

**City of Saratoga Springs  
Planning Commission Meeting**

**May 22, 2014**

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

---

**Draft Planning Commission Minutes**

**Present:**

Commission Members: Jeff, Cochran, Jarred Henline, Kirk Wilkins, Sandra Steele, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson

Staff: Lori Yates, Sarah Carroll, Nicolette Fike, Scott Langford

Others: James Jones, Mike Helmantoler, Aric Jensen, Tami Buckland, Chris Raver, Joe Hitzeman, Cornell Brown, Joel Darby, Satt Jenson, Miranda Jensen, Ryan Bybee, Arnold Hansen, Paul Watson, Jeff Nielsen, Jeremy Weller, Jim Wherler, Jennifer Hansen, Steve Sowby

**Excused:** Kara North

**Call to Order** - 6:36 p.m. by Eric Reese, Vice Chairman

**Pledge of Allegiance** - led by Hayden Williamson

**Roll Call** - Quorum was present

Input was called for from the Commission, no comments were given at this time.

**Public Input Open** by Eric Reese

Michael Helmantoler -, wanted to know who was responsible for upkeep on the area on the north side of Jordan Ridge Blvd. which is currently full of weeds. Also, on Riverbend, are there plans for water access? Sarah Carroll – replied that Jordan Ridge Development was responsible, and no there are not plans for water access. She would speak with him later on his questions outside of the meeting.

Meeting turned over to Commission Chair Jeff Cochran.

**Public Input Closed** by Jeff Cochran

**4. Public Hearing: Preliminary Plat for Lake Cove located at 3168 South Spinnaker Drive, Ron Johnston, applicant.**

**CONTINUED TO JUNE 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**5. Public Hearing: Preliminary Plat for Hillcrest Condominiums Phase 3 located at 1900 North Crest Road, Nate Hutchinson, Flagship Homes, applicant.**

**CONTINUED TO JUNE 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**6. Public Hearing: Site Plan and Conditional Use for Platinum Car Wash located at 1413 N West Commerce Drive, Gary Hadfield, applicant.**

**CONTINUED TO JUNE 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**Motion by Sandra Steel to continue the Public Hearing: Preliminary Plat for Lake Cove located at 3168 South Spinnaker Drive, And Preliminary Plat for Hillcrest Condominiums Phase 3 located at 1900 North Crest, And the Site Plan and Conditional Use for Platinum Car Wash located at 1413 N West Commerce Drive, to the meeting of June 12, 2014. Second by Kirk Wilkins. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline, Eric Reese and Jeff Cochran. Motion passed unanimously.**

**7. Public Hearing: Master Development Agreement Extension and Revision for the Riverbend development located at approximately 900 North Redwood Road, Knowlton General, applicant.**

Sarah Carroll – presented the item. Applicants are requesting to renew and extend and modify the existing MDA. Applicant would like to request the same road layout to utilize existing utility lines and to continue the same road widths as already started. Staff recommends they keep basketball half court, 5 areas with concrete pad and picnic table 16'x20' pavilion and one medium size playground. She made note of the wetland area and what would be needed to comply to build there. She reviewed Staff findings and conditions and recommended adding a condition related to the amenities.

Aric Jensen, for applicant – they are pleased with what staff has presented and are willing to move forward quickly when approved.

**Public Input Open** by Jeff Cochran

Cornell Brown, HOA president for Riverbend – noted that in these developments the amenities seem to get lost in the modifications of the plats. Parking with the smaller streets is becoming a problem and safety issue. Kids are playing in the streets because parks have not been developed yet. Breaking up into smaller lots is advantageous for them.

Tami Buckland – parking has become a significant issue, with the size of the units, many units have multiple cars (passed a picture of parking to commission) and not enough parking. Emergency vehicles cannot access units and it's unsafe for children. She has witnessed accidents almost happening because of vehicles parked in odd places. She recommends adding several more parking spaces in the new plan. The park they currently have was paid for by HOA and not developer. It's not designed for older children, but they use it and it gets destroyed.

