

**City of Saratoga Springs**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**April 14, 2016**

Regular Session held at the City of Saratoga Springs City Offices  
1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

---

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Commission Members: Kirk Wilkins, Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, David Funk, Ken Kilgore, Troy Cunningham, Brandon MacKay

Staff: Sarah Carroll, Kevin Thurman, Nicolette Fike, Gordon Miner, Mark Christensen

Others: Kyle Cook, Stan Steele, Richard Brockmyer, Corey Anderson

**Call to Order** - 6:32 p.m. by Chairman Kirk Wilkins

1. **Pledge of Allegiance** - led by Kyle Cook

2. **Roll Call** – A quorum was present

3. **Public Input**

**Public Input Open** by Chairman Kirk Wilkins

No public input was given tonight.

**Public Input Closed** by Chairman Kirk Wilkins

4. **Public Hearing: Transportation Master Plan Amendment. --- Item Continued to April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

5. **Public Hearing: Bicycle & Pedestrian Study & Master Plan.**

Sarah Carroll introduced Kyle Cook and Richard Brockmyer, Consultants from Fehr and Peers, who explained some of the details of the project.

Kyle Cook gave an overview of the process they went through for the study. He then noted the vision and goals they had. Continuity was a key goal along with increasing transportation safety and making it a routine component of city planning. He noted some of the things learned from community outreach and surveys that were the basis of the plans that were developed.

Richard Brockmyer reviewed the proposed system improvements and prioritization such as trails, sidewalks, bike parking, crosswalk options, and support facilities. He noted a section of the report dedicated to maintenance costs. He noted the online web map they had developed

**Public Hearing Open** by Chairman Kirk Wilkins

Cory Anderson asked about bike parking requirements added to the code. He bikes to work every day as do others in his office. He suggested incentives for businesses that allow for bike parking, a reduction in their credits for parking spaces. He notes that people that bike to work don't want to leave their bikes outside; they are too expensive, so he would like a way for them to provide parking inside the building.

Richard Brockmyer commented that there are both short and long term suggested biking requirements.

**Public Hearing Closed** by Chairman Kirk Wilkins

Sandra Steele asked if they had included Camp Williams in any of their planning (Consultants replied no) because for connectivity they would like to see a trail all the way around the Camp and part of that would go through our community. She asked if they did any studies for mountain biking, more than just the soft trails. She asked if the study indicated how many would bike to work if there were facilities.

Kyle Cook noted that the questions weren't asked in that way but noted that 80% cited lack of complete infrastructure that prevents them from biking and walking. With that you can infer that having the infrastructures and support facilities would help.

Sandra Steele commented that because we are a linear city some of the things that work in other cities may not work with ours. She is concerned about the amount of money that would need to be spent to provide some of the facilities. Developers won't want to provide something that doesn't get used. She thought the code changes were overkill; in Lindon they do a percentage for parking.

Kyle Cook replied that it's common to have a concern about putting undue burden on businesses to provide the racks and things. It's something the City needs to decide how far they want to go. Bike parking alone is not going to really encourage people to bike; it's more a combination of things.

Sandra Steele likes the percentage for public parking spaces that you have. She would like to look at something similar to disabled parking standards, it would look cleaner, not one at every business store front. She understands 50 ft. from the front door but disabled parking needs to take precedence and it should be noted that it should. Sandra asked why is it required to be concrete and noted that Lindon has theirs as a hard surface.

Kyle Cook replied that they would be ok with hard surface.

Richard Brockmyer commented that it's a best practice, putting it on equal footing with parking.

Sandra Steele noted she asked because thinking in the future, if they find they are under-bicycle-parked, it may be easier to put it on asphalt without tearing it up and putting in concrete. She asked when they did measurements if they took into consideration tricycles some seniors and disabled ride.

Kyle said they didn't include those directly, they looked at typical designs, in most instances you could use them for a tricycle too.

Sandra Steele noted when there could be cases of it impeding accessible parking. She noted Lindon did not require covers for outdoor parking; maybe a certain percentage could meet the code. But we need to remember keeping the 80" clearance. Sandra noted when business uses change they would have to meet new code and put in parking. Also it may require wider sidewalks that we may need to start requiring. She asked who would be responsible for lighting, the City or Businesses. She is concerned that it could be considered business un-friendly because of the cost they need to incur. Would big business want to come here or go to another area that didn't require as much? You need to consider the sq. ft. those inside lockers take up. You are paying per sq. ft. per year for that space being taken up. When we get commuter light rail she agrees with more parking there than any other use.

