



**ADOPTED MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
May 20, 2025, at 4:30 pm  
80 South Main Street  
Spanish Fork, UT 84660**

**Councilmembers Present**

Mike Mendenhall, Mayor  
Jesse Cardon, Councilmember  
Kevin Oyler, Councilmember

Stacy Beck, Councilmember  
Landon Tooke, Councilmember  
Shane Marshall, Councilmember

**Councilmembers Absent:**

**Staff Members Present:**

Jordan Hales, Finance Director  
Tara Silver, City Recorder  
Dave Anderson, Community Development Director  
Eddie Hales, Fire and EMS Director  
Tyler Jacobson, Asst. City Manager  
Seth Perrins, City Manager

Vaughn Pickell, City Attorney  
Matt Johnson, Police Chief  
Dale Robinson, Parks and Recreation Director  
Cory Pierce, Public Works Director  
Jack Urquhart, Public Information Officer  
Dave Mann,

**Staff Members Absent:**

**Visitors Present:****Name**

Ken Shaw  
Sabrina Clark  
Naleta Mellor  
Darrin Mellor  
Elizabeth Patino  
Selena Tienda

**Name**

Wendy Osbourne  
Peyton Randall  
John Bawden  
Ryan Bawden  
Andrew Kelly

**Name**

Charles Arnolds  
Emmalyn Sam  
Lesa Ridge  
Elijah Lewis  
Paul Snyder

---

**WORK SESSION - No formal actions are taken in a work session**

Visitors:

**Staff Present:** Seth Perrins, Mayor Mendenhall, Councilmember Beck, Councilmember Cardon, Dale Robinson, Vaughn Pickell, Jordan Hales, Tyler Jacobson, Eddie Hales, Councilmember Tooke, Chief Matt Johnson, Kim Hall, Jack Urquhart, Cory Pierce, Councilmember Marshall Dave Mann, Jered Johnson, Shane Marshall (4:43 pm) Cory (4:46 pm)

Mayor Mendenhall started the meeting at 4:38 pm

A. 2025 Budget - Utility Rate Discussions

**1. Separation of Fee Schedule from Budget**

- Currently, the utility fee schedule is embedded in the budget (Appendix C), but staff propose removing it in future to allow more flexible timing.
- The timing of current rate adjustments (July 1) is inconvenient; departments prefer changes that align with calendar year activities (e.g., sports programs, SFCN contracts).
- For electric rates, increases will take effect in September/October to avoid peak summer rates, easing financial burden on residents.

**2. Proposed Rate Changes – Residential Utility Customers**

- Schedule 1 Rates (existing homes):
  - Sewer: +\$2.69
  - Water & PI (Pressurized Irrigation): +\$1 each
  - Storm Drain: No change

- Power (base): +\$1
- Schedule 2 Rates (new homes post-July 2024):
  - Sewer: Potential increase to \$35.79 (pending final impact fee study)
  - Storm Drain: +\$2.57
  - Water & PI: +\$0.35 each
  - Power (base): +\$0.76
- The rate difference between Schedule 1 and 2 is based on impact fee recovery. Percent differences vary by service (e.g., sewer, water).

### **3. Rate Structure Philosophy**

- Rates are based on long-term Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs).
- Tiered rate structures are in place (like tax brackets). For example:
  - Water tiers: First 6,000 gallons at \$1.24 per 1,000 gallons, then increase.
  - PI: Tiered with a base allowance of 25,000 gallons/month.

### **4. Rate Increase Trends**

- Sewer: Regular increases in past 5–6 years.
- Water: Flat or decreased since early 2000s.
- Power: Gradual base rate increases to account for net metering fairness.
- Garbage, Storm Drain: Minimal or no changes recently.

### **Infrastructure & Budget Topics**

### **5. New Fit City Center CIP Fund**

- A new fund is proposed to allow savings for capital needs (e.g., treadmills, pool repairs).
- An initial placeholder of ~\$78,000 included as a "budget balancer".

- Future strategies may include internal service fund models.

## **6. Staffing – Police Department**

- Two new police officer positions are included in the budget.
- Proposal to start recruitment early, even before budget approval, to reduce lead time.
- Council gave verbal go-ahead to post positions now, with understanding that no hires will start until July 1.

### Transportation Utility Fee

- Temporarily removed from the FY budget.
- Staff propose revisiting the idea in winter 2025 due to public concerns and ongoing legislative implications.

### Rocky Mountain Power Transmission Line Project

#### Overview:

- RMP plans a high-capacity utility corridor from Spanish Fork to Eagle Mountain.
- Proposed construction: large structures (~130 ft easement) with significant visual and land-use impact.

#### Council Actions & Implications:

- City created a zoning overlay requiring public review for such projects.
- Legal findings suggest the city must bear costs if requiring changes that don't improve safety/delivery.
- City is negotiating to allow public trails along RMP easements and access to unused land parcels.

#### Impacts:

- Modera Development (approved but not built) may need redesign to accommodate the corridor.

- RMP not planning to purchase parcels, only easements.
- Entitled projects affected must coordinate with RMP.

#### Transparency & Public Communication

- Fee schedules do not require a public hearing (only notice).
- Council supports separating the schedule to increase visibility and transparency.
- Residents will be informed through utility notices and council documents.

Councilman Cardon ▾ made a **Motion** to Adjourn ▾ the Closed Meeting for strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor at 5:28 pm.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

#### **6:00 pm CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE, OPENING CEREMONY:**

Mayor Mike Mendenhall called the Spanish Fork City Council meeting to order on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 6: 02 pm. He welcomed all attendees, both in person and online, at the Spanish Fork City Council Chambers. He expressed appreciation for everyone's participation and involvement.

He noted that, as was customary, the meeting would begin with a motivational thought and prayer, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Councilman Tooke was assigned to offer the motivational thought and prayer, and Councilman Oyler was asked to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Councilmember Tooke thanked the Mayor and stated that he had invited Payton Randall to share a thought and offer the prayer during the meeting. He briefly mentioned that he had known Payton since birth, having had the opportunity to meet him and live near his family. Councilmember Tooke expressed appreciation for Payton taking the time to attend and contribute to the meeting. He then invited Peyton to proceed.

Payton Randall, addressed the Council. He began by quoting President Ronald Reagan: *"Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same."*

He expressed sadness that many individuals, particularly those of his own generation, appeared not to fully appreciate the freedoms they possessed or to recognize the pain and sacrifice required to obtain them. He encouraged all those present, especially parents, to teach their children, while they are young, about the freedoms that had been fought for and the continued responsibility to protect them.

Payton Randall gave the invocation.

Councilman Oyler led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **1. Oath of Office Auston Lunt**

Mayor Mendenhall invited Chief Matt Johnson to come forward and introduce the City's newest police officer.

Chief Johnson addressed the Mayor and Council, stating it was a privilege to introduce Officer Austin Lunt, the newest member of the Spanish Fork Police Department. Chief Johnson noted that Officer Lunt had joined the department a few months earlier and brought with him extensive law enforcement experience. Officer Lunt began his career with the Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office in 2013, working at the correctional facility. In 2015, he transferred to the Sanpete County Sheriff's Office, and in May 2016, he joined the American Fork City Police Department. He served as a sergeant with American Fork for five years and gained extensive experience in both patrol and investigations.

Chief Johnson shared a message he received from Chief Paul of the American Fork Police Department upon learning that Officer Lunt had applied for the position. Chief Paul had texted: *"I have a good friend and officer that applied. He'd be a great addition to your police department, but if you hire him, I'm never speaking to you again."* Chief Johnson added humorously that they did hire Officer Lunt, and although Chief Paul had only spoken to him occasionally since, there remained good relations.

Officer Lunt was present with his wife Kristen and their children: Emory, Kaylee, Kennedy, and Tucker. Chief Johnson formally welcomed Officer Lunt and his family, expressing gratitude for their decision to join the Spanish Fork community. He then invited Mayor Mendenhall to administer the Oath of Office.

Mayor Mendenhall administered the Oath of Office to Officer Lunt, who solemnly swore to serve the people of Spanish Fork City with integrity and to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Utah.

Following the oath, Officer Lunt introduced his family and shared their excitement about joining the city. He remarked that they were looking forward to becoming part of the

community and expressed appreciation for the warm welcome. He added humorously that they would be living a few doors down from John Mendenhall.

Mayor Mendenhall jokingly warned of the extended conversations that could result from such proximity, adding that John was one of the nicest people and welcoming them once again to the city.

Photographs were taken of Officer Lunt and his family with members of the City Council. The Mayor and Council presented gifts, including Spanish Fork sunglasses and candy, to the Lunt children, who were thanked for attending and officially welcomed to the city.

Mayor Mendenhall added the State Champions MMHS Boys Volleyball Team to the agenda.

## **2. State Champions MMHS Boys Volleyball**

Players:

Beattie, Mckay	Hawkins, Abraham	Sanders, Elijah
Borges, Matheus	Henderson, Matthew	Storey, Manase
Christensen, Logan	Hillman, Taft	Strong, Blake
Dirkmaat, Kai	Krommenhoek, Solomon	Tew, Nathan
Edmunds, Peyton	Lake, Bryan	Thornton, Trey
Gren, Ashton	Lyman, Caden	Thygerson, Brody
Hair, Jonathan	Mejia Lopez, Kenny	Tuigamala, Jordan
Hair, Samuel	Olsen, Kimball	Visentin, Hunter
Hansbrow, Nelson	Petersen, Luke	Wiezbowski, Patrick
Harrison, Brody	Pratt, Connor	

Mayor Mendenhall noted that under the opening agenda and recognitions, members of the Maple Mountain High School Boys Volleyball State Championship team were present. He invited them to come forward and address the Council, joking that while they would not be required to take the oath of office, the City still expected the same level of commitment.

Matt Borgias, a junior at Maple Mountain High School, introduced himself, followed by Napoleon Galang, who identified himself as the team's head coach.

Coach Galang shared highlights from the team's successful season. He reported that the team finished with a record of 29 wins and only 1 loss, successfully earning back-to-back state championships. Their sole loss occurred during their participation in the first-ever National

High School Tournament in Austin, Texas, hosted by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA), the governing body for collegiate volleyball. At this tournament, Maple Mountain competed against top-ranked teams from California, Oregon, and Colorado, ultimately finishing as runners-up. Despite the loss, the team took pride in representing Utah on the national stage and demonstrating high-level performance.

