

Minutes of the City Council/Redevelopment Agency Joint Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on July 22, 2025 at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 850 0158 5964, in-person in the City Council Conference Room at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

Present: Councilmembers: Brett Cragun  
Jordan Savage  
Paul Watson  
Julie Robertson

Excused: Councilmember Jennifer Carver  
  
Mayor Dave Maughan  
City Manager Brody Bovero  
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

City Employees Present:  
Assistant City Manager Stephen Marshall  
City Attorney Colin Winchester  
Fire Chief Aaron Byington  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson  
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele  
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley  
Communications Specialist Kara Finley  
Building Official Brian Lemmons

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; review recommendation from Planning Commission, General Plan amendment from medium density residential to commercial, and zone change application R-1 to GC, 3400 W. 1700 S.; continued discussion and review of City Land Rental/Lease Policies.; continued discussion for request for consideration of lease of City property for a mobile food operation operated by Amanda and Michael Hildebrand; continued discussion regarding proposed amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code Section 11.20 pertaining to enforcement of parking regulations on State-owned properties; review and discussion of types of permits required in Syracuse City and consideration of proposal to impose a fee for working without a permit; discussion regarding code enforcement ordinances related to business landscaping maintenance standards; discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Syracuse City budget for Fiscal Year (FY) ending June 30, 2026; and consideration of use of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding to widen 1000 West near Antelope Drive.

### **Public comments**

Mayor Maughan recognized the candidates running for the office of City Council were in attendance of the work session meeting. The Mayor asked that they introduce themselves to the Council and the public. Abraham Pollard, Jasmine Martinez, Andrea Brown, and Grechen Ivy Rulan briefly provided information about themselves.

Mark Jensen stated he lives in Layton and spoke to agenda item C2, discussion and review of the City Land Rental/Lease Policies. He asked the Council to consider a specific aspect within the discussion that impacts children. Mr. Jensen stated his daughter and nephew experienced the consequences of a policy gap firsthand; they wanted to set up a lemonade stand within a City park, and they were told they could not set up a lemonade stand without a permit. Mr. Jensen stated the legislature has given guidance under Senate Bill 81 in 2017 and Senate Bill 151 in 2023 regarding this issue. He then spoke to the proposal to restrict sales within 300 feet of the splash pad and stated it makes all of the centennial park and the splashpad off limits to sell anything while allowing commercial vendors right outside the boundary, which is a clear inconsistency especially with the proposed resolution to treat all businesses equally. Mr. Jensen said the City Attorney did create a document which affirmed that the City leases to businesses, and the City has to provide the same opportunities for children without a permit. Mr. Jensen would like to see Syracuse City be a place where all children's entrepreneurial spark is met without a barrier and greeted with an open door.

Makalya Jensen, Dallin (no last name given), and Liam (no last name given) spoke about how setting up a lemonade stand is important to them and it teaches them the responsibilities and the importance of saving money. They also want to donate the money to charities.

Shauna Packer stated her kids want to donate a portion of their earnings from a lemonade stand to St. Jude's hospital. She said her children like to go to the splash pad and she believes allowing her kids to sell lemonade is a good opportunity to

July 22, 2025

teach them how to work hard and save money. She would like the Council to change the policy to allow minors to sell lemonade in City parks.

Nica Avey stated she would like children to be able to sell lemonade and believes it is a great life skill and teaches them hard working abilities and how to problem solve. Ms. Avey stated she believes blocking children from selling lemonade is in defiance of the spirit of the law that already exists and that law passed with unanimous support. She stated surrounding cities have adopted this policy and she believes Syracuse should as well.

Deputy City Recorder Graham read the following written public comment for the record of the meeting:

"Good afternoon Mayor Maughan. As Amanda emailed you, we really want to express our gratitude to you for your stewardship through this process. We will not be able to attend tonight, so I was hoping you might share with the council these words for you and for them. When we came to the city asking to park our trailer at the Museum Parking lot, we were frustrated and admittedly a little bewildered with the lack of success we were having with private or corporate owned areas in Syracuse. Potentially as such a new type of business, it has not caught on yet in our small portion of Davis County like it has in Layton and Farmington. We had no idea that what we perceived as a simple ask would lead to today. It has been amazing seeing the function of local government at work in the discussions, the weighing of options, etc. as this has been considered. I truly wish more people would become more aware of the amazing work happening "behind the scenes". We want to unequivocally say, without knowing the outcomes, that we will move forward with our dream whether mobile in Syracuse or not, leading hopefully to a brick and mortar in our city within a couple of years - we will always first try to be servants and stewards for and to our city in whatever capacity we and our coffee trailer can. Additionally, we want to acknowledge the wheels we set in motion with this ask, and are happy to see and be part of whatever change comes benefiting businesses like ours in the future. A grateful thank you to the city council members, the city employees, and of course you Mr. Mayor, for the thoughtfulness, consideration, and hours put into considering our ask, and however the vote goes, we will always be indebted to the many small acts of kindness shared with us along the way. In closing, we thank you and still hope that in some way, we will be a business operating in Syracuse in the near future - in a parking lot of the city, or a brick and mortar eventually. warmest regards, Mike Hildebrand."

**Planning item C1: Recommendation from Planning Commission:  
General Plan amendment from medium density residential to  
commercial, and zone change application R-1 to GC, 3400 W. 1700 S.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the City has received a rezone and General Plan Map Amendment application from Rick Peterson of FSP10 Sunquest 2, LLC for approximately 1.882 acres located approximately 3400 W 1700 S. The request includes two parcels. The land is owned by FSP10 Sunquest 2 LLC. The applicant provided the following reasons for the requested change: "Rezone to General Commercial to develop a retail center." The property is located west of the Glen Eagle Golf Course Club House and the property includes a single-family home. The south edge of the property has frontage on 1700 S/ Antelope Drive/ SR 127 which is a UDOT state highway. The east edge of the property is an open field, and the west is another single-family home. Land use to the north of the property is the first hole of Glen Eagle Golf Course. South of the property is a large lot single family residential subdivision named Ranchettes West. The current zoning on the parcels is Residential (R-1). The R-1 zone is a single-family zone that allows 2.3 units per acre and a minimum lot size of 12,000 sf. Zoning to the east is already general commercial (GC). Zoning to