Mark Christensen commented that it is a changing trend especially for the millennial generation and people that like to bike to work. They heard comments earlier tonight to the fact. It's an HR question of how can we provide those amenities for our employees so they can have those opportunities. Having those amenities available will pull in a certain demographic. It's a lifestyle change for the community that will be driven by demand. Human resource practices today are driving a lot of these suggestions.

Sandra Steele thinks the sizes of the business will drive the need.

Mark Christensen said they had this conversation with another developer recently, we don't know what business will come in next as uses can change. Perhaps what is in there today doesn't need it but by not requiring it we've prevented our future from having adequate resources.

David Funk noted that he lived near Portland which is a biking community. It is a great idea to provide indoor facilities and that we ought to reduce their requirement for auto parking. If it converts to another use, they already have the indoor facilities to continue to use. We are definitely a different city than Portland, but we are set up for light rail and biking in the future, so everything should flow to the Redwood Road corridor so it will be easier to pick up a bus or light rail. He is a little concerned about some of the future walking and biking trails. He has found it unfriendly getting between locations currently. He noted three areas he was concerned about on the map. One was where Foothill Blvd. meets with Pioneer Crossing (an area where an accident has occurred). A second area was the high school on the east side. (It was clarified that there was a sidewalk from the high school east to Redwood Road.) Third he was looking at near the new Smiths and Pioneer Crossing, especially from the high school over to that area. He noted Jordan river Parkway is something a lot of people like to use and as many parts of the city as possible should be connected to that. He sees the two most important areas to provide connectivity to are Redwood Road corridor and Jordan River Parkway Trail.

Mark Christensen noted when D.R. Horton finishes the phases in Legacy Farms; one of them will include a widening and expansion of 400 South that will help provide that connectivity.

Hayden Williamson would be opposed to requiring bicycle parking. There are compelling reasons why business would want parking and then we don't need to mandate it. They should decide if they need it. He would be in favor of incentivizing or letting them substitute some bike parking for regular parking.

Troy Cunningham commented that a few of his avid cycling friends like the bike plans. Cyclists want connectivity and places to stop along the way to eat or rest. He looked at bike lockers in other areas. He wonders whether or not businesses may find this unfriendly and would be in favor of some sort of offset for parking.

Ken Kilgore asked if we were to put the plan in place how it would influence UDOT to getting things built.

Gordon Miner noted it's a cooperative effort with UDOT, we express our desires and they try to accommodate as best they can.

Mark Christensen commented that for non-motorized things there are different grants and funding we can look at. MAG has some grants we could use. We definitely have a need for it and we will be looking at a lot of different funds for it. The more we do that puts structure in place, it will give us leverage to look for partners. When we go to MAG for funding it's about tying the right funding to the right project. The Redwood Road expansion is different. But the trail from Pioneer Crossings to Legacy Farms is going to be a conversation they are having. Having these plans in place will help prioritize this.

Gordon Miner noted that at the next meeting the Master Transportation Plan will be presented and they can see some of the plans there.

Sarah Carroll noted that they do have a Master Plan that is a tool when they are coordinating with them. She noted the path under Pioneer Crossing that was able to be added because they had that on their master plan. When we have bike trails shown on our plans and we are able to show that as priority it helps. We do have employees that like to bike and they have commented on the connectivity, as that improves you will see more bikers as the safety and convenience rises.

Mark Christensen noted it's a lifestyle a lot of people are moving towards. We are going to have to meet it from an HR standpoint. We need to start down the path and continue to make incremental changes. But if we don't have the connectivity then we are never going to make the steps. As we add more and more bike lanes and trails we will see it used more.

Hayden Williamson asked if we had any indication of what percentage of the residents would bike if they felt the right circumstances were in place.

Kyle Cook replied that those that were interested in taking the bike survey are those that are interested in biking to begin with. They can't say for sure. But the majority of the respondents noted that being outdoors and healthy were of interest.

Richard Brockmyer commented that about 80% of the population was interested but concerned. There is a percentage that will never bike no matter what, but a large percentage right now that this plan is focused on, are interested but don't feel safe with the conditions now.

Mark Christensen commented that this is looking forward and as we can build these modes of transportation it may help draw different types of employers here.

Ken Kilgore commented on the cross sections, has it been studied that it's actually a safer design.

Richard Brockmyer says there is literature that supports that more separation is better especially at higher speeds.

Kyle Cook mentioned it's less about space and more about volume and level of comfort that comes with that.

Ken Kilgore just wants to make sure that whatever we put in is indeed safer.