Sarah Carroll – on Riverside drive it is a public road and city does not recommend any stalls that back on to it. Staff did recommend amenities for the new phase.

Jennifer Hansen – has a problem with one medium size park in the proposed amenities for children with that large of an age gap. She feels it is important to have a tot lot. What they have is not enough for the little children, the bigger kids are taking over and it's a dangerous condition. The park is also in horrible repair. And she also agrees they need more parking.

Joe Hitzeman – also feels there is not enough parking, people parking in field and out of stalls. He also mentioned unsafe conditions for kids with them playing in the street because of no amenities for them to use. Feels he was promised things when he moved in and nothing has been built yet.

Arnold Hansen – echo's what others have said about amenities and parking. He would like the developer to improve the curb appeal on Redwood Road. He feels the complex is nice but the entrance doesn't reflect well on development or city.

Chris River – seconds what everyone else has said. Parking has been a huge problem, it's a safety hazard for kids in street, and parking in muddy field.

**Public Input Closed** by Jeff Cochran

Sandra Steele – has no problems with setbacks as long as driveways are a minimum of 20ft. She has issues with leaving the road the way the project started out, she feels a modified curb would work better and is concerned about undulation of driveways.

Jeff Cochran – said it would be difficult to put a high back curb and gutter in with this space.

Scott Langford – showed the new plan was a modified curb and gutter. Their intent is to continue the existing cross section.

Sarah Carroll – indicated they could have the developer change the detail.

Sandra Steele – is concerned about the parking, she would ask the developer if they could please add more parking and disperse it throughout development. Asked on garage size –

Aric Jensen - said old phase is one car garages and new phase is two.

Sandra Steele - asked about engineer's requests being met, specifically with roads and turn-arounds meeting all standards. (Item 6 in engineer report.)

Staff and Developer - replied that the design today meets what engineer has asked.

Sarah Carroll – indicated that it would be fair to add that sentence, that the existing cross-section could be continued.

Sandra Steele – agreed that amenities were a must. She would leave it up to staff to work with developer as to what kind of playground is required.

Hayden Williamson – asked which phase Riverside drive would be installed

Sarah Carroll – answered that it would be all three phases, they all have portions.

Hayden Williamson – in doing that in all 3 phases will it still meet fire code requirements?

Sarah Carroll – replied that it would be reviewed with each plat as they would need to provide turn-arounds.

Hayden Williamson – feels that adding a condition concerning this issue of Riverside drive would be good.

Feels developer should sit down with resident to see what they need and bring it back to the city for review.

Eric Reese – encourages adding parking where possible and having HOA work with developer on amenities. He feels curb appeal will be addressed and that it should look nice coming into the development.

Kirk Wilkins – directed questions to staff on the option of city if the MDA application expires.

Sarah Carroll – if MDA expires they don't have a way to continue similar setbacks and any new plan would have to meet current city codes.

Kirk Wilkins – said the setbacks weren't a concern. He doesn't have problems with road extension. Would echo comments earlier on amenities that developer work with city and create amenities that will help solve problems. Question on why the roads were 2' narrower as noted in the packet.

Sarah Carroll – explained that recently the City Council adopted new road cross sections that are 2 feet wider. If they increase current plat to current code then they can't have 20' drives.

Kirk Wilkins – question on the unit in the flood plain, if the wetland is replaced where would it be?

Sarah Carroll – replied that the developer would have to come up with a plan to replace it and if it can't be done then the developer would not be able to build lots in that area in later phases.

Scott Langford – they may have an option to buy areas outside at a ratio of 7 to 1 that is expensive and a long process.

Jarred Henline – does see the concerns with parking and amenities but this is really a review for an extension and sees the issues coming up later at preliminary plat. He is not sure how to put those conditions in without being specific. He asked why 7 years on the extension? He feels it should be shorter.

Sarah Carroll – something in code about the time allowed, 7-10 years but you could approve a shorter time frame.

Jarred Henline – he does understand the resident concerns and feels there are options to work out with developer, but our focus today is if we are going to continue this extension or not and for how long and then perhaps other problems like park and parking may come after that.