Coach Galang described the experience as memorable and inspiring, noting the presence of volleyball legend and Olympic coach Karch Kiraly, who conducted clinics for the players. He also mentioned that Will Ferrell's son competed in the tournament, and the actor himself observed Maple Mountain's matches. A humorous moment was shared when a parent from the team informed Ferrell they were from Spanish Fork, to which he replied, "Oh, you guys are really good."

Maple Mountain finished the season ranked #1 in Utah and #19 nationally. Coach Galang emphasized the dedication of the coaching staff and players, particularly their strong academic performance and discipline. Unlike many other programs in the state, Maple Mountain's team did not encounter any issues with grades or attendance. He credited the team's success to a culture rooted in family values and a commitment to developing young men of character. He praised the players for putting school first and maintaining focus on their goals throughout the season.

Mayor Mendenhall echoed the coach's sentiments, expressing admiration for the team and staff. A brief Q&A followed, during which it was confirmed that the team defeated Wasatch High School in the state championship match, after having faced them twice previously. Coach Galang reported a total of 31 student-athletes in the program, with 16 players on the varsity and junior varsity rosters and 12 on the sophomore team.

The Mayor and City Council offered their congratulations and appreciation for the team's efforts in representing Spanish Fork with excellence. A round of applause was given, and photographs were taken with the team.

Mayor Mendenhall then recognized Mrs. Ridge and her Webelos Scout troop, inviting them to come forward and introduce themselves. He noted that Mrs. Ridge's son, Brian Ridge, works for the City and is frequently relied upon for IT assistance. The Mayor extended a warm welcome to the group.

Lisa Ridge addressed the Council, introducing herself and the group of Cub Scouts present. She stated her name was Lisa Ridge and that the group comprised three dens: the Webelos and Arrow of Light Dens from Pack 72. Their chartered organization was the Parents Organization at American Leadership Academy (ALA). She explained that the Cub Scouts included both boys and girls from kindergarten through fifth grade, and they regularly engaged in educational and service activities. She noted that the purpose of their visit that evening was to learn more about the community, particularly about elections and terms of service in city government.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked them for attending and invited the Scouts to come forward and state their names so viewers watching the meeting could recognize them. He encouraged



the Scouts to stay for the upcoming election-related agenda item, which would be presented by Tara Silver, the City Recorder, to help them learn more.

Mayor Mendenhall opened the floor for public comments, inviting members of the community to address the Mayor and Council on any topic not already listed on the agenda. He requested that remarks be kept to three minutes and reminded speakers to state their names for the official record.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Joey Stanley was the first to speak. He identified himself as a resident living southwest of Russell Swenson Park and raised a concern about a canal, believed to be the Mill Race Canal, that runs along the south side of the park. Noting that the canal was unfenced, he referenced a recent tragedy in which a young child drowned in a canal near ALA. Mr. Stanley, the father of a child of similar age, urged the Council to consider installing a fence along the canal to prevent future incidents.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked Mr. Stanley and directed him to share his contact information with Dale Robinson, the Parks and Recreation Director, for follow-up.

Seth Perrins, City Manager, responded by stating that the City had not previously considered fencing that particular canal and clarified that it was not City-owned, which introduced additional complexity. However, he assured that staff would review the matter and follow up with Mr. Stanley.

Wendy Osborne, representing Tabitha's Way Local Food Pantry, addressed the Council next. She announced the organization's 15-year anniversary and shared plans for a month-long celebration throughout June, culminating in a block party on Wednesday, June 26, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The event would feature food, entertainment, and family-friendly activities. She introduced a "No Hunger Pledge" campaign, aiming to collect 1,500 pledges to raise awareness, advocacy, and action against hunger. Additional goals included collecting 15,000 pounds of food and raising funds to provide 150,000 additional meals.

Ms. Osborne asked the City for support in several areas, including:

- Permission to display posters in public buildings such as libraries, offices, and recreation centers
- Approval to hang banners in high-traffic parks and intersections
- Opportunities to promote the event and campaign at City events such as Food Truck Fridays and community festivals

She expressed gratitude for the City's ongoing support.

Mayor Mendenhall praised Tabitha's Way for its contributions and reiterated the need to follow current ordinances for signage. He expressed amazement at the 15-year milestone and acknowledged Ms. Osborne's long-standing partnership with the City.

Seth Perrins added praise, noting that Wendy Osborne and Tabitha's Way had received every possible civic award, many of them more than once, recognizing their invaluable service to the community.

Andrew Kelly then addressed the Council. He began by thanking Wendy Osborne for her efforts and encouraged others to support Tabitha's Way through donations. He proceeded to comment on the City's budget process, expressing concern that the timing of the public hearing felt ceremonial and that decisions had already been made by that time. Mr. Kelly suggested that a Council member, rather than a staff member, should present the budget to reinforce transparency and accountability.

Mr. Kelly expressed his belief that the timing of public comments on the budget felt ceremonial, suggesting that by the time the public hearing occurred, decisions had already been made. He asked the council to allow space for genuine input, even if it was late in the process.

He acknowledged the difficulty of presenting the budget and complimented Jordan for doing a commendable job, while also stating that such presentations should be delivered by a councilmember, not staff. He suggested Mayor as an appropriate choice given his finance background, emphasizing that elected leaders should "own it."

Kelly recognized that the largest line item in the city budget was employee compensation, and while he supported city staff, he noted there was always room for improvement. He acknowledged the many dedicated individuals serving the city and called for continued transparency and thoughtful prioritization of budget allocations.

He expressed concern over the location of the Spanish Fork Farmers Market, which he described as being "in the boondocks" with vendors "standing in the dirt." He urged the council to relocate the market to the city park, calling it a natural gathering space and suggesting that such a move would increase foot traffic and support for local vendors.

Mr. Kelly passionately addressed the inconsistencies and deficiencies in sidewalk infrastructure, comparing it to how the city handles roads. He criticized the prevalence of dead-end footpaths and poor pedestrian connections, especially in newer developments.

He recounted seeing mothers pushing strollers along Spanish Fork Parkway in the dirt, calling it unacceptable. He advocated for ensuring that all new roads include curb, gutter, and sidewalks, calling it a basic standard observed in most cities.

He called on the city to "put on our big boy pants" and implement sidewalk infrastructure properly, especially during new road construction projects.

In response to a clarifying question from Seth Perrins, Mr. Kelly returned to the podium to specify that he was referring to the area between Highway 51 and Canyon Creek Parkway, particularly near Lowe's and Costco, where sidewalk connectivity is poor and pedestrian crossings are lacking. He affirmed that the north side of the parkway has gaps, causing pedestrians to walk in unsafe conditions.

Mr. Kelly concluded by noting that while the city budget included \$10 million for employee benefits, which he did not criticize, he felt that funds were available and could be better distributed to address pedestrian infrastructure needs.

Paul Snyder spoke next. A long-time resident, he moved to Spanish Fork in 1977 and was annexed into the City in 2010. Mr. Snyder expressed concern about the architectural quality of new developments, advocating for more durable and aesthetically pleasing construction materials such as masonry, stucco, and stone. He questioned whether there was an architectural review committee in place and encouraged the City to promote building quality over quantity. He quoted lyrics from "*Little Boxes*" to illustrate his concern over uniform, uninspired housing designs and emphasized the importance of quality in construction.

Julianne Burton Curtis came up to speak on a development item; however, since it was scheduled as a public hearing item later on the agenda, she was asked to wait and provide her comments at the appropriate time.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked all members of the public for their comments and encouraged anyone seeking specific follow-up to ensure their contact information was shared with staff. He praised the community for its engagement and willingness to participate in civic discourse.

He indicated that the comments would begin with Councilmember Marshall and proceed sequentially to Councilmember Tooke.

### **COUNCIL COMMENTS:**

#### **Councilmember Marshall**

Councilmember Marshall reported that all Council members had attended the Fit City Fair on Saturday. He commended the staff, specifically Erica, Landon, Stacy (who emceed the event), and Dale Robinson's team for their exceptional efforts. He highlighted the fair as one of the City's best-attended events and praised the new Fit City Recreation Center as an exciting development.

#### **Councilmember Beck**

Councilmember Beck reminded the community that the Yard of the Week Program had begun and encouraged residents to submit nominations through the City's website. She also announced an upcoming veterans' service opportunity organized by Richard Davis, inviting community groups and individuals to help place crosses at the cemetery on Thursday at 3:00

p.m. for Memorial Day. She noted that the Memorial Day program had been held at 10:30 a.m. in previous years and encouraged participation.

Mayor Mendenhall confirmed the Memorial Day program would be held at 10:30 a.m. at the cemetery, recognizing veterans and featuring ceremonial elements such as the flag and taps.

### **Councilmember Oyler**

Councilmember Oyler recognized Verna Jo Hollingshead, who retired as the Senior Center Director. A retirement celebration was held in her honor, and she expressed her intent to continue volunteering. He also highlighted the upcoming “Woofstock” event on Saturday, May 31, hosted by the animal shelter. This 1K fun run and canine carnival aimed to raise funds and increase community engagement. He reported that the animal shelter currently had its lowest number of dogs in over seven years due to successful adoptions.

Councilmember Oyler also noted that the Historic Preservation Commission’s Main Street Veteran Banner Program would launch in the coming days, encouraging residents to walk Main Street, view the banners, and read veterans’ biographies on the Historic Commission’s website in recognition of Memorial Day.

### **Councilmember Cardon**

Councilmember Cardon congratulated the Class of 2025 graduates and noted that Youth City Council applications were still open through Friday for students entering 9th–12th grades. He shared photos and reflections from the Fit City Fair, commending the Parks and Recreation Department for their efforts. He humorously acknowledged helping from atop a ladder during the event and encouraged participation in events that promote physical, mental, and emotional wellness.

### **Councilmember Tooke**

Councilmember Tooke invited Kathleen Leavitt, President of the Spanish Fork Chamber of Commerce, to provide an update.

Kathleen Leavitt

Ms. Leavitt announced that after extensive planning, the Farmers Market would be moved to the City Hall parking lot beginning July 26, noting improved conditions for both vendors and shoppers. She promoted the newly released Area Guide, calling it the best edition yet and a tribute to local businesses.

She also shared upcoming Chamber events, including:

- Ribbon Cutting at Neil’s Fugal in Salem – May 22
- Business After Hours at Doug Smith Auto – May 28, 4:00–6:00 p.m.