Kyle Cook responded that the most important thing is to provide that space. The white line is not going to stop an errant driver but you can decide what you want to do with that space like curb.

Richard Brockmyer noted that at a certain point it's better to totally separate it.

Gordon Miner noted the general idea is about separation. On freeway it's 12 feet on a local street it can be down to 10 feet. The concept here is just the higher volume of vehicles the more separation.

Ken Kilgore agrees with the concerns about cost to business when requiring parking. But sees a different way than Commissioner Williamson that yes we want our city to be bicycle friendly. He noted how it didn't hurt business in cities where it became a priority, like Portland. As for locker facilities, he thinks we can encourage it, but be sensitive to types of businesses. If it's not high tech offices it may not be necessary. Because of the way Saratoga is laid out it may be a very good place for biking.

Brandon MacKay noted that for his business in order to attract millennials you need to have these types of amenities. He commented on the need for soft trails and mountain biking. It has tons of possibility here in Saratoga. He noted he just had lunch with the School Bike team and it's the highest growth sport in the state. The high school here has the second largest team in Utah. Soft trail single track would make Saratoga a destination. Due strictly to the topography here it's a great opportunity for an attraction point in the City and a great place for our youth. Mountain biking is a great youth sport to provide a life of opportunity.

Kirk Wilkins noted that Eagle Mountain has some great trails and he would like to see some connectivity to that. He asked if we would do anything with bike locks, we have to accommodate it. He likes the idea that we don't increase the huge requirements for businesses without a tradeoff.

Sandra Steele noted on Riverside dr. there are roundabouts, when you come to those the bike trails have a concrete stop where you have to come back out into traffic. Perhaps there should be some type of mechanism where the bike lane would be continuous.

Mark Christensen noted those were designed specifically to slow traffic down. There is some inherent sharing of the road. At the point of full build out it may need to be addressed further.

Sandra Steele thinks we may need to look at standards for roundabouts in the future that include this. Along the lake for connectivity, she noted homes that had not put in hard surface trails. We need some way that our teams look for the trails in the individual custom homes that were required.

Sarah Carroll noted at the next meeting they will be seeing the update to the Transportation Master Plan and there are some different alignments on there that don't necessarily coordinate with the maps you are seeing tonight so staff recommended a condition that those coordinate with the upcoming Master Transportation Plan.

Hayden Williamson asked about maintenance cost and wanted an idea of what it was.

Kyle Cook noted typical costs for plowing, sweeping, resurfacing. It took into account centerline distance at build out, hard or soft surfaces, distance, facility types, and typical unit cost for maintenance at build out.

Mark Christensen noted the amount typically used on trail maintenance. He also mentioned a lot of the network hubs they are looking at are state budgeted, a lot of trails are maintained by HOA's also.

Hayden Williamson said this is money coming out of our pocket so we do need to be careful.

Sarah Carroll mentioned that they need to make a motion on this tonight and reviewed conditions. There are two suggested conditions:

- a. The bicycle parking code shall be removed and replaced with a paragraph identifying required bike parking is a general goal, and staff shall be directed to return later with a revised code amendment reflecting appropriate parking requirements.
- b. A revised Transportation Map is scheduled for a public hearing with the Planning Commission April 28th, road locations on the maps within the Bicycle And Pedestrian Map shall be updated to reflect the revised Transportation Master Plan.

Sandra Steele wants to continue this because there are some issues but would comment that City Council should see this also for a work session because they will have things to look at.

Kevin Thurman noted that they can't direct that Council have a work session but staff could speak with City Council to see if they are interested in a work session on this issue.

Ken Kilgore is ok with the Master Plan but perhaps there are issues with the code.

Sandra Steele is not ok with the Master Plan, there are some omissions that have been made, that she commented on earlier.

**Motion made by Hayden Williamson to Table the Bicycle and Pedestrian Study and Master plan until after staff has had a Work Session with City Council and come back to us with updates based upon comments we made today and comments that Council will make. Seconded by Troy Cunningham.**

David Funk is concerned that they are saying that staff has to meet with City Council with a work session. We can't tell them they have to do that.

Mark Christensen said they can suggest, but it's City Council's meeting to decide.

Ken Kilgore thinks a lot of these are just details that don't seem to need a whole work session. Shouldn't we be able to decide this, it's either obvious or not that it's important. We should be able to work it out

ourselves and not ask City Council before we decide. Perhaps we need to approve the Plan and not the code yet. Why does it require City Council to look at before we decide?

Hayden Williamson feels that he is in favor of tabling it and having City Council look at it in a work session. He feels it should have come to us first as a work session then they could do the work and come back to us. He thinks tonight should be considered as a work session.