Jeff Cochran – thanked public for their comments. The Master Development Agreement is in place for 7 years and things change, if we give them a long time it may not be consistent with current city standards. He concurs with Mr. Henline. He asked for clarification on item in the report about utility placements currently laid out in future roads and if they really needed to be moved.

Sarah Carroll – if they didn't move them it would fall under driveways or things like that. The city engineer prefers they are in right of ways.

Jeff Cochran – feels they could meet the new standards and keep utilities in roadways. He asked developer to address that.

Aric Jensen – they did a layout that took into account all current standards. When they did that the utilities were falling under drive pads and things like that. They filed a variance application with new layout. At that time Kimber did not prefer asking for the variance and asked them to come with MDA extension instead.

Jeff Cochran – are there conditions they could put on MDA?

Sarah Carroll – we are giving up something by extending setbacks; things are given to them so we can ask for things from them. It would have to be run by the City Attorney.

Aric Jensen – does not disagree with what neighbors have said. He is new to the firm, has identified places they can add some parking stalls. With the wetland issues they are aware of them and the process they would need to go through. In terms of landscaping out front they have already contacted their landscaper to work on it. He feels they can address all the issues brought forward and doesn't have a problem going to City Council with these conditions.

Jeff Cochran – reviewed thoughts from commission on the roadway being completed early, amenities and working with neighborhood HOA, roadway widths and keeping them the same.

Sandra Steele – is concerned with length of time for extension. When they grant extensions how long do they let MDA's go? Do we continue to give extensions and then things will never get up to city standard.

Eric Reese – suggested adding playground issue, language to allow HOA to suggest something.

Kirk Wilkins – perhaps add ratios concerning parking.

Hayden Williamson – concerned with adding ratios, but we could put something in to address additional parking.

Jarred Henline – should we table this and have the City Attorney look at it first and have developer bring it up to our standards first before we send it on to city council? He is not comfortable with suggesting items on parking or amenities and come up with good wording on the fly. We shouldn't give up something without getting what we want. He doesn't think legally we could come up with a good solution tonight.

Hayden Williamson – if we tabled this could we hear it before it expires in June?

Scott Langford - indicated that the City Council will get a copy of the planning recommendations and it would be hard to continue it longer with deadlines. We could tighten it with developer before we go to City Council.

Sandra Steele - could we extend it for a few months to be able to continue more discussions?

Sarah Carroll – we have extended other MDA's while they worked on revising it. If they decide to table or continue it they could take a request to extend the existing MDA to City Council to get a short extension while they work it out.

Aric Jensen – said when we have a fixed date the contract expires on that date. If the City Council takes action on it to extend it then they are comfortable that the Council has taken action but contract law in the state is pretty explicit, if it is tabled and no action is taken then their contract will run out. His concern is that if it's tabled and council doesn't hear it and take action then they are back to variance process. He is good with Commission adding all the recommendations to take to Council.

**Motion by Hayden Williamson to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Riverbend MDA extension and modification with Findings and Conditions found in the staff report with language added that the developer work with the city and current residents to address concerns regarding parking, to address concerns regarding amenities, and to work with the city with concerns regarding the timing for Riverside drive. Seconded by Eric Reese.**

Jeff Cochran – asked a question on the motion - would Mr. Williamson consider that applicant also work with city staff to consider putting the current roadway width in.

Hayden Williamson – he would not, he is in favor of keeping the roadway consistent with the project.

Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Eric Reese, Kirk Wilkins. Nay: Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran.

**8. Concept Plan for Sierra Estates Senior Housing located at 350 West 400 North, Ross Welch, applicant.**

Sarah Carroll – presented the plan and reviewed staff recommendations.

Steve Sowby, for Applicant – appreciated the opportunity to come back with improved plan. They have implemented all suggestions previously given by commission. They ask for approval tonight and agree with all staff recommendations.

Sandra Steele – for van accessible spot for employee parking, suggests applicant make sure access space is on passenger side. She asked previously that they comply with state statutes and that the statutes changed this past April.

Hayden Williamson - likes the new plan and parking.

Eric Reese – likes the plan.

