed to be clarified. He asked if visitors wanting to fill a prescription would need to make an appointment to become patients of the clinic before a prescription could be filled, and said there were a lot of details that needed to be clarified. Ms. Topham said she believed if a visitor had a valid prescription, they should be able to obtain a medication at the future pharmacy without needing to become patients of the clinic. Mr. Campbell said he was not sure such a pharmacy belonged in the PU Zone.

Mr. Burns said much of what had been said made sense, but was a little too far in the weeds. He spoke of residents needing access to a pharmacy and medical clinic, and that he believed it made sense for that to be in the PU Zone. Mr. Aton said he agreed.

Mr. Aton said the subject property was obtained with the intent to be used for public use. He said they had been hearing from staff that Town Hall was bursting at the seams and they needed more room. The intent had never been to use the Community Center for Council meetings long-term. He said a Town Hall made sense. Mr. Aton expressed the opinion that a nonprofit medical clinic made sense in the PU Zone, especially in a small town like Springdale with the volume of visitors and the drive required to go down canyon to obtain medical attention. He said this was something that served the community and the public and believed the medical clinic was appropriate in the PU Zone, and would like to see a pharmacy attached to the medical clinic with the same hours as the clinic, and other restrictions.

Kyla Topham made a motion to table Ordinance 2025-20 Amending Chapter 10-7A of the Town Code by adding Medical Offices, Drugstores, Pharmacies, and Medical Clinics as Permitted Uses in the Public Use Zone and directed staff to further clarify Drugstores and Pharmacies in order to restrict stand-alone locations in the Public Use Zone and further define different metrics that can eliminate some of the discussed concerns. The motion was seconded by Jack Burns.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Ordinance Revision 2026-01:** Changes to Section 6-2-9 Adding a Prohibition on Camping in a Vehicle Parked in the Public Right-of-Way. Staff Contact: Thomas Dansie.

Mr. Dansie said Land Use Code already prohibited camping in a parked vehicle on private properties and private parking lots, and in a roundabout way, prohibited overnight occupancy of cars parked in the public right-of-way. He said the proposed ordinance revision would provide cleaner and clearer code to reflect the

current policy of not allowing overnight occupancy or camping in vehicles parked in the public right-of-way or public property.

Ms. Topham asked if camping in a vehicle parked in the public right-of-way was a current problem in the Town, and Lieutenant Shafer of the Police Department indicated it was.

Jack Burns made a motion to approve Ordinance Revision 2026-01: Changes to Section 6-2-9, adding a prohibition on camping in vehicles parked in the Public Right-of-Way. The motion was seconded by Pat Campbell.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Administrative Action Items

1. Consideration of a Proposal Made by Jeff McKee to Form a Community Oversight Committee. Staff Contact: Greg Hardman.

Mayor Bruno said the Council had read all the emails sent by Mr. McKee, and asked if there was anything Mr. McKee wanted to add to what had already been said. Mr. McKee said he had nothing further to add.

Council Deliberation:

Mr. Hardman said an email from Mr. McKee to the Town dated November 14, 2025 suggested that a community oversight committee would be able to do four things. The third action listed was to issue advisory subpoenas for records. Mr. Hardman said the specific statute referenced was a criminal procedure statute, and would not apply to the type of committee requested by Mr. McKee. He said he did not believe a community oversight committee would have the right to issue a subpoena.

Mayor Bruno said personnel matters were slippery slopes. She expressed concern about whether residents that would nominate themselves to such a committee would have sufficient HR expertise. She pointed out that not even the Town Council had access to personnel files. Mayor Bruno said she believed the Town had a good process in place, and expressed the opinion that the process had not failed Mr. McKee, but that Mr. McKee had not followed the process. She said several members of staff had approached her and written letters expressing they were not in support of such a committee. Mayor Bruno said she did not see a need to fix something that was not broken, and said she did not support the proposal.

Mr. Campbell said he agreed with Mayor Bruno. He said in his personal experience such citizen oversight committees or citizen review boards were a hammer, with untrained members and no real authority. He said personnel hearings were generally closed, with redacted documents, ultimately voted on in public by a Council without public discussion of reasons for the termination or lack thereof. Mr. Campbell said he believed it would be valid for a citizen review board to look at financials, audits, or how the process was conducted, but to delve down into a singular personnel issue, it would be dangerous for even the Council to be involved.