Kevin Thurman suggested that they make their recommendation. It is a legislative communication.

Kirk Wilkins asked if Commissioner Williams would consider amending the motion to reflect that we feel more to continue it to have more time to consider it.

Ken Kilgore believes we should give City Council a clear recommendation.

Kevin Thurman also recommends that they give a recommendation.

**The Motion was Amended by Hayden Williamson: To continue the Bicycle and Pedestrian Study and Master Plan to a future date as determined by staff.**

**The Amendment was accepted by the Second, Troy Cunningham.**

Sarah Carroll asked if they wanted to give specific direction, or just everything they have discussed.

Hayden Williamson said everything they have discussed.

(1. Review the items discussed by the Planning Commission today.)

**Aye: Sandra Steele, David Funk, Hayden Williamson, Kirk Wilkins, Ken Kilgore, Troy Cunningham, Brandon MacKay. Motion passed 7 - 0.**

**6. Work Session: Code Amendments for Large Lot Landscaping.**

Sarah Carroll reviewed the Code amendments. Due to increased code enforcement, issues have arisen with the landscaping of large lots. With larger than ½ acre lots complete landscaping may not make sense as the native landscaping on the lots matches well with existing native landscaping along the road. The Planning Commission previously discussed allowing large lots to only landscape a portion of their lot and also expressed concern over inequity of water rates. The proposed amendment is to: Amend single-family landscaping standards to address large lots and require all lots over ½ acre to landscape at least ½ acre, and all lots under ½ acre to completely landscape.

Ken Kilgore commented that most of the complaints have been that many of the larger lots (1-5 acres) are not meeting the requirement. So if we add this in it doesn't necessarily take care of the complaints. He wondered about grandfathering.

Sarah Carroll replied that currently we are requirement the whole lot so there wouldn't be any grandfathering but it would change the enforcement to just ½ acre.

Kevin Thurman noted that this is less restrictive than currently. For a grandfathered use you would have had to meet the old code at some point.

Kirk Wilkins asked the size of lots were that had complaints.

Sarah Carroll replied they were 1-5 acres.

Troy Cunningham mentioned one resident got a fine for his yard not being landscaped but it was due to the fact that the flood wiped out his landscaping.

Ken Kilgore remembered that there was an extension created to help in those situations.

Sarah Carroll said there is an extension request where people can explain their situation and it can be taken into consideration.

Mark Christensen remarked that this is a legitimate question for people, what are they required to maintain.

There is an equity question and it's a legislative decision more than a staff recommendation issue. We do need clarification as we deal with it as a staff for enforcement.

Kirk Wilkins asked where the ½ acre came from.

Mark Christensen noted it started with ⅓ and some felt they should have to do more.

Ken Kilgore noted ⅓ put undue burden on the small guy and not let the bigger lots pay their fair share.

Kirk Wilkins would like to see the data, how many properties are above ½ acre or ⅓

Mark Christensen noted that for those that have the large lots it's a big issue. It can be a lot of land to take care of.

Kirk Wilkins noted that he had been looking around other cities and saw several larger 1 acre lots that were not necessarily landscaped but were maintained.

Sandra Steele thinks we should consider that we allow xeriscaping and they don't have to landscape in a manner that we usually think of. If you have a ½ acre lot and a ¼ acre lot next to you, that smaller lot should have some natural protection from weeds.

Mark Christensen noted that is true whether it's a large lot or a vacant lot. He pointed out that in HOA's typically you won't see this as much; typically you see it outside of HOA's. There are some areas where this is a big issue.

Sarah Carroll noted having a specific amount in the code; most of the R3 zones have less than 10,000 sq. ft. lots. So the ½ acre was larger than the standard lot in the city but there were different concerns about the fairness so staff increased it to ½ acre and the commission can choose either or make a suggestion.

Mark Christensen mentioned that now they may not be impacting anyone if they don't have anyone around them, but as development moves in near them it will.

Sarah Carroll showed another area where larger lots have landscaped part of the lots. Is it realistic to require them to do all of the landscaping?

Ken Kilgore favors ½ acre because of the way water rates work right now. A property owner that has a larger lot will be able to water a lot without going over their allotment, and it helps the beautification of the city.

Sandra Steele agreed with that.

Kirk Wilkins thought the ½ was a little high.

Ken Kilgore mentioned the concern is based on the complaints that the city received that the larger lots were not landscaped. And it didn't make sense to do the whole things but if it comes to cost the larger lots pay less because they get additional water credits for having a larger lot. The smaller lots have to do more watering to meet their ½ acre and go over their allotment. This evens it out a little.