Kirk Wilkins – looks like they have done everything asked, good job.

Jarred Henline – thinks it looks good.

Jeff Cochran – indicated his thanks for listening to the commission and coming back with improved plan.

**9. Public Hearing: Preliminary Plat for North Saratoga Center Plat A located at 2175 North Stagecoach Drive, Ryan Bybee, applicant.**

**10. Public Hearing: Site Plan and Conditional Use permit for Unique Autobody located at 2175 North Stagecoach Drive, Andrew Bollschweiler, applicant.**

**Jeff Cochran asked that we listen to items 9. and 10. Together and hear public comment together for them.**

Scott Langford – presented the items.

9. Applicant has applied for preliminary and final plat approval as it goes to City Council. This is the only office/warehouse zone in the city.

10. Showed overlays and touched on unique needs of business. Applicant raised a question of dumpster location, they feel best spot would be enclosed within building and have planned for that. As you approve site plan it includes signage, that won't be a separate item. No additional signage is requested for storage unit.

Ryan Bybee, Applicant – one comment on road for fire access, they had discussion about road extension of Stage Coach Blvd. that would be developed in future, he suggested for access that perhaps building it now would be a better option than making a temporary turn-around.

**Public Input Opened** by Jeff Cochran

No public input at this time.

**Public Input Closed** by Jeff Cochran

Jarred Henline – he is good with item 9. On 10, if they change their minds on the garbage cans and decide they need more what would happen.

Scott Langford – they would have to comply with code and provide enclosure for that.

Jarred Henline – on the sign, they need to pick one of the options.

Kirk Wilkins – wanted to know what style of fence on west side.

Scott Langford – applicant has submitted plan for 6' rod iron style.

Kirk Wilkins –has a concern that cars would be parked there that could be seen from main road.

James Jones, Architect – the building is larger to have cars parked inside, so they should not be parked outside at all.

Kirk Wilkins – expressed concern with trash inside and possibly containing bio hazards and other potential hazards.

Scott Langford – this is a conditional use permit; Commission could put an additional condition to make sure cars were not stored in NW portion of lot.

Kirk Wilkins – would like to add a condition that no broken down cars are parked along North and West side. Also pick one of the sign options.

Eric Reese – doesn't have any concerns, but wanted more detail on improving road for fire access.

Ryan Bybee – showed where it was on the overlay and the problems with a temporary turn.

James Jones – said the road is already dedicated so they have talked with staff to see what was needed to get it in this year.

Eric Reese – would support condition of no cars being worked on stored outside. Would let applicant do what they have planned with dumpsters.

Hayden Williamson – likes the look of it. He would support condition of no cars on NW sides.

Jeremy Weller – said no cars would be out front and exposed, adding there are no doors on front of building.

Sandra Steele – concern with parking, there are 4 spaces provided for storage units, is there an onsite manager?

Scott Langford – yes there is an onsite manager and they do live there. Manager indicated that parking was never an issue. Extra cars usually park on Stagecoach or further in near units.

Sandra Steele – thinks there should be separate parking for manager and that there should be a Van Accessible space that meets standards in width. She suggested a condition about if additional garbage containers would be needed that they install surrounds as in code.

Jeff Cochran – reviewed comments for item 9. Handicap parking spot. Item 10. Condition that no parking on N. and W. side and discussion on signs and discussion on trash container

Sandra Steele – feels more parking should be added for item 9.

Jarred Henline – also feels more parking would be good.

Ryan Bybee – noted that there is space inside the facility for manager to park if he needs to use it.

**Motion by Jarred Henline to recommend approval to the City Council of the North Saratoga Center Plat A Preliminary Plat, located at approximately 2175 North Redwood Road, based on the findings and conditions in the report and add two additional conditions that they come into compliance with statutory code regarding handicap parking, and maybe meet in the middle that during business hours no employee can park in customer spaces. Second by Sandra Steele. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline, Eric Reese and Jeff Cochran. Nay: Hayden Williamson.**

Hayden Williamson – voted nay because he is uncomfortable with attaching stipulations regarding existing parking based on approval to add more units. They know their business better than we do. He feels it's not the proper role of government to force them to have adequate customer parking. The handicap one does have a little weight with him but tends to go with the spirit of the law on that.