Mr. Hardman commented there were already State-appointed bodies to deal with fiscal irresponsibility and ethics issues. Ms. Topham said she felt more confident in the State-appointed group's ability to get to the bottom of a situation. However, if something came to the Council that went through the proper channels, she felt it would be the Council's duty to consider and address the situation. She added that a process already existed for a case to be brought to the Council. Mr. Aton said he agreed, and that the Council had the extra tools and support of staff and Town Attorney. He said a citizen committee would not have

accountability in the same way as an elected Council. Mr. Aton said he was opposed to a community oversight committee.

Mr. Burns said he believed there was great value in third-party review of operations, but they needed to be conducted by people with the expertise to do the assessment and was not comfortable appointing residents to do that. Mr. Burns said he agreed with a lot of what had been said and would not be comfortable with what was proposed.

Kyla Topham made a motion that the Town Council deny the consideration of a proposal made by Jeff McKee to form a Community Oversight Committee based on the discussion at the Town Council meeting on January 14, 2026. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Ave

Aton: Ave

Bruno: Ave

Burns: Ave

Topham: Ave

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Audit Presentation for the FY 2024-2025 budget – Caleb Rees, Rees CPA. Staff contact: Dawn Brecke.

Caleb Rees with Rees CPA presented the audit findings for the Town of Springdale's 2024-2025 fiscal year budget. He spoke of the Council's role in reviewing expenditures and asking questions, and reported no audit findings related to internal controls or budgetary compliance. Mr. Rees highlighted the capital investment and long-term debt sections in the budget.

Mayor Bruno said she was reminded the previous day of the idea that a municipality should not be afraid to issue bonds for projects that would last over the life of the bond. Mr. Rees said the idea was called "the matching concept," and said he agreed. Mr. Campbell asked which expense the Town would be tied to first: a project bond, or cost associated with a catastrophic event. Mr. Rees said he would expect in the case of a catastrophic event that the Town would have reserves, and would not have budgeted to the penny. If reserves were exhausted, Mr. Rees said the Town would be tied to the existing bond, and would need to look at bonding, as well as insurance and federal help, to pay for additional catastrophic expenses. Mr. Rees said he was impressed with the preparation and dedication shown by each member of the Council.

3. Consideration and Possible Approval of an Engagement Letter from Rees CPA for Auditor Services for the Fiscal Year 2025-2026. Staff contact: Dawn Brecke.

Responding to a question from Mayor Bruno, staff said the cost of the proposed arrangement with Rees CPA was in line with that of the current arrangement.

Jack Burns made a motion to approve the engagement letter from Rees CPA for Auditor Services for the Fiscal Year 2025-2026. The motion was seconded by Second Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Ave

Aton: Ave

Bruno: Ave

Burns: Ave

Topham: Ave

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Resolution 2026-01: Adopting a Revised Parking Zone Map for the Town of Springdale. Staff contact: Thomas Dansie.

Mr. Dansie said the Parking Ordinance in Title 6 of the Town Code identified different parking zones (paid, prohibited, and restricted parking zones), depicted on the Parking Zone Map. Mr. Dansie said staff proposed two changes to the map based on recent changes to parking management. The first proposed change involved improvements to the area south of the church down to Quail Ridge Road for the express purpose of increasing the amount of paid parking available. The map currently reflected the area as prohibited for street parking.

The second proposed change would add text to the map to authorize the Parking and Police Departments to use a specific prohibited parking zone on a temporary basis to direct traffic for parking as needed to accommodate demand in peak periods.

Pat Campbell made a motion that the Town Council has reviewed and approves Resolution 2026-01: Adopting a Revised Parking Zone Map for the Town of Springdale as discussed in the Town Council meeting on January 14, 2026, and authorizes the Mayor to sign. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Resolution 2026-02: Amending the Fee Schedule to Include Solar Permits, Agricultural Use Permit, and Administrative Agricultural Use Permit. Staff contact: Kyndal Sagers.

Mr. Dansie said the proposed resolution would clean up the Fee Schedule to be consistent with current policies and practices. He said the Town received a public comment letter pertaining to inconsistency in the Code and proposed Fee Schedule for the Administrative Agricultural Review Process and Administrative Agricultural Use Permit. Mr. Dansie suggested the Council could amend the proposed resolution to be consistent with Code.

Kyla Topham made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-02: Amending the Fee Schedule to Include Solar Permits, Agricultural Use Permit, and Administrative Agricultural Use Permit with the following change:

1. **Rename the Administrative Agricultural Use Permit to Administrative Agricultural Review Process as discussed in the Town Council meeting in January 14, 2026, and direct the Mayor to sign.**

The motion was seconded by Jack Burns.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion and Possible Approval to Extend the Resignation Period of Town Manager Rick Wixom through March 31, 2026.