- Ribbon Cutting at Course Counseling in Spanish Fork – May 30
- Ribbon Cutting at Good Grinds (Hawaiian restaurant) in Salem – June 6
- Ribbon Cutting at Physical Therapy at 325 W Center Street – June 11

Councilmember Tooke shared his experience participating in the Freedom Walk at Canyon View Park and reflected on the value of events like the Rotary Chamber of Commerce Scholarship Golf Tournament, where scholarship funds are raised for local youth.

He also celebrated the recent graduation of Spanish Fork University 101, calling it an eye-opening experience for residents. He encouraged the public to enroll when the next class was announced.

He expressed appreciation for the Fit City Wellness Fair, especially the highlight of a one-year family membership to the Fit City Recreation Center as the grand prize. Lastly, he shared a heartfelt experience volunteering with Meals on Wheels, delivering meals and engaging with local seniors, and encouraged others to get involved.

### **Mayor Mendenhall**

Mayor Mendenhall thanked the Council and highlighted public comments earlier in the meeting regarding canal safety and trail infrastructure. He emphasized the challenges and opportunities created by ongoing development, including improvements such as piping ditches and connecting trails. He assured residents that safety remains a top priority and that their concerns would be addressed.

He noted the Maple Mountain vs. Spanish Fork High School baseball game that evening and directed residents to SFCN channel 16 for coverage. He also congratulated the Maple Mountain High School Class of 2025, including his son Nash and Celeste Perrins, niece of Seth Perrins. He acknowledged the 595 graduates and encouraged parents to talk to their children about summer safety and responsibility.

Mayor Mendenhall shared frustration over recent vandalism at a city park and reminded the public that damage to public property incurs significant costs. He urged residents, particularly parents, to help instill respect for City facilities.

He concluded by expressing pride in the opportunities now available to local graduates and the community's ongoing efforts to provide meaningful local employment.

### **STAFF REPORTS**

City Manager Seth Perrins indicated there were no staff responses at that time but noted that follow-up comments would be shared during the next meeting.

### **SPANISH FORK 101:**

## **A. Election Update**

Tara Silver, City Recorder and Election Officer, addressed the City Council and audience with a comprehensive presentation on the upcoming 2025 Municipal Elections. She informed attendees that the Primary Election would be held on August 12, 2025, with ballots being mailed out beginning approximately July 22, 2025. The General Election was scheduled for November 4, 2025, and those ballots would be distributed starting around October 14, 2025. Tara advised residents who do not receive their ballots shortly after those mailing dates to contact the Utah County Elections Office to verify their voter registration status.

Tara explained that this year's municipal election will include three open positions: Mayor (four-year term) and two at-large City Council seats (also four-year terms). She emphasized that Spanish Fork does not have voting districts, meaning all elected officials represent the city as a whole.

She outlined the Declaration of Candidacy period, which opens on June 2, 2025, at 8 am, and closes on June 6, 2025, at 5:00 p.m. Candidates must file in person at the Recorder's Office, located at 40 South Main Street, Room 130. Tara highlighted new state laws regarding candidate names on the ballot. Candidates must use their legal name as listed in voter registration records for simplicity. If a candidate wishes to use a nickname, initials, or a variation of their legal name, they must sign a candidate affidavit and, in some cases, provide five supporting affidavits from unrelated county residents attesting to the use of that name. Names used on the ballot must comply with regulations prohibiting slogans, titles, or misleading identifiers.

She provided examples for clarification: using "Mike" instead of "Michael" would require a simple affidavit, while using a nickname like "Skip" for "Charles" would require the five additional affidavits. Tara also noted that ballot name order would be determined by surname and not influenced by name variation.

For candidates who will be outside of Utah during the declaration period, Tara explained the required process. A notarized declaration must be completed prior to departure, and a representative must file the paperwork in person during the declaration period. Additionally, a video call with the City Recorder was required to verify identity and complete the packet. A Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form must also be submitted at the time of filing.

She addressed recent changes to mail-in ballot laws, noting that ballots must now be physically received by the County Elections Office prior to the election deadline. A postmark alone was no longer sufficient, and ballots received late would not be counted. Voters were encouraged to mail ballots early or use the official ballot drop box at the Spanish Fork Library before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day.

Tara also mentioned that in cases where ballots are delivered improperly, the City must follow strict chain-of-custody documentation protocols to ensure compliance. She concluded by referring residents to the City's website, where comprehensive election information, necessary forms, and a candidate checklist would be available within the week. For questions or assistance, residents were encouraged to contact the Recorder's Office directly.

Mayor Mendenhall commended Recorder Silver for the detailed and informative presentation and highlighted the importance of declaring candidacy early in the filing period, rather than waiting until the deadline. He reminded attendees that the Recorder's Office was located in the building adjacent to City Hall.

Councilmember Marshall sought clarification regarding the Friday 5:00 p.m. filing deadline, and Tara confirmed that as long as a candidate was inside the office by 5:00 p.m., they may complete the filing. However, anyone who leaves the office during the process cannot be readmitted.

Mayor Mendenhall affirmed that Recorder Silver was thorough and adhered closely to all legal requirements, and encouraged potential candidates to begin early to avoid any last-minute issues.

Mayor Mendenhall transitioned to Consent Items A through G. He asked for a motion.

### **CONSENT ITEMS:**

- a. Minutes Spanish Fork City Council Meeting 04-20-2025**
- b. SR-51 Corridor Agreement Addendum**
- c. General Aviation Consent to Lease Assignment**
- d. Federal Aid Agreement with UDOT - Mapleton Lateral Canal Trail Phase 3**
- e. Resolution for the Personnel Policy Updates**
- f. State of Utah Community Wildfire Preparedness Plan**
- g. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Utah Department of Workforce Services and Spanish Fork City Regarding the HEAT Assistance Program**

Councilwoman Beck ▾ made a **Motion** to Approve ▾ the **Consent Items a. through g.**  
Councilman Marshall ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** Roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

This moved the meeting into the public hearing portion of the agenda, which included items A through F. The Mayor instructed attendees to listen carefully for their item, as each would be opened individually for public comment.

The first public hearing item was an ordinance related to Title 15 – Impound Yards, presented by Mr. David G. Anderson.

## **PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **A. Ordinance for the Title 15 Impound Yards**

Dave Anderson, Community Development Director, presented staff's recommendation regarding proposed changes to the City Code related to impound yards. He explained that the proposal involved three components, two of which were addressed in the text amendment under Item A, with the third addressed in subsequent map amendments on the agenda.

Mr. Anderson stated that the recommendation reflected a more permissive approach to allow new impound yards in Spanish Fork, while simultaneously strengthening the conditions under which they could be permitted. Currently, impound yards were permitted to be used only in the Industrial 2 (I-2) and Industrial 3 (I-3) zones. However, these zoning districts represent less than 10% of the city's total industrially-zoned land, most of which was classified as Industrial 1 (I-1), a zone that does not currently allow impound yards.

Over the past several years, and particularly in recent months, staff had received multiple requests from individuals seeking to establish impound yards on I-1 properties. Staff responded by developing a more nuanced policy approach that allows for increased access to such uses, but under clear constraints.

Key Proposed Text Changes:

- Remove impound yards as permitted uses in I-2 zones.
- Add impound yards as “uses subject to conditions” within the I-2 zone.
- Introduce supplementary regulations, including specific conditions and operating parameters.

One of the most significant new conditions, Mr. Anderson noted, was a size restriction, limiting impound yards to a maximum of  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre. This restriction aims to prevent large-scale impound yards from occupying strategically valuable or highly visible areas that the City has invested in for broader economic development goals.

He further explained that the Council would retain final authority on any future applications to rezone property from I-1 to I-2 for the purpose of creating new impound yards, emphasizing that zoning changes would only be approved under carefully considered circumstances—e.g., locations that are not on major corridors and properties that are otherwise difficult to develop.

Mr. Anderson acknowledged that this proposal also helped accommodate existing impound yard operators who may be required to relocate due to site changes and emphasized that the new regulatory framework both elevates development standards and maintains local control over future decisions.

Councilmember Marshall summarized the proposal as making it harder to establish impound yards in I-2 zones by removing them from permitted uses, while simultaneously allowing the



City to create new I-2 zones (via legislative action) to provide opportunities for impound yards on a limited, case-by-case basis.

Dave Anderson confirmed that assessment, emphasizing that while the use would remain possible in the I-2 zone, it would be subject to non-negotiable conditions and additional oversight.

Councilmember Oyler simplified the description by stating that the proposal "puts boundaries on it, makes it still possible, but with boundaries."

Mayor Mendenhall added that the reasoning behind the acreage restriction and other limitations was to protect the public investment in infrastructure in industrial zones. He emphasized the importance of return on investment from businesses in those areas and explained that impound yards, due to their limited employment and economic output, were less compatible with some of the City's broader goals.

With no further questions, the Council moved to open the public hearing for Item A.

Mayor Mendenhall opened the floor for public comment regarding the proposed ordinance text amendment concerning the regulation and zoning of impound yards within Spanish Fork City.

None ▾ **Moved** to go in a public hearing.

None ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Sabrina Clark, representing ABS Towing, addressed the Council. She identified ABS Towing as a current participant in the City's towing rotation. Ms. Clark expressed concern over the proposal to amend zoning regulations, stating that opening up additional opportunities for impound yards could lead to a surge in the number of towing companies applying for zone changes and operating permits.

She noted that the City had recently decreased from eight to five active tow companies due to property redevelopment and emphasized the importance of maintaining a close-knit and manageable group. She referenced examples from neighboring cities such as Lehi, which limits itself to five tow companies, and Springville, which has as many as 27 wreckers, to illustrate potential over-saturation. Ms. Clark voiced opposition to the proposed amendment,

citing concerns about quality control and the potential loss of the City's strong working relationships between officers and tow providers.

Elizabeth Patino, representing 3DL Towing, stated that her family-owned company had been in operation since 2016 and was one of the businesses displaced due to redevelopment. She explained that their role included retrieving vehicles after accidents, impounds, and abandoned vehicle removals. Ms. Patino shared that they were seeking a zoning change to resume operations near their previous location. She emphasized the company's desire to remain a part of the Spanish Fork community and to continue contributing to city services, particularly in keeping public areas clean of abandoned vehicles.