Motion (withdrawn) by Jarred Henline that Based upon the evidence and explanations received today, (I move) that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the

Amended Site Plan for the North Saratoga Center Office Warehouse Development (Phase 2B) on property located at approximately 2148 North Stagecoach Drive, with the findings and conditions found in the report and also an added condition that cars on the property to be serviced should be parked within the structure and not on the outside. Second by Kirk Wilkins

Hayden Williamson – understood on the stipulation on parking, that cars being serviced would be allowed to be parked on the east side.

Scott Langford – commented that it might be better to tie that condition to the use plan, not on the site plan.

**Jarred Henline - Motion withdrawn without objection.**

**Motion by Jarred Henline: Based upon the evidence and explanations received today, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the Amended Site Plan for the North Saratoga Center Office Warehouse Development (Phase 2B) on property located at approximately 2148 North Stagecoach Drive, with the findings and conditions in the report. Second by Eric Reese. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Eric Reese, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.**

Jeff Cochran – notes items discussed for use plan of cars not on North or West, signage to choose one, and trash containers.

**Motion by Jarred Henline Based upon the evidence and explanations received today, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow “Automotive Repair, major” on the west 1.66 acres of property located within the North Saratoga Center Office Warehouse development (Phase 2B), located at approximately 2148 North Stagecoach Drive, with the findings and conditions found in the report and added conditions being that cars on the property being serviced should be parked within the structure or on the East side only, and that they may only have one sign not two. Second by Eric Reese.**

Hayden Williamson – on the parking would Mr. Henline be willing to substitute to say “cars cannot be parked outside of the fenced area,” because they have 5 stalls on the North side of the building that are behind fenced area and it would be protected by fence?

Jarred Henline – answered no, he is good the way it was stated.

**Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.**

**11. Public Hearing: Rezone and Concept Plan for Beacon Point located 4400 South 100 West, Paul Watson, applicant.**

Scott Langford – presented this item and staff findings and recommendations. There are some questions on culinary and secondary water in the area and fire protection zone. Applicant would be required to submit a fire protection plan and assurance that homes would be protected. Chief Campbell indicated an additional study would need to be made.

Paul Watson, Applicant – they will work out issues with water with staff; they know where the problems are and feel it will be ok. They agree with staff recommendations. They would not like to bring collector all the way down to Redwood Road. UDOT is ok with the accesses.

**Public Input Open by Jeff Cochran**

Scott Jensen – water pressure is definitely a concern. Also with retention ponds, there is an existing ditch that helps prevent flooding, will that be maintained?

Scott Langford – said in phase one they will be diverting water into retention ponds.

Paul Watson – with 100 flood plain two basins are needed, and they are putting them in phase one.

Scott Jensen – with added access will Redwood Road be adding lanes, as in a turn lane?

Scott Langford – they would be required to improve the frontage.

Scott Jensen – wanted to make sure lot sizes were consistent with current neighborhood.

Scott Langford – replied the average lot size was around 10,000 ft.

Miranda Jensen – worried about traffic coming in during first phase through the existing neighborhood because of the traffic currently there. There are children playing in the street and would there be construction access.

Jeff Cochran – construction access is required that are not through the neighborhood.

Miranda Jensen – wanted to know if all new traffic for residents was going to be routed through current roads.

Scott Langford - they would use existing roads for phase one and then phase two would complete the access to Redwood Road.

#### **Public Input Closed by Jeff Cochran**

Jarred Henline – access on open space, some of it is steep hill?

Scott Langford - yes they will need to specify sensitive land on the plat, only 50% is allowed by code for open space.

Jarred Henline – asked Paul to address water issues.

Paul Watson – later phases will bring new pipelines and they feel it will have sufficient pressure. They will make sure existing homes have pressure

Scott Langford - staff leaning towards rezone being conditioned upon preliminary plat approval, and those issues being resolved.