Responding to a question from Ms. Topham, Mr. Wixom indicated willingness to extend his resignation period through March 31, 2026. Ms. Topham said the process to find a replacement was moving forward, but said she believed it was important for Mr. Wixom to have enough time working with the new manager.

Jack Burns made a motion to extend the resignation period of Town Manager Rick Wixom through March 31, 2026. The motion was seconded by Randy Aton.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

E. Administrative Non-Action Items

1. General Council Discussion

Mayor Bruno displayed a Fantasy Football belt she won the previous year, and passed the belt to Mr. Dansie.

F. Adjourn

Randy Aton made a motion to adjourn at 08:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Kyla Topham.

Vote on the motion:

Campbell: Aye

Aton: Aye

Bruno: Aye

Burns: Aye

Topham: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.



Robin Romero, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: Barbara Bruno DATE: 2-11-26

A recording of the public meeting is available by accessing the Town's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/@SpringdaleTownPublicMeetings>.



Approved Minutes of the Springdale Town Council Special and Regular Meetings of January 14, 2026



PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD Please print your name below

Meeting: Town Council Meeting

Date: 01/14/2026

ATTENDEES:

Elizabeth Cutler

Name (please print)

Jeffrey T.E. Roseman

Name (please print)

DAVE HARRON

Name (please print)

Mike James

Name (please print)

Ralph Green

Name (please print)

Jeff Bradybaugh

Name (please print)

Robyn Chancery

Name (please print)

Nicole Williams

Name (please print)

ATTENDEES:

Name (please print)

Thank you, Mayor and Councilmembers.

I want to be clear about my position. I support access to medical care in Springdale. I support maintaining a clinic here. What I do not support — at least not based on what has been presented — is the assumption that our town requires a brand-new 4,000-square-foot medical facility on newly rezoned land.

In my view, the Town moved too quickly to a preferred solution without adequately evaluating alternatives. Modifying the existing medical building, renovating it, expanding it, or even replacing it on the same site all appear to be viable options that were never meaningfully analyzed in a public, data-driven way.

Instead, the Town appears to have decided first that a new facility was necessary, then proceeded to acquire land, pursue rezoning, and amend Public Use zoning to allow additional uses. That sequence puts the cart before the horse. I have not seen clear metrics presented — such as resident utilization rates, projected resident demand, or cost-benefit comparisons between renovation and new construction — that would justify a permanent zoning change and a new municipal campus.

I am also concerned about who this facility is primarily intended to serve. Springdale is a small town. While we host millions of visitors each year, our residents should not be expected to bear the long-term land-use, financial, and policy consequences of facilities designed primarily to support tourism demand. That distinction has not been clearly addressed.

My concerns were reinforced by the Planning Commission's review. Although the staff memo encouraged analysis of impacts, scale, alternatives, and long-range implications, the Commission's discussion focused almost entirely on whether the proposal met a minimum legal threshold under the General Plan. There was little examination of whether a zoning change was necessary at all, or whether less permanent tools could achieve the Town's stated goals.

A zoning map amendment is a permanent legislative act. It runs with the land and sets precedent, particularly when viewed alongside the Future Land Use Map, which designates multiple Valley Residential areas as Mixed Use. A Conditional Use Permit — or a phased, site-specific approach tied to demonstrated resident need — appears to be a more proportional and responsible option, yet it received little to no consideration.

I respectfully ask the Council to slow this process down, to reconsider whether renovation or redevelopment of the existing site has been fully explored, and to carefully evaluate whether this proposal primarily serves residents or shifts the burden of tourism infrastructure onto them. Regardless of the outcome tonight, I ask that these concerns be clearly reflected in the record.

Thank you.

Recently, the Planning Commission approved two related items for parcel S-137-C—the Town-owned property next to Town Hall:

- Item A2: A zone change from Valley Residential (VR) to Public Use (PU).
- Item A3: A code amendment adding medical offices, pharmacies, and clinics as permitted uses in the PU zone.

Although presented separately, these actions are inseparable; without the zone change, the amendment has no effect. Yet the Commission approved both within ten minutes—without a single question or substantial discussion. No site plans or architectural renderings were shown, only aerial photos and unrelated building images. Someone even remarked that the new structure would “blend right in,” even though no design had ever been seen.

This approval relied on a concept, not confirmed design. Commissioners also claimed nearby residents would face little impact, without evidence. In past years, as we all know, private citizens requesting far less significant zone changes have faced rigorous scrutiny. When resident Matt Ryaner proposed a zoning change at 975 Zion Park Boulevard, he was questioned in detail about design, materials, and landscaping, with meeting minutes spanning nine pages before his request was finally denied. Why did town owned parcel S-137-C receive such cursory review?