Selena Tienda, co-owner of King of Kings Towing, addressed the Council, noting that her company began operating in Spanish Fork around 2017. She explained that her business had been actively searching for a new impound yard for more than five years, knowing their previous location would eventually be redeveloped. She detailed challenges they faced in finding a suitable I-2 zoned location or persuading landowners to rezone existing property.

Ms. Tienda emphasized that the limited availability of qualifying I-2 zones made it extremely difficult for companies like hers to comply with current requirements. She stated her support for measures that would increase access to suitable sites, particularly for existing local businesses that had already invested in the community. Ms. Tienda also clarified that while concerns about overexpansion were valid, any zoning change would still require legislative approval, which acts as a control mechanism.

There were no further public comments on Item A. Mayor Mendenhall asked for a motion on the item.

**Councilman Cardon** ▾ **Moved** to go out of a public hearing.

**Councilman Tooke** ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Following the public hearing, members of the City Council engaged in detailed discussion regarding the proposed ordinance amendment to modify regulations for impound yards within the Industrial 2 (I-2) zone.

Councilmember Oyler sought clarification regarding the scope of the ordinance, noting that the agenda stated the change would make impound yards a "use subject to conditions in the Industrial 1 zone."

Dave Anderson, Community Development Director, confirmed this was incorrect in the agenda language and clarified that the ordinance amendment pertained exclusively to the Industrial 2 zone, with no change being made to the Industrial 1 zone.

Mr. Anderson explained that under current regulations, impound yards were permitted by right in I-2 and I-3 zones. The proposed amendment would reclassify impound yards as conditional uses in I-2, with specific conditions—including a maximum size of  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre—that must be met. This would raise the bar for approval and ensure greater oversight by the Council, as each new application would require a zoning map amendment.

Councilmember Marshall noted that the ordinance provides clarity and discretion for future zoning map amendments by placing size and location limits on impound yards. He emphasized that this amendment, while limiting, also opens the door for carefully considered approvals.

Councilmember Oyler confirmed that the next two agenda items (Items B and C) involve properties currently zoned I-1 requesting to be rezoned to I-2 to allow for impound yard use under the new ordinance—highlighting how the guardrails introduced in Item A would apply.

Councilmember Oyler inquired with Police Chief Matt Johnson whether the current number of towing companies on the City's rotation (now five, down from eight) was sufficient for the department's needs.

Chief Johnson responded that the current rotation was manageable and praised the existing tow companies for their service. He noted that if displaced companies obtained suitable yards and met the necessary conditions, they could be added back into the rotation, as long as they complied with established policy (including yard location, insurance, and response times).

Chief Johnson also confirmed that the City's rotation policy does not currently limit the number of towing companies, but additional policy review could be conducted to ensure the system remains effective and sustainable.

Councilmember Oyler asked whether the new conditions would apply retroactively to existing impound yards. Mr. Anderson clarified that existing operations with valid business licenses would be grandfathered in and could continue without meeting the new condition, unless they sought expansion or modifications that would trigger new compliance requirements.

Mayor Mendenhall asked for a motion.

Councilman Marshall ▾ **Moved** to approve the **the proposed ordinance to modify the City's regulations for Impound Yards in the Industrial 2 zone based on the finding that the proposed changes would enhance to City's ability to address impacts created by Impound Yards in the city.**

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

## **B. Ordinance for the Freddy's Tow Zone Change**

Dave Mann, on behalf of City staff, introduced the proposed zone change request for Freddy's Towing, which involved a parcel located on 300 West. The applicant was one of several towing companies recently displaced by redevelopment and was seeking to relocate to the rear portion of an existing property.

Mr. Mann explained that the proposed rezoned area would encompass approximately 12,960 square feet and be less visible from the street than their previous location. The proposed site was bordered to the east by currently undeveloped property. The site would be accessed via an existing drive aisle on 300 West, which also served an adjacent business with frontage improvements already in place.

Dave Anderson, Community Development Director, confirmed that because the frontage along 300 West was developed, the applicant's path forward would likely not require a site plan but rather direct issuance of a business license, contingent on compliance with the newly adopted ordinance conditions (Item A). He emphasized that:

- The zoning map amendment applies only to the specified portion of the parcel;
- No subdivision of the parcel was being undertaken;
- Screening requirements, such as walls, were not triggered because the impound yard area was more than 100 feet from a public right-of-way.

Anderson clarified the distinction between licensed impound yards and similar-looking but unlicensed storage areas, noting that business license classification and zoning designations legally differentiate the two.

Councilmember Cardon asked how frequently the City rezones only part of a parcel.

Staff replied that while rare, it was not unprecedented.

Cardon also asked about the process for ensuring required improvements are in place, which staff confirmed would be part of the business license review.

Councilmember Oyler inquired about neighboring properties that resemble impound yards.

Anderson clarified that such properties may appear similar but do not function legally as impound yards without the proper zoning and licensing. He reiterated that the new ordinance (Item A) provides a clear framework for regulating such uses.

Councilmember Marshall commented that the proposed ordinance provides the Council with greater comfort in approving zone changes by limiting the scope and size of potential impound yards. He remarked that if the entire parcel were proposed for rezoning, he would not be supportive, but a small, concealed portion offers a balanced solution.

Mayor Mendenhall added perspective on why towing yards were a relevant local issue, citing their role in removing damaged vehicles after accidents. He emphasized the need for local accessibility on what was often a person's worst day, while also acknowledging the importance of aesthetics and environmental impact.

City Manager Seth Perrins provided additional context by referencing a heavily partitioned parcel in Provo, currently home to multiple towing companies operating in a loosely regulated manner. He warned that similar development could occur if the City was not mindful and selective in approving additional applications. Perrins encouraged the Council to retain a tight gatekeeping role moving forward to prevent unintended overuse of the I-2 zoning designation for impound yards.

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Moved** to go in a public hearing.

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

The Council entered into public hearing for Item B.

No members of the public came forward to comment.

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Moved** to go out of a public hearing.

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes

Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Following the closure of the public hearing, the Council continued discussion on the long-term implications of approving the zone change for Freddy's Towing.

Councilmember Oyler raised a question regarding state-mandated time limits for vehicle storage in impound yards, particularly when vehicles were not claimed by their owners.

Mayor Mendenhall invited input from Sabrina Clark i to provide clarity.

Sabrina Clark explained the standard vehicle disposition process following a tow:

- Upon towing, officers provide a case number, officer name, and badge number.
- Towing companies input that information into the IVS (Inventory Vehicle Search) system managed by the DMV.
- If no owner contact occurs within 30 days and the vehicle is eight years or older, the towing company can apply for title and junk the vehicle.
- If the vehicle is eight years or newer, they must wait 60 days and send it through a state auction before obtaining the title.
- The process ensured legal disposal while providing time for owners or insurance providers to respond.

Clark clarified that not all companies dispose of vehicles immediately upon receiving title, but in her experience, insurance companies typically act quickly, with most vehicles being removed within five days to avoid ongoing storage costs.

Councilmember Oyler raised concerns about the potential for impound yards to become informal junkyards if vehicles were allowed to sit indefinitely. He expressed the need for safeguards to avoid long-term clutter and prevent requests for additional impound yards stemming from capacity issues.

Seth Perrins added that insurance companies were highly motivated to remove vehicles quickly due to daily storage fees. He noted this financial incentive typically prevents long-term accumulation of vehicles in impound lots. Perrins acknowledged the risk of overproliferation if not managed carefully and urged the Council to be mindful of future applications that could turn limited, well-managed yards into overused, partitioned spaces.

Mayor Mendenhall emphasized that the purpose of these yards in Spanish Fork was to serve local needs, particularly for crash-related incidents, and ensure accessibility for residents

dealing with vehicle loss. He distinguished this from other cities with more frequent towing for violations, such as in large apartment complexes.

Mayor Mendenhall called for a motion

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Moved** moved to approve the proposed **Ordinance for the Zoning Map Amendment for Freddy's Towing impound yard, based on the five findings and two conditions outlined by staff.**

#### **Findings**

- 1. That, due to the size of the proposed Impound Yard, lack of visibility and lack of direct access to a public street, the subject property would likely not support a more beneficial use.**
- 2. That the needed public improvements to the larger parcel's frontage on 300 West have already been made.**
- 3. That Impound Yards have historically been located in this part of the community.**
- 4. That there is some need for Impound Yards in the community.**
- 5. That Impound Yards are only permitted in the I-2 and I-3 zones.**

#### **Conditions**

- 1. That the Applicant meets the City's development and construction standards and other applicable City ordinances.**
- 2. That the pending additional requirements included with a proposed Zoning Text Amendment for Impound Yards in the I-2 Zone be satisfied prior to the issuance of a Business License.**

Councilman Marshall ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Mayor Mendenhall moved on to the next item on the agenda: an Ordinance for the Okelberry Impound Yard Zoning Map Amendment.

### **C. Ordinance for the Okelberry Impound Yard Zoning Map Amendment**

Dave Mann, representing City staff, presented a zoning map amendment request for a portion of a parcel located near 200 East and 1800 North. The overall parcel was approximately 3.75 acres, currently zoned Industrial 1 (I-1), with the applicant requesting a zone change for a 6,300-square-foot section in the rear corner of the property, adjacent to an existing billboard. The proposed use was for an impound yard, fenced off from the remainder

of the site.

Mr. Mann explained that the proposed location was considered highly suitable by staff, as it was tucked away and not visually prominent from either 200 East or the freeway. He shared images of the property from multiple vantage points, highlighting the minimal visual impact of the proposed impound yard.

However, during the Development Review Committee (DRC) review, concerns were raised regarding potential storage of RVs or trailers at the site. The applicant had indicated they would accept them only when towed within city limits but would prefer to direct them to their Orem facility. Staff recommended a condition prohibiting RV/trailer storage at this location, which was incorporated into the findings.

Councilmember Marshall noted this application as an example of parcel fragmentation, expressing concern over the potential for proliferation of multiple small impound yards on a single parcel. He acknowledged that while this location was well-screened, repeated approvals of similar applications could result in multiple fenced lots, reducing aesthetic quality—especially given the site's proximity to the freeway exit into Spanish Fork.

Mayor Mendenhall echoed those concerns, warning of the cumulative effect of several impound yards concentrated at a key entrance to the city. He stated that such a trend could create a poor first impression—"Welcome to Spanish Fork, where we crash our cars." The Mayor emphasized the importance of preserving the visual integrity of this prominent corridor.