Kirk Wilkins – asked about the elevation difference between some lots and once the detention basin is full and water follows little river, he is concerned the houses would be impacted.

Paul Watson– reviewed different elevations, and said the channel is about 12 feet wide and 8’ deep. Models have been done and engineering, it’s sized to handle the drainage.

Kirk Wilkins – would suggest that there isn’t a rezone without conditions. He agrees corner lots need to be increased in size to meet code. He is still concerned with water pressure.

Eric Reese – likes the trail system and would echo what others have said about the MDA.

Hayden Williamson – also concerned about 3 lots backing on to collectors especially about the one close to Redwood Road.

Paul Watson – we could put a restriction on plat that forces a turn on the driveway.

Hayden Williamson – Concerned about fire access during phase1 before phase with main access is built. Could temporary emergency access be put in place?

Paul Watson – replied that he would have to work it out with UDOT.

Hayden Williamson – he would like to see that added as a note. He would like to see approval based upon recording of preliminary plat.

Sandra Steele – this is the last R2 in the city. She is concerned with fire issue and defensible area, and upkeep of defensible area. She is concerned with water pressure issues. She doesn’t like 60 lots in phase 1 all driving through the current neighborhood. She feels it’s too premature to come to commission tonight and would not support a rezone now.

Jeff Cochran – is struggling with the R4 zone, thinks R3 may be more acceptable within the city. He is a little concerned with the collector road. He thinks water issues could be worked out in time.  
Paul Linford– pointed out that 100 ft. south the area is zoned between R10 and R20 and feels the R4 zone would help with that transition from this area to that.

Jarred Henline – feels added traffic in existing neighborhood for phase 1 might be too much.

Eric Reese – asked staff if the traffic was a valid concern?

Scott Langford – referred to engineers report and his expertise.

Hayden Williamson – on a condition to tie into Redwood road, would we make it a condition of rezone or on a condition for final plat approval.

Scott Langford – thought it would benefit everyone best if it was articulated it in a condition.

**Motion made by Hayden Williamson, Based upon the evidence and explanations received today, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the rezoning of approximately 63.64 acres of property as shown in Exhibit 2 and generally located at 4300 South Redwood Road from the R-2 to the R-4 zone, with the findings and conditions listed in the staff report, with the additional conditions that rezone does not happen until “final” plat is recorded, and that collector road to Redwood Road is included in phase one. Second by Eric Reese.**

Eric Reese – a MDA had been talked about?

Scott Langford – that would be the third option in staff report, condition in report for this motion is that it doesn't take effect until preliminary plat. That is so there is some entitlement at that point and developer could post bonds and start construction.

Jeff Cochran – believes the question is would Mr. Williamson accept the MDA option?

Hayden Williamson – his goal was to make sure that the city is able to determine the final product and not just rezoning it.

Scott Langford - recommends second option listed in staff report on option 2, conditions on page 6.

Hayden Williamson – does not accept MDA as part of his motion.

**Nay: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion failed unanimously.**

**Motion was made by Hayden Williamson that: Based upon the evidence and explanations received today, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the rezone of approximately 63.64 acres of property as shown in Exhibit 2 and generally located at 4300 South Redwood Road from the R-2 to the R-4 zone, with the findings and conditions listed below in the staff report, specifically pointing out That the rezone shall take effect after the Applicant obtains Preliminary Plat approval. And the Preliminary Plat shall be substantially consistent with the attached Concept Plan. And that the primary access to Redwood Road be connected in phase one. Second by Eric Reese Aye: Kirk Wilkins, Hayden Williamson, Eric Reese. Nays: Sandra Steele, Jarred Henline, Jeff Cochran .**

At 9:25p.m. a break was taken by Commission.

Meeting resumed at 9:31p.m.

**12. Revision to the City of Saratoga Springs Land Development Code. (Section 19.05—Temporary Uses).**  
Continued discussion from May 08, 2014 Planning Commission, possible recommendation.