More fundamentally, what problem is this project solving? Commissioners asked no questions about existing clinic capacity, future use of the parcel, or alternative community benefits. Instead of beginning with an open discussion about how best to use Town-owned land, the process jumped directly to approving a predefined medical and pharmacy concept. By the time this reaches the Town Council for a formal public hearing, the decision will already be mostly settled—leaving little room for genuine public input.

From a policy standpoint, the Town must ask whether the best use of this property is a municipally backed medical complex or a project that better serves long-identified needs such as workforce housing. The Council has repeatedly acknowledged the housing shortage. This parcel could demonstrate leadership by incorporating both housing and limited healthcare facilities. A simple VR-to-Village Commercial (VC) rezoning could accomplish that transparently, yet staff chose a more convoluted path: VR to PU, then a code change redefining PU to include private medical operations.

This workaround appears designed to bypass prior precedent. A similar VC rezoning request along Lion Boulevard came before the Council in 2019: was debated, and ultimately denied. The new approach essentially revives that idea under a different label.

The deeper issue lies in redefining “public use.” Providing a public benefit does not automatically make a project a public use; otherwise, any business claiming to help residents could occupy public land. Traditionally, PU zones accommodate facilities truly owned or operated by government or public entities—schools, parks, and utilities—not private clinics or pharmacies, even nonprofit ones.

Ultimately, the issue is not one parcel but the integrity of Springdale’s planning process. Zoning decisions involving public property must prioritize openness, transparency, and equal treatment. If the Town can rezone its own land in minutes, while residents face exhaustive review, public trust suffers. Springdale’s identity has always rested on deliberate planning and community involvement. Before moving forward, the Town should slow down, engage its citizens, and ensure this project—whatever form it takes—genuinely serves the public good.

Bill Marshall

Comments for Springdale Town Council 1/14/2026 Agenda Items C2 and C3

Dear Council and Staff,

The Town of Springdale is now several years into the groundwork for a replacement medical clinic. In asking for a significant zoning change as part of this project, I urge you to take a pause and review and reconsider and re-inform your public.

Look What's New Just Down the Road

The Springdale General Plan states “Springdale will promote community health and the wellness of its residents” and goes on to include language specific to providing a medical clinic. Since this Plan was updated, a 24/7/365 ER has opened in Hurricane, UT next door to an InstaCare that is now open daily and houses multiple primary care physicians, labs, radiology, PT, tele-health etc. For decades, the trends in rural community health care have been toward centralization of services (as technology and specialization got more complex) and tele-health, mobile units, transportation options and mail-order pharmacy have taken hold.

Highly Reputable Family Health Care (FHC) is not another Helen and Mike

Initial planning for a clinic building and engagement with FHC rode an emotional wave of community support after the closing of the prior clinic staffed by locals Helen and Mike. Their team provided exceptional high contact, high caring and personal medical services to friends, neighbors and visitors. It was logical to envision a replacement that would fill that gap.

What Do The Data Show?

The public deserves to know what usage of FHC services in Springdale has been over the past year. Surely these numbers exist and the Town of Springdale has access to them.

What Are the Details of the FHC Agreement?

Is the Town now contractually obligated to provide a clinic building? And is FHC contractually obligated to provide services for the duration of the bond debt? How much risk is the Town taking on? For example, who pays back the bonds for both the land and the building if the clinic closes? Does the Town have any ongoing financial obligation beyond providing the land and structure? FHC relies in part on federal DHS funding. Under RFK Jr's direction, and today's Executive and Legislative branches, how stable is FHC's funding?

And the Cost?

The land was \$1.4M (\$1.8M with interest). A grant of \$334K covers some/all of the architecture design expense. The buildout costs in today's economy could be an additional \$3-5M.

(Source: Springdale Capital budget FY 2027-2028)

How Stable is Park Visitation?

Clinic revenues from out-of-town visitors (now more likely to be uninsured due to ACA and Medicaid cuts) and Town funding from taxes, etc are at higher risk of uncertainty than in previous years. With an unleashed Executive branch, another looming government shutdown, Zion Park staffing uncertainty, new higher Park entrance fees for foreign visitors, mid-2026 restrictions on bus traffic in the Park, an unsettled national economy (and don't forget...geology), is there future stability in Park visitation? If Park visits go down, clinic visits go down, Springdale business revenues go down and the Town coffers get less.