Councilmember Marshall suggested a potential policy or text amendment to prevent adjacent impound yards from clustering together, even if individually they meet size restrictions. He stated he would be unwilling to approve additional impound yards abutting this site and that denying future requests on those grounds would not be arbitrary.

Councilmember Cardon supported the approach, agreeing that the recent Title 15 changes provide the necessary legislative discretion to evaluate such applications on a case-by-case basis.

Council members agreed that while the current application was acceptable due to its discreet placement, a larger policy conversation may be warranted if similar applications continue to emerge. The Council also acknowledged that while the ordinance caps maximum impound yard size at 30,000 square feet, it does not set a minimum size, nor does it limit proximity between yards—a topic likely to be revisited.

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Moved** to go into a public hearing

Councilman Marshall ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Absent
Jesse Cardon	Yes



Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Mayor Mendenhall asked for those with public comments to come forward.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Sabrina Clark, representing ABS Towing, raised concerns regarding the applicant's company group, which includes Stauffer's and Larry's Towing. Ms. Clark noted that these companies operate five towing entities, including heavy-duty tow trucks, which were typically not needed in Spanish Fork due to lack of demand. She expressed concern that although the applicants claim heavy-duty tows would continue to be taken to Orem, they might eventually be stored in the new Spanish Fork impound yard.

She further explained that Spanish Fork's towing rotation policy required towed vehicles to remain within city limits, and questioned why companies already operating from Orem, and continuing to store tows there, should be added to the rotation. Ms. Clark cautioned that yard space may be quickly consumed by heavy-duty vehicles, limiting capacity for standard vehicles and forcing companies to decline rotation calls.

Councilmember Oyler asked for clarification about the process when a tow yard has no available space.

Ms. Clark responded that companies must turn down the call, resulting in the next provider on the rotation being contacted.

Selena Tienda, co-owner of King of Kings Towing, suggested a policy refinement: limiting one tow company per physical yard address, thereby reducing the potential for multiple business licenses tied to a single property. She referenced Orem City's policy that implements such restrictions, explaining it helps prevent clustering while allowing fair access for other qualified companies. Ms. Tienda emphasized the need to avoid perceptions of favoritism and advocated for consistent, enforceable rules applicable to all.

No further public comments were made.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to go out of a public hearing

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes

Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Councilmember Oyler expressed a preference for the location and configuration of the previous item (Item B) over the Okleberry site, citing concerns about proximity to the freeway and visual impression at a key gateway to the city. He supported the idea of placing further restrictions to avoid unwanted expansion and clustering of yards.

Dave Mann clarified that image two, showing visibility from the freeway, was captured using Google Street View. Although the site was technically visible, Mann noted it was difficult to see from a typical vehicle's perspective, offering some natural screening. He also addressed heavy-duty towing, stating that while the applicant initially proposed it, staff raised concerns during DRC review, and the final recommendation was to exclude RV and heavy-duty vehicle storage at the site.

Councilmember Marshall echoed Oyler's concerns, stating the Okleberry proposal felt fundamentally different due to its small size (6,300 sq ft) and tucked-in location on a larger parcel. He expressed discomfort with the idea of piecemeal expansion of adjacent impound yards, describing a scenario where multiple small lots could create a patchwork of fences without meaningful oversight or long-term planning.

Councilmember Cardon emphasized the importance of policy clarity and neutrality, stating the city should not "pick winners and losers" but rather set clear rules that all businesses can follow. He advocated for continued evaluation of the new Title 15 changes, suggesting the city may need further amendments if parcel clustering becomes problematic.

Councilmember Oyler noted his discomfort with the absence of the applicant during the public hearing and deliberations. He also reiterated that approvals should be based on site suitability and land use compatibility, not the reputation or nature of any particular towing company.

Dave Anderson, Community Development Director, supported that view, affirming that staff's role is to evaluate site characteristics, including visibility, access constraints, and long-term utility, not individual business models or operators. Anderson confirmed that the findings and conditions provided focus exclusively on land use suitability.

Councilmember Oyler stated that he preferred the location of the prior impound yard proposal over the current one. He expressed concern about the proximity of the proposed yard to the city entrance off the freeway. He emphasized that if the site were to expand in the future, it could present more significant visibility and aesthetic concerns. He noted that Councilmember Marshall had raised similar issues and that the Mayor had previously acknowledged them as well.

Councilmember Oyler added that he would be particularly concerned if the facility were to grow beyond its current proposed size. He supported the idea of implementing policies to prevent such expansion. He then asked whether image number two, presented during the

meeting, had been taken from the freeway or by a drone.

Mr. Mann clarified that the image in question had been taken from Google Street View, specifically from the freeway off-ramp. He shared that he personally used that off-ramp daily and noted it was difficult to see the impound yard unless one was actively looking for it. He confirmed that the site was not easily visible from a car.

He then addressed the issue of heavy-duty towing, stating that it had been part of the applicant's original operations plan. However, it was the staff and Development Review Committee (DRC) who raised it as a consideration in evaluating the application and its appropriateness for the location.

Mayor Mendenhall acknowledged Councilmember Marshall's earlier concerns and commented that the Google Street View image likely captured a higher perspective than most vehicles would provide. He agreed that the visibility issue changed depending on the yard's scale and placement relative to the freeway.

Councilmember Marshall added that visibility of the impound yard was limited unless someone was at the height of a semi-truck. However, he emphasized that the concerns remained valid, particularly if the facility were to expand. He stressed the need for well-defined rules and limits on such uses. He warned against subjective decision-making based solely on a dislike for a company or its location, emphasizing that city policy needed consistency and fairness to avoid favoritism.

Mr. Anderson explained that both staff and the council had remained focused on land use and site-specific considerations, not on individual companies. He outlined the criteria used to evaluate proposals: parcel size, visibility, access, and site limitations that might discourage higher-value uses (e.g., office or manufacturing). He stressed that all applications were judged on these objective characteristics rather than on who the applicant was.

Mayor Mendenhall agreed with Mr. Anderson's point and noted that while the applicant might have helped provide more context, the council's role remained focused on the land use proposal.

Councilmember Marshall reiterated that he preferred the location of item B to item C. He observed that item B's site was 13,000 sq. ft., whereas item C was only 6,000 sq. ft., making it a small, corner parcel within a heavily used facility. He noted that this made the proposal feel quite different in character and scope.

Mr. Perrins emphasized that both staff and council had maintained a focus on land use rather than the applicant's identity. However, he noted that operational discretion still needed to rest with city departments, particularly the police department in determining vendor rotation and eligibility based on performance and compliance.

He warned that despite regulatory efforts, businesses might still attempt to work around restrictions. He offered to research and return with possible policy options if the council wished to consider limiting the number of operators at a single site. Above all, he stressed

that Chief Johnson should retain full discretion in managing the city's towing rotation list to exclude "bad actors" and maintain public safety and service standards.

Mayor Mendenhall expressed appreciation for the thoughtful questions and public engagement during the previous discussion. He noted that the impound yard topic had developed into a more complex conversation than anticipated when initially reviewing the agenda.

Councilman Marshall ▾ **Moved to Deny the the proposed Ordinance for the Okelberry Impound Yard Zoning Map Amendment based on the finding that the size is too small and the location is undesirable for this type of use.**

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Seconded** and the motion died with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	No
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Mayor Mendenhall then transitioned the meeting to Item D, introducing the ordinance related to the Construction Standard Drawing (ST-503). He commented, somewhat humorously, that Councilmember Marshall appeared excited about the item, referencing the engineering cross section drawing that had been provided.

Councilmember Marshall remarked lightheartedly, "How can you not be excited about that?"

Mayor Mendenhall explained that the item concerned the city's local road street cross section, specifically Standard Drawing ST-503. He stated that the proposed ordinance involved the addition of a note to that standard drawing. The note would give the City Engineer the authority to make minor adjustments to the design specifications in certain cases.

#### **D. Ordinance for the Construction Standard Drawing ST503**

Cory Pierce showed an example and then displayed a site plan snapshot, clarifying that it was chosen to avoid broader development details. He pointed out that the homes fronted a center courtyard with sidewalk access and expected that neighbors would engage from that space. The rear-facing garages, he explained, would have sidewalks that served little pedestrian use and thus would not require standard treatment.

Mr. Pierce elaborated that the rear sidewalks behind garages often went unused and were difficult to maintain due to their narrow widths. The proposed change would allow flexibility in these areas if certain conditions were met. He confirmed that planning staff recommended approval.

Mr. Pierce noted that while 20-foot driveways were proposed (in alignment with current zoning standards), the Planning Commission discussed extending that to 25 feet to better accommodate modern vehicle sizes, especially trucks. He acknowledged the tradeoff between space and safety, suggesting 22 feet might be a practical compromise.

Councilmember Marshall sought clarification, admitting some confusion. He confirmed that the “street” referenced in the plan would be a public road and asked whether homes would not face the street. Mr. Pierce confirmed this, explaining that front doors faced inward toward courtyards, while garages were rear-loaded along the public street.

Councilmember Oyler asked if the park strip and sidewalk were located at the front of the homes in these cases.

Mr. Pierce confirmed, explaining that rear park strips often resulted in small and unmaintainable sections of landscaping, which contributed little functional value and degraded over time.

Councilmember Cardon asked why this authority was not part of the plat approval process rather than an ongoing discretion of the city engineer.

Mr. Pierce responded that staff aimed to reduce unnecessary council workload on minor sidewalk decisions, but the council could choose to retain that discretion.

Mr. Anderson explained that this waiver would typically be addressed during early design discussions or at the preliminary plat stage. He stressed it would not be allowed post-plat approval, and that staff would always inform the council during presentation if any sidewalk or park strip modifications had occurred under this provision.

He stated that the goal was to avoid surprise changes late in the process and affirmed that developers would be bound to the approved plat, with no ability to later invoke the waiver retroactively.

Councilmember Beck supported the intent of encouraging safe pedestrian movement in neighborhoods by concentrating sidewalks at the front of homes. She emphasized the importance of connectivity and the ability for residents to walk safely and access amenities and neighbors without navigating through garage-access corridors.

Mr. Pierce affirmed Councilmember Beck’s comments, emphasizing the importance of neighborhood feel and front-porch engagement over rear garage access. He noted that in practice, rear sidewalks were often blocked by parked vehicles and served minimal practical purposes. He reiterated the goal of flexible, early-stage discussions to optimize layout and utility access.

Councilmember Marshall examined the visual example, asking for clarification on various features including driveways, sidewalks, and green areas.