Scott Langford – reviewed the revision and discussion at last meeting. Revisions included removal of the parking requirement for all TUP's, replace with a requirement for approval of business within 300'. Added garbage standards. Creation of a separate section for mobile food vendors and incorporating additional clarifying standards such as duration and separation from residential areas. Prohibitions on operation as a

drive-through, prohibiting in park strips, and other standards. Reduction of the bond requirements to \$250 on private property and \$500 on public property, and creating an allowance for an annual bond for mobile food vendors.

Jarred Henline – numbering on pages 7 and 8 needs to be fixed. In paragraph 3a on page 8 says it has to be hosted by brick and mortar business, he would add that maybe they could be at a park “or in a public place, permission by the city.” He feels the bond is still high but likes that they can choose a yearly option.

Eric Reese – what exempts a kid going out to the curb, like a lemonade stand.

Scott Langford – indicated most codes they had looked at were silent about the issue.

Hayden Williamson – thought they had discussed some wording about if on a private property it would be exempt.

Jarred Henline – recalled the discussion that they just didn’t apply with this code, there is nothing that prevents them from doing so with this code.

Hayden Williamson – he thought they had talked about on the bond requirement that if they were in good standing that they could have that reduced.

Jeff Cochran – likes Commissioner Henline’s thought that they have to be hosted by brick and mortar or a public place in the city.

Sandra Steele – doesn’t think the city would allow it at any other time than civic events.

Hayden Williamson - if required to be hosted by brick and mortar only then why have a public property bond?

Sandra Steele - believes that fee would be for civic event times to clean up the park.

Hayden Williamson – the problem with requiring only brick and mortar business to invite or host the vendors is that it doesn’t make sense for civic events like the splash?

Sandra Steele – then thinks there should be some phrasing that they would be allowed to go to public places during city events.

Jarred Henline – doesn’t think the city should say to not do something (like allowing vendors at a public location) when the resident wanted it. Should let free market reign

Jeff Cochran – currently how it is written they cannot go to park, or public place for any event.

Kirk Wilkins – he has heard people say our city is hard to do business with, too many restrictions. He feels we should make changes to make it easier to deal with. Make easier restrictions.

Hayden Williamson – on second item 3b, he can see situation where they could be there longer than 8 hours and suggests allowing them to be here longer.

Jarred Henline – would agree to that.

Sandra Steele – noted that at another meeting it was set up for 12 hours a day, and others said no, only 8 hours. We need to move forward with this tonight, because there are other items waiting on this down the pipeline.

**Motion by Jarred Henline to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed amendments to Section 19.05 with the Findings and Conditions found in the report: with the added conditions: no. 1, that numbering from the two subparagraph 3’s be corrected; That subparagraph 3a on page 8 be changed to also include (A mobile food vendor shall be permitted only when hosted by an existing brick-and-mortar business) “or upon public property with permission from the city.” ; 3b, mobile food vendors shall not be parked for more than 8 hours a day in any location without first being given express permission from the city; And paragraph 10, the bond paragraph be changed to that after 6 months of good behavior the bond be reduced by half for those vendors who have been found to be in compliance to code. Second Hayden Williamson. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.**

### 13. Approval of Reports of Action

2 reports to act on

Riverbend and Temporary uses.

Scott confirmed recommendations.

Motion by Hayden to approve report of action on Master Development Agreement and Revision for the Riverbend development located at approximately 900 North and Redwood. Second by Sandra Steele. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Hayden Williamson to approve the plan of action for the revisions to the City of Saratoga Springs Land Development Code, section 19.05 Temporary Uses. Second by Kirk Wilkins. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.

**14. Approval of Minutes:**

1. March 13, 2014.

Motion by Eric Reese to approve minutes from March 13, 2014. Second by Kirk Williams. Aye: Sandra Steele, Kirk Wilkins, Jarred Henline and Jeff Cochran, Eric Reese, Hayden Williamson. Motion passed unanimously.

**15. Commission Comments – no comments given at this time**

**16. Director's Report**

Scott Langford – indicated that the next meeting will be a full agenda. Reported on items that had been forwarded to City Council.

Meeting adjourned by Jeff Cochran

Adjourn 10:05 pm

June 12, 2014  
Approved

Lori Yates  
Lori Yates, City Recorder