If Not A Clinic, What?

The General Plan also addresses the need for housing. Other commenters have covered this. A pause of this zone change request could allow more thorough consideration of a way to provide more accessible housing. Could the land already purchased be developed differently?

Nancy Goodell

Dear Mayor and Town Council Members,

I am writing as a Springdale resident to share comments for your consideration prior to Wednesday's meeting regarding the proposed rezoning of the Lion Boulevard parcel from Valley Residential to Public Use.

I want to be clear at the outset that I support access to medical care, thoughtful long-term planning, and strong municipal services. My intent is not to oppose these goals, but to ask whether the current record demonstrates a level of **demonstrated need** sufficient to justify a **permanent zoning change**, and whether the sequencing of decisions related to this proposal is appropriate.

In preparing these comments, I have reviewed the Springdale General Plan, the Planning Commission staff report, materials provided in response to my recent public records request, the Town's 2023 Rural Communities Opportunity Grant application materials, and recent public reporting on the transition of the Zion Canyon Medical Clinic.

Demonstrated Need vs. Aspirational Planning

Operational data provided by the clinic shows that the existing facility operates on a limited schedule—two days per week in winter and three to four days per week in summer. Appointment data indicates that in most months between 10% and 25% of offered appointments go unfilled. The provider has also confirmed that there is currently no mechanism to measure unmet demand beyond this unfilled rate.

In addition, when Family Healthcare assumed operations following the retirement of the longtime private owners, its CEO publicly stated that a priority would be assessing community need, including how many days per week the clinic should be open and what services are actually required. She also stated that the organization is prepared to adjust and grow as need is demonstrated.

From a planning perspective, this information does not demonstrate a facility operating at capacity or patients being turned away due to lack of space. Rather, it suggests that current constraints may relate to staffing, funding, or operating model rather than physical square footage. Before expanding the physical footprint, it seems reasonable to ask whether expanded hours, staffing, or other operational adjustments were evaluated as alternatives.

Sequencing of Public Investment

I also note that the Town has recently invested significant funds in renovating the existing Town Hall, that the current post office remains operational, and that the medical clinic is not operating full-time and remains in an assessment phase under new ownership.

At the same time, the Town has taken substantial financial steps toward a future municipal campus, including the purchase of the Lion Boulevard property and the adoption of a reimbursement resolution through the Municipal Building Authority allowing bonding reimbursement for that acquisition and related expenses. From a planning standpoint, this reflects a significant financial commitment occurring in advance of clearly demonstrated operational need. The sequencing of these decisions is a key concern for me.

Permanence of Rezoning

The action before the Council is not simply approval of a building, but a permanent zoning change. Even if the initial phase is limited to a 4,000-square-foot clinic, the Planning Commission staff report notes that the parcel could accommodate additional public uses over time. I respectfully ask whether the rezoning is being justified based on the long-term suitability of this site for all Public Use purposes, independent of the current proposal, and whether cumulative future build-out has been fully evaluated.

General Plan Consistency

The General Plan clearly supports enhanced medical services and access to a pharmacy. It also emphasizes protecting residential areas, managing development intensity, and exercising restraint in zone changes. I am seeking clarity on how these principles are being balanced in this proposal, particularly given that the parcel is currently zoned residential and adjacent to established neighborhoods.

If the Council believes additional analysis would be helpful, I respectfully encourage you to request clearer data on unmet demand, operating capacity, and reasonable alternatives before making a permanent zoning decision.

In closing, my concern is not whether enhanced services are a worthy goal—but whether the existing record demonstrates a necessity that warrants rezoning at this time, before existing facilities are fully utilized and before the clinic's own needs assessment process is complete.

Thank you for your time, your service to the community, and your thoughtful consideration of these comments.

Respectfully,

Robyn Chancey
Springdale, Utah

Darci Carlson

Comments on TC 1/14/26 agenda item D5

Hi Kyndal, good morning!

In reading the staff report for item D5 “Revising the Fee Schedule”, I’m questioning the use of the term “Administrative Agricultural **Use Permit**.”

If you follow the language used in Town Code section 10-15D-9, it seems that using the term “Administrative Agricultural **Review Process**” is more consistent with this section. The table in this section currently uses the term **Review Process** for the requested use and zone. The Review Process is charged a \$75.00 fee, while the Use Permit is charged a \$200 fee. To me, using the term 'Use Permit' twice, for both **Agricultural Use Permit** and **Administrative Agricultural Use Permit**, is confusing.

Thanks for taking the time to consider my comments.

Have a great week!

-Darci