With assistance from Mr. Pierce, he confirmed that what initially appeared to be unclear design elements were rear access driveways, with sidewalks located inward along the courtyard frontage.

Mr. Perrins asked whether this ordinance change originated from internal staff proposals or developer requests.

Mr. Pierce confirmed that it was a collaborative initiative between planning and engineering, partly influenced by two current projects (Creekside and another forthcoming) where the design challenge was evident.

Mr. Anderson emphasized that this amendment was consistent with the city's public street commitments, allowing flexibility in certain development types like townhomes or rear-loaded homes. He noted that requiring eight-foot park strips and five-foot sidewalks behind every garage resulted in additional concrete and unfriendly public space, diminishing the residential character.

He contextualized the 20-foot driveway standard as being consistent with the city's 18-foot minimum for parking stalls but agreed with the Planning Commission's view that some vehicles exceeded that length. He supported 22 feet as a reasonable compromise between parking needs and design constraints.

Mr. Pierce concluded by explaining that deeper driveways provided buffer zones for snow removal and other public services. He cautioned against designs that brought garages directly to the public right-of-way, which could interfere with snow plowing and create risk to private property.

Mayor Mendenhall agreed with the practical recommendations and supported adjusting the driveway depth to 22 feet, citing the need for usable space in front of garages that did not encroach into public roads.

He then called for a motion to enter a public hearing on the item.

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Moved** to go into a public hearing

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Mayor Mendenhall asked for those with public comments to come forward.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

The public hearing was opened and closed with no public comments.

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Moved** to go out of public hearing.

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Councilmember Cardon reopened the discussion by asking for clarification on sidewalk and park strip widths. He confirmed with City Engineer Cory Pierce that a typical sidewalk was 5 feet wide and that a park strip was currently 8 feet, according to city standards.

He outlined a scenario where, with a 20-foot driveway, the total depth from garage to street would effectively be increased by another 13 feet (5 feet of sidewalk and 8 feet of park strip), adding to the total concrete footprint.

He stated he was comfortable with the proposed ordinance amendment, particularly after understanding that these changes would be considered during preliminary plat approval, and not arbitrarily later in the process. He emphasized that while 25 feet was not a “magic number,” he preferred it over 20 feet, especially in townhome developments where driveways were frequently used for parking. He believed that the extra space would enhance livability and separation between units.

Mayor Mendenhall asked for a motion.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to approve the **Ordinance for the Construction Standard Drawing ST503 with condition of changing the drive way from 20 to 25 feet**

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	No
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

## **E. Ordinance for Creekside Village Zoning Amendment**

Dave Mann introduced the Creekside Village proposal, describing it as a request to rezone property to the R4 zone with an accompanying Master Planned Development (MPD) overlay. The proposed site was located on the south end of Spanish Fork City, along Main Street, and included an existing structure and previously-used dirt bike tracks. Mann stated that the site encompassed three parcels, two privately owned and one owned by the city. He explained that part of the development included a potential land exchange, allowing land currently located within the floodplain (primarily to the south) to be traded for land more suitable for development (outside the floodplain) to the north. This exchange would be based on appraisals and aimed to equally benefit both the city and the applicant.

Mann noted that the proposal included 169 residential units, with 72 two-story townhomes and 97 three-story units, yielding a density just under 13 units per acre. He reviewed architectural elevations for both unit types and indicated that renderings had been provided by the applicant, including an example of a similar development in Lehi. He emphasized that the Creekside proposal would incorporate a greater front yard setback than the Lehi project.

He explained that some variations to zoning code were requested, particularly the deviation from the maximum of six units per building. The applicant proposed buildings with eight units in certain sections. This issue had been discussed by the Planning Commission, particularly in regard to potential impacts on visibility and neighborhood appearance.

Mann highlighted the development's planned amenities, which included a 1,700 square foot clubhouse with a bicycle maintenance area (due to the site's proximity to the Spanish Fork River Trail), a swimming pool, and pickleball courts. He described how the site design supported walkability, with the fronts of the townhomes oriented toward landscaped pedestrian walkways rather than traditional street-facing layouts. He noted that garbage collection would be handled with individual residential cans, consistent with owner-occupied dwellings.

Regarding annexation, Mann stated that a small portion of the proposed development extended beyond current city limits and would need to be annexed prior to recording a final plat. He also stated that updated plans would be required to reflect changes recommended by the Planning Commission, including adjustments to guest parking and unit layout.

Councilmember Oyler asked about adjustments required to conform with the recently approved 25-foot driveway standard.

Mann responded that the applicant had proposed 22-foot driveways and garages and had included visual mockups showing that two trucks could be parked without encroaching into the street. However, he noted that this design may still need to be adjusted to comply with the latest standard and would likely fall under master plan development provisions.

Mann also addressed a concern raised by a neighboring property owner during the Planning Commission meeting regarding an easement agreement. He confirmed that staff had



reviewed the matter with the applicant and believed that all obligations under the agreement had been met.

Mann reported that the Planning Commission had recommended a reduction in unit count to allow for more guest parking. Originally, the proposal included 172 units, but the applicant reduced that number to 169 to create approximately 40 additional guest parking stalls.

Councilmember Beck inquired whether the renderings reflected a reduction from eight-unit buildings to six, as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mann clarified that the site plan still showed a majority of eight-unit buildings, especially along Main Street, although there were also a few five- and three-unit buildings included.

Beck acknowledged that the final decision on this point would rest with the Council.

Councilmember Cardon asked about how the development's density had been calculated given the presence of floodplain areas. Mann stated that the 12.9 units per acre figure accounted for land within the floodplain. He added that earlier proposals for similar developments in the area had shown much higher densities, with discrepancies between the developer's and city's calculations in past projects.

Mayor Mendenhall asked if there were any further questions for David Anderson. When there were none, he thanked David and stated, "Not right now."

Before opening the public hearing, he invited the applicant to come forward, noting their presence and expressing appreciation.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked Mann and confirmed there were no further questions at that time. He then invited the applicant, Mark Hampton, to speak before opening the public hearing on the item.

Mark Hampton addressed the council, introducing himself and the development team. He mentioned that Riley Jarrett, the project architect, was present and had prior experience working on a nearby project known as the "Fritzi property." Hampton also introduced Chris Milam, the primary landowner and project partner, humorously referring to him as "Motocross Chris." Hampton expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present the Creekside Village project and emphasized that the team had carefully considered feedback from the Planning Commission over the course of the project's development.

Hampton noted the uniqueness of the site, stating that it was rare within both Spanish Fork and the broader Utah County area. The development team's goal, he explained, was to create a project that engaged both the Spanish Fork River Trail and Main Street, while complementing the historic character of the area. He described a specific architectural style called "brownstone units" for the townhomes facing Main Street, which drew inspiration from late 1800s architecture. These units, he said, would include features such as deeper front landscaping to enhance the pedestrian experience.

Hampton explained the rationale behind the proposed 22-foot driveways, stating that the original design aimed to accommodate large vehicles without compromising front yard landscaping or pedestrian activity areas. He acknowledged that the recently adopted 25-foot driveway standard would require design adjustments, which might reduce green space but would not impact the total unit count.

He detailed the access plans, explaining that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) had approved only two access points along the Main Street frontage. These included acceleration and deceleration lanes. He emphasized that the development's buildings were set back significantly from the street, beyond both the property line and the city's multi-use trail and landscaped buffer.

Hampton emphasized the development's focus on community activation and affordability. He mentioned amenities like a bicycle repair shop, pickleball courts, and a clubhouse, acknowledging the mixed opinions that pickleball facilities sometimes provoke. He referenced recent housing affordability studies and pointed out that Utah had become one of the most expensive states for residential property. Hampton shared a personal anecdote about his son moving to Texas for affordability and stated that this project was designed to offer reasonably priced housing for Utah families. He concluded his remarks by inviting Riley Jarrett to speak about parking and design.

Riley Jarrett began by describing how the design team had responded to Planning Commission concerns regarding visitor parking. He stated that they had added 40 new stalls and distributed them more evenly, especially in the southern and central portions of the site and around the amenity areas. He reported that the project would now offer a total of 761 parking stalls, significantly more than the minimum requirement of 508. This included 338 garage stalls, 338 driveway stalls, and 85 dedicated visitor stalls.

Jarrett confirmed that the site plan already reflected 22-foot driveways and that adjustments would be made to meet the newly adopted 25-foot standard if necessary, potentially impacting internal green space. He also described trail improvements, stating that trails originally routed through neighboring property had been redirected and now included two city-approved access points, one on the north and one on the south. Full public access to the eastern neighboring parcel was provided as well.

On the topic of building configuration, Jarrett addressed the Planning Commission's recommendation to limit buildings to six units instead of eight. He argued that their architectural analysis showed little visual difference between six- and eight-unit buildings due to the substantial articulation and variation in the building façades. He explained that switching to six-plexes would increase the number of narrow alleyways between buildings without increasing usable green space or adding parking.

Jarrett also reiterated that the site design prioritized pedestrian safety and neighborhood connectivity. He described how all buildings were interconnected with a continuous network of trails that linked homes to amenities and the Spanish Fork River Trail system. He concluded by stating that the design team believed they had adequately addressed all feedback and had developed a walkable, engaging, and well-parked community.

Mark Hampton returned briefly to reiterate the reasoning behind using eight-plex buildings. He explained that reducing the number of units per building would not decrease the overall unit count, but would result in more alleyways and less efficient site use. Building in clusters of eight was more cost-effective, which in turn allowed the developer to offer the homes at a lower price.

Hampton emphasized that the design's articulation helped ensure that visual monotony was avoided, even with eight-unit buildings. He added that openings between buildings would still comply with city code setbacks and would not create large, open view corridors from Main Street, preserving privacy and cohesiveness.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked Mark Hampton and asked if any council members had questions before opening the public hearing. Council members indicated they would wait until after public comment.

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Moved** to go into a public hearing

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Julieann Burton Curtis introduced herself and began by expressing appreciation to Dave Anderson and the City Council members for taking time to listen to the views and ideas of the citizens. She also acknowledged Mark Hampton and Chris Milam, expressing respect for their efforts and the work they had done on the proposed development.

Julieann explained that she had been monitoring the subject property for some time and had seen it pass through various proposed developments. She shared concerns about the impact that increasing development on the parcel would have on the city, particularly with regard to preserving the rural character and openness of the south end of Spanish Fork. She pointed out that the east side of the area already had high-rise condos, and she worried that additional similar development would give the entrance to the city a closed-in, urban feel. She emphasized her preference for the city's heritage, horses, and country ambiance, and feared that too much development in that specific location would diminish those qualities.

Julieann also raised safety concerns related to the proximity of the development to the Spanish Fork River, particularly for families with young children. She shared her personal experience of frequently using the trail along the river and noted how the current setting

provides a feeling of separation from the city—something she would not like to see diminished by high-density housing.

She then presented an alternative vision for the parcel, which she called the "River's Edge Retreat and Lodge." She proposed that the city and developers consider a retreat-style facility that could include a large rustic lodge for dining and events, outdoor seating, themed heritage cabins, and recreational facilities like picnic groves, campfire pits, sport courts, and a rental shop for outdoor gear. She suggested the facility could appeal to corporate retreats, family reunions, weddings, and tourism, with possible short-term rentals available through services like Airbnb.

Julieann asserted that this concept would be in harmony with the city's strong recreation identity, which includes the fairgrounds, the new recreation center, and numerous sports fields in the area. She distributed printed materials to the Council, including a proposed business plan and an impact study she had created using AI tools. This study compared the proposed 172-unit condo development to the River's Edge Retreat concept in terms of alignment with Spanish Fork's heritage, community engagement, and long-term land use.

According to her analysis, the River's Edge Retreat showed strong alignment with Spanish Fork's cultural values and offered accessible public spaces, event hosting opportunities, and long-term economic benefits through tourism and job creation. In contrast, she stated the condo development offered only private benefit and limited public engagement, despite generating short-term revenue through taxes and impact fees.

Julieann requested that the Council consider postponing a decision on the 172-unit proposal in order to reflect more deeply on the potential of her proposed alternative. She emphasized that a win-win solution could be found by locating the high-density housing on a different parcel while reserving this unique site for a community-enhancing retreat. She concluded her remarks by submitting her documents to the Council.

Andrew Kelly then addressed the Council and acknowledged that he had already spoken earlier in the meeting. He offered further perspective, noting that he had spent time in historic European cities, often walking through the streets at night and admiring preserved architecture. He observed that in those cities, historic building façades were often preserved due to their beauty and cultural value.

Kelly stated that while Spanish Fork lacked many buildings worthy of such preservation, the proposal before the Council stood out for its architectural quality. He expressed strong support for the Creekside Village project, stating that it would be a visually appealing and valuable addition to Main Street. He argued that it was superior to alternatives like gas stations or car washes, and represented a step forward in making Main Street more attractive.

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Moved** to go out of a public hearing

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Councilmember Tooke began by addressing Julieann Burton Curtis directly, thanking her for previously reaching out and engaging in a personal conversation regarding her proposal. He then asked whether her idea for a River's Edge Retreat was something she was currently capable of pursuing, suggesting that the recreational nature of the project sounded enjoyable but inquiring whether she had the resources and readiness to begin such a venture at this time.

Councilmember Tooke then redirected his questions to the developers, Mark Hampton and Riley Jarrett. He inquired about the two entry and exit points along Main Street, expressing concern about the potential for traffic disruption and asking if there was sufficient infrastructure to support vehicle movement without impeding traffic flow.

Mark Hampton responded that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) had required acceleration and deceleration lanes and that a traffic study had been completed. UDOT had also directed that improvements span the full frontage of the property for consistency, despite the technical requirement being less.

Hampton elaborated that the development would dedicate and improve the road frontage to UDOT standards, and further described the spatial configuration, noting that a 10- to 12-foot-wide trail would be installed along Main Street, followed by a wrought iron fence and an approximate 35-foot setback from the property line.

Councilmember Oyler asked if that 35-foot setback would need to be reduced to accommodate 25-foot driveways, and Hampton acknowledged that it might.

Councilmember Tooke followed up by asking whether on-street parking would be allowed along Main Street. Hampton clarified that due to the acceleration and deceleration lanes, no street parking would be permitted.

Tooke then shifted to visitor parking within the development. He pointed out that two long rows of units lacked convenient nearby visitor stalls and questioned the rationale.

Hampton responded that each residence included a two-car garage and a driveway capable of accommodating two additional vehicles, and that the other visitor parking was concentrated around the development's amenities.

Mark Hampton explained that in their Lehi development, only garage parking was available, yet the parking proved sufficient. He emphasized that the Creekside Village project provided significantly more parking—exceeding city requirements by about 300 stalls when driveways

and garages were both counted.

Councilmember Cardon clarified that while this met city code, he personally disliked the cluster of visitor parking near the river on the development's east side. He expressed concern that those spaces might become de facto overflow parking for tenants rather than being used by actual visitors. He suggested that more evenly distributing visitor parking would better serve residents.

Councilmember Beck echoed these concerns, stating she had watched the Planning Commission meeting and appreciated the additional stalls but also felt they should be more evenly dispersed throughout the project. She noted the inconvenience of a long walk for guests attending events or visiting units on the far side of the development.

City Manager Seth Perrins clarified that the council was not merely giving feedback at this point; rather, the applicant was seeking formal approval. If council members wanted changes made to the project, they should table the item or attach conditions to the approval. He emphasized that this was not a conceptual review, but a decision-making point, and any expectation for design modifications should be explicitly tied to council action.

Councilmember Oyler asked for clarification on what, exactly, the council would be approving. He noted that although the Planning Commission had recommended changing the buildings facing Main Street from eightplexes to sixplexes, the current proposal still featured eight-unit buildings. He asked whether the council would be approving the eightplex layout if it moved forward as was.

Mark Hampton confirmed that the request still included eightplexes despite the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Dave Anderson acknowledged that due to the short turnaround between the Planning Commission meeting and the City Council agenda deadline—less than a week—the applicant, Mark Hampton and Riley Jarrett, had made several changes in a very limited timeframe. He noted that he might still be catching up on all the changes made to the site plan.

To clarify for both council and staff, Anderson listed the updates that had been incorporated into the preliminary plat. These included the addition of guest parking, the widening of the roadways to 22 feet, adjusting the driveway depths, shifting the trail, moving the asphalt to Mr. McHale's property boundary, and providing public access to the park on both the north and south ends.

Councilmember Oyler voiced concern about the 22-foot driveway depth proposed in the plan. He noted that the Council had recently approved a standard requiring a 25-foot driveway depth, which could conflict with what was currently included in the plat. He asked whether the Council could still approve the current plan or if it would be necessary to wait until a revised plat reflecting the updated standard could be presented.

Dave Anderson responded that the Council could incorporate conditions of approval—for example, stipulating that the driveway depth must be revised to 25 feet, which would allow the applicant to proceed under clear parameters. Alternatively, if the Council felt the changes needed more thorough review or might have broader design implications, Anderson recommended continuing the item and revisiting it after a short delay to ensure clarity and alignment.

Councilmember Cardon clarified the procedural distinction between the two associated items on the agenda. He explained that the current item, Item E, was focused on the zoning map amendment. Specifically, the request to change the zoning designation for the property. The subsequent Creekside item in New Business would address the preliminary plat. He suggested that the Council could proceed by approving the zoning change now and tabling the preliminary plat until the revised design could be reviewed with the requested changes.

Dave Anderson emphasized that if the Council's requested changes were relatively minor and clearly defined, such as changing the driveway depth from 22 to 25 feet, those could be managed as conditions of approval without requiring additional delays. However, if the Council anticipated more substantive revisions or wanted to be absolutely certain that the changes were implemented exactly as intended, continuing the item for a few weeks would be a more prudent course of action. He emphasized the value of clarity for both staff and the applicant.

Councilmember Oyler asked whether the appropriate time to discuss design-related changes would be during the "New Business" portion of the meeting.

Mayor Mendenhall agreed and recommended that the Council now focus solely on the zoning map amendment. He noted that the applicant could return later during the discussion of the preliminary plat, at which time the Council could dive deeper into any desired revisions.

Mayor Mendenhall acknowledged that the public hearing had been held and that the Council had heard from both the applicant and the public. He then invited a motion from the Council for Item E, the Creekside Village Zoning Map Amendment.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to approve the **proposed Creekside Village Zoning Amendment based on the following findings and subject to the following conditions:**  
**Findings**

- 1. That the proposal conforms to the City's General Plan Designation and proposed Zone designation.**
- 2. That the Applicant has listed proposed modifications to the development standards for this project.**
- 3. That the proposal meets the required findings for the Master Planned Development Overlay.**

#### **Conditions**

- 1. That the Applicant meets the City's development and construction standards and**

**other applicable City ordinances.**

**2. That the City Council approve the Preliminary Plat and make the required findings for the Master Planned Development Overlay District.**

**3. That the Applicant enters into any necessary agreements regarding the exchange of property, monetary adjustment based on land appraisal, and utility easements prior to Final Plat application.**

**4. That the Annexation of the portion of property outside of the City Boundary be completed prior to Final Plat application.**

Councilwoman Beck ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Before proceeding with the final public hearing on the agenda, Mayor Mendenhall announced a procedural adjustment. He moved to address New Business – Item A prior to the last public hearing item.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **A. Ordinance for the Creekside Village Master Planned Development Preliminary Plat**

Mayor Mendenhall asked if there were any further questions for David Anderson regarding the Creekside Townhomes proposal. Hearing none, he thanked him and invited Mark Hampton, the applicant, to address the council. Mayor Mendenhall thanked Mr. Hampton for his presence.

Mr. Hampton acknowledged that a section of city-owned property, 2.11 acres, remained on one side of the proposed development. He explained that while a land trade had shifted the development northward, it had not fully removed city property from the area. He added that future city plans for a road might involve this property.

Regarding visitor parking, Mr. Hampton noted that the design intentionally clustered visitor spaces around amenities and relied on garages and driveways to serve as primary visitor parking.

Mayor Mendenhall responded that he preferred allowing the developer discretion on parking placement, trusting that they would prioritize functionality and aesthetics. He also noted that, behind the homes, residents would either see parked vehicles or open space, depending on occupancy.



Councilmember Beck raised a concern about visitor access in eight-plex units, particularly the difficulty in reaching front doors of interior units when parking in driveways. She suggested adding small visitor lots at row ends to improve accessibility. She acknowledged that this might result in a slight loss of units but believed it would enhance livability.

Mr. Hampton explained that adjusting from five eight-plexes to ten six-plexes could allow such modifications without significant impact. He noted the trade-off was typically just the width of one building and humorously acknowledged societal tendencies toward convenience.

Councilmember Oyler suggested guests could simply use garage codes when visiting.

Councilmember Oyler cautioned against reducing density, noting the city's priority to address housing shortages. He felt eight-plexes were more efficient and affordable. He then referred to photos shown by staff from the adjacent public trail, commending its aesthetics. He asked whether three-story buildings near the river could be modified to match the height of the two-story units elsewhere in the project.

Mr. Jarrett clarified that both the three-story and two-story units were approximately 30 feet tall, due to different architectural designs. He confirmed the rooflines would be consistent in height.

Councilmember Oyler accepted the clarification and complimented the project's architecture and overall design. He then brought up a separate concern regarding a previous development (Fritzi project) across the street, where a promised fence for neighboring properties with livestock was never constructed. He requested Mr. Hampton's assistance in addressing that issue, as many residents had contacted him about it.

Mr. Hampton acknowledged the situation and explained that the fence had been part of the original intent, but a tight timeline and property sale disrupted that plan. He confirmed he no longer had control over the property but offered to help track down responsibility and apply appropriate pressure to ensure compliance.

Mr. Anderson suggested a meeting be arranged with Lone Star, the developer responsible for the preliminary plat, to help resolve the issue. He clarified Lone Star still had units under construction at the site and remained a key party.

Mr Hampton stated if Lone Star was involved he would do what he could to help the issue.

Councilmember Marshall shifted the focus back to the Creekside development, seeking clarification on trail and landscape setbacks. He asked whether the trail was included in the applicant's 33-foot setback.

Mr. Jarrett responded that the actual setback was 35 feet from the property line to the buildings, and the trail lay outside of that, totaling approximately 45 feet from the road to the building. He confirmed there was also a landscape buffer and curb and gutter.

Councilmember Marshall expressed concerns about the Main Street frontage, stating it did not resemble a typical Main Street corridor. While he preferred the aesthetics of front-facing homes, he was conflicted about their orientation toward a high-speed arterial road. He acknowledged the trail placement was well-executed, and the applicant had done as much as possible with the site constraints.

Mr. Anderson clarified that the public trail was outside the project's fence, while internal sidewalks provided community connectivity.

Councilmember Beck emphasized that connectivity within the community remained a critical design element.

Councilmember Cardon noted the challenging nature of the site and commended the applicant's efforts to make the design viable. He acknowledged some concerns about amenity placement, but overall felt this was a significant improvement over prior proposals. He expressed caution around the term "affordable housing," stating "more affordable" was a more realistic descriptor in the current market.

Mayor Mendenhall added that the project had evolved considerably, receiving initial rejections from DRC and Planning Commission, but had now returned with substantial revisions and broader support. He reiterated the complexity and effort that had gone into making the proposal viable.

Councilmember Oyler asked for clarification on the riverbank study mentioned earlier. He wanted to confirm it was a required condition of approval and ensure that any mitigation costs would be borne by the developer.

Mr. Pierce confirmed that a riverbank stabilization study would be required. He emphasized the importance of understanding erosion risks, particularly on sharp river bends, and ensuring the developer covered costs for any necessary improvements.

Mr. Hampton acknowledged the responsibility for such improvements on property they owned.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to approve the **Resolution on the Creekside Preliminary Plat** based on the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

### **Findings**

- 1. That the proposal conforms to the City's General Plan Designation and proposed Zone Map amendment.**
- 2. That Staff is proposing a new street standard that would apply to one of the streets in the proposed development.**
- 3. That the Applicant has increased the amount of guest parking based on concerns expressed by the Planning Commission.**
- 4. That Staff and the Applicant have reviewed the easement agreement involving the adjacent property owner.**

### Conditions

- 1. That the Applicant meets the City's development and construction standards and other applicable City ordinances.**
- 2. That the Applicant addresses all red-line review comments prior to Final Plat application.**
- 3. That the City Council approve the Rezone and associated conditions of the Master Planned Development Overlay District.**
- 4. That the City Council approve the new street standard.**
- 5. That the Applicant enters into any necessary agreements prior to Final Plat application.**
- 6. That the Applicant provide a hydraulic study for Staff review prior to Final Plat application.**

Councilmember Oyler reworded Number 6, on the suggestion of Seth Perrins to

- 6. That the applicant provide a riverbank stabilization study to staff for review prior to final plan application.**

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Councilmember Marshall clarified his position, stating that although he had previously supported the higher density for the Creekside Village project, his concerns were less about the number of units and more about the project's frontage design. He explained that he was uncomfortable with homes fronting a high-speed road that functioned more as a highway than a traditional Main Street.

He expressed concern that the site's context, located on the outskirts of Spanish Fork near Salem, felt disconnected from the city's core. In his view, the stretch now flanked by three-story buildings on both sides was fundamentally different from more centralized, walkable areas of the city. While he believed the zoning was appropriate and acknowledged the developer had done the best possible with the site's constraints, he remained uneasy about the street-facing layout. Nonetheless, he accepted the outcome, noting his respect for the broader council decision.

Mark Hampton responded with appreciation for the dialogue, noting the complexity of balancing building heights and layout with the site's challenges. He also pointed out that across the street from the proposed development, a four-story building similarly fronted the road, highlighting that it wasn't an entirely new precedent. He thanked Councilmember Marshall for acknowledging the efforts made to optimize the plan despite the difficult

parameters.

Councilmember Cardon asked Marshall a hypothetical: if the river behind the property weren't a constraint, what design would he have preferred?

Marshall replied that in an ideal scenario, he would have reversed the layout so the backs of the homes faced the road, turning the community inward. He appreciated the internal community spaces in the design but felt the row of homes facing Main Street was visually and socially isolated from the rest of the neighborhood.

Cardon agreed with the concept, acknowledging the idea of neighborhood cohesion and recognizing that future redesign efforts might benefit from that approach.

Mayor Mendenhall thanked the council for the thoughtful discussion and turned briefly to a lighter topic, sharing a local sports update: the Spanish Fork Dons had defeated the Maple Mountain Golden Eagles, advancing in the tournament. This prompted some jovial banter among the council members about past sports predictions and family reactions.

The meeting then transitioned to Item F under the public hearing section, regarding an ordinance to amend Title 15 related to reimbursable projects. Cory Pierce presented the proposal, explaining that it aimed to bring fairness between developers and the city

## **PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **F. Ordinance for the Title 15 Reimbursable Projects**

Mr. Cory Pierce explained that this section of Title 15 pertained to how the city reimbursed developers for impact fee-related projects. He noted that, historically, the city had not allowed reimbursement for design costs incurred by developers, as their contracts typically lumped design with construction costs, making it difficult to itemize eligible expenses.

In contrast, for city-initiated projects, design costs had been more transparently documented and routinely reimbursed from impact fees. Recognizing this imbalance, city staff reviewed the issue and proposed new language, highlighted in red in the draft ordinance, that would allow developers to apply for reimbursement for design costs associated with off-site or system improvements, subject to several conditions:

- The engineering contract must clearly separate design costs from other services.
- The city must be able to review and verify those costs for accuracy and eligibility.

Mr. Pierce emphasized that the amendment was intended to create consistency and fairness in practice. He also clarified that, alternatively, the city could choose to exclude its own design costs from reimbursement, but that approach was not favored. He concluded that the overall impact on impact fees would be minimal, as design costs represented a small percentage of total project costs.

Following Pierce's presentation, the Council voted to enter a public hearing.

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Moved** to go into a public hearing

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

With no comments from public , Mayor Mendenhall asked for a motion to exit the public hearing.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to go out of a public hearing

Councilman Oyler ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** all in favor

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

The Council discussed the item briefly, and with no further questions.

Councilman Tooke ▾ **Moved** to approve the **Ordinance for the Title 15 Reimbursable Projects**

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	No

The Council then moved on to the final new business item: a resolution to adopt a

multi-jurisdictional automatic and mutual aid agreement for fire, EMS, and related emergency services. This agreement involved Spanish Fork City and several neighboring jurisdictions, including Wasatch Fire District, Carbon County, Helper City, Price City, and Utah County.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

#### **A. Resolution to Adopt Multi Jurisdictional Automatic Aid, Mutual Aid, Fire, Training, Emergency Medical, and Other Services Agreement Between Spanish Fork City, Wasatch Fire District, Carbon County, Helper City, Price City, and Utah County**

Eddie Hales addressed the council regarding the multi-jurisdictional automatic aid and mutual aid agreement. He explained that this agreement used identical language to existing agreements already in place among all Utah County fire and EMS agencies. The only difference was that this version extended the agreement's applicability eastward along Highway 6, encompassing areas such as Carbon County, Wasatch County, and Utah County. regions where automatic and mutual aid had traditionally occurred without any formal agreements in place. He emphasized that, despite decades of cooperation, no formal contracts had ever been signed with agencies like Helper City, with its fire chief confirming that no such agreements had been implemented in at least 30 years.

Hales underscored the importance of this agreement in legally safeguarding all participating entities, cities and counties alike, when it comes to sharing resources, coordinating training, and maintaining seamless service across jurisdictional boundaries. He assured the council that all partner agencies were aligned and prepared to approve the agreement on their respective ends. He then formally recommended that the council approve Spanish Fork's adoption of the agreement.

With no further questions from the council a motion was put forth.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to approve the **Resolution to Adopt Multi Jurisdictional Automatic Aid, Mutual Aid, Fire, Training, Emergency Medical, and Other Services Agreement Between Spanish Fork City, Wasatch Fire District, Carbon County, Helper City, Price City, and Utah County**

Councilman Marshall ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote.

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Mayor Mendenhall confirmed the approval of Item B and announced that it concluded the

formal agenda. As there was no need for a closed session. Mayor Mendenhall thanked everyone for their participation and attendance.

Councilman Cardon ▾ **Moved** to approve the **Adjourn**

Mayor Pro Tem Beck ▾ **Seconded** and the motion **Passed** with a roll call vote at pm

Kevin Oyler	Yes
Jesse Cardon	Yes
Stacy Beck	Yes
Landon Tooke	Yes
Shane Marshall	Yes

Attest: May 20, 2025

*I, Tara Silver, City Recorder of Spanish Fork City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate, and complete record of the meeting held on May 20, 2025. This document constitutes the official minutes of the City Council meeting.*



TARA SILVER, CITY RECORDER