Hayden Williamson commented that it's only a concern if we are requiring everyone to landscape their back yard. If we are focusing on impacts, if I chose to not landscape and have bare dirt I'm not impacting anyone. He didn't think we should have a requirement to landscape backyards.

Ken Kilgore replied that then it goes back to fire hazards and weed control.

Hayden Williamson commented that we need to change it to regulating impacts like weeds and fire abatement.

Sarah Carroll commented about the weed comments and each yard gets a water allocation per size of the lot and if you go over usage you pay more. If you have a larger lot and you never go over the allotment but the initial fee is larger for a larger lot. So you may never go over the allotment but the fee is larger to begin with. That should be taken into consideration.

Kevin Thurman noted it is a legislative decision, and just because it says you don't have to landscape it all doesn't mean you can't landscape it all. To have different rates depending on how much you landscape is a slippery slope.

Sarah Carroll noted if we take out the discussion of fair utility fees, and just look at what is appropriate in the larger lots to landscape. Utilities can be another discussion as the city progresses.

Ken Kilgore mentioned that Commissioner Williamsons point is a whole other discussion on if we even enforce backyard landscaping.

Sandra Steele said there are impacts if you don't do your back yard. Aesthetics is a big one, especially for neighbors looking down on it.

Mark Christensen mentioned we haven't noted landscaping of backyards for tonight; this discussion is not meeting the description of the agenda item.

Hayden Williamson feels it's all covered in the same section of the code and we need to look at it as an impact standpoint all around.

Sandra Steele is concerned that if we don't require something in the backyards, it impacts the neighbors, with water runoff for instance.

Hayden Williamson replied that landscaping is not the only way to handle runoff.

Kevin Thurman reminded the commissioners that talking about backyard landscaping is not an item on the agenda tonight; we can bring that back at another time. It goes against the Open Public Meetings Act.

Kirk Wilkins directed commissioners to return to topic.

Sarah Carroll recommended that we hear from each commissioner in which way they are leaning. They could take a vote on if they want another topic to come back for discussion at a later time.

Ken Kilgore is in favor of ½, he disagrees with removing landscape from backyards but he knows several have commented on public hearings that there are citizens that are concerned about backyards so he agrees that it could come back as a discussion.

Troy Cunningham is in favor of ½ acre, and backyards being landscaped.

Hayden Williamson is in favor of ½ acre and we need to discuss backyards.

Kirk Wilkins is in favor of ½ acre and would be in favor of bringing backyards for discussion.

David Funk is in favor of ½ acre and has no problem bringing backyard for discussion but leans towards having it landscaped.

Brandon MacKay is in favor of ½ acre.

Sandra Steele is in favor of ½ acre and believes anytime one of them has a concern it deserves to be heard.

7. **Work Session: Discussion of Code and Vision.** – No discussion on this item was needed.

8. **Approval of Minutes:**

a. **March 24, 2016**

Motion made by Sandra Steele to approve the minutes of March 24, 2016. Seconded by David Funk.

Aye: Sandra Steele, David Funk, Hayden Williamson, Kirk Wilkins, Ken Kilgore, Brandon MacKay. Abstain: Troy Cunningham. Motion passed 6 - 0.

9. **Reports of Action.**

There were no reports tonight.

10. **Commission Comments.**

Hayden Williamson asked when they bring back Backyards that they bring back some ideas that would say what kind of codes it would impact.

Kirk Wilkins also suggested looking at other cities that don't require backyard landscaping.

Sandra Steele wanted to thank members of the commission who served on the bicycle committee.

11. **Director's Report:**

a. **Council Actions**

- o ABC Great Beginnings work session
- o Home occupation code was approved

b. **Applications and Approval**

- o Several new applications and resubmittals.
- o Staff approved hillcrest condos o and lakeside 27 tup for temp sales trailer

c. **Upcoming Agendas**

- o Code amendments
- o Western Hills phases 2 &3 preliminary plat
- o ABC Great Beginnings Rezone
- o Accessory dwelling unit code amendment work session
- o Master Transportation Plan

d. **Other**

12. **Motion to enter into closed session.** No need for closed session.

13. **Meeting Adjourned at 9:09 p.m. by Chairman Kirk Wilkins**

4-28-16  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Approval

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicolette Fike, Deputy City Recorder



\_\_\_\_\_  
David L. Funk  
Planning Commission ~~Chair~~ Vice Chair  
~~Kirk Wilkins~~ David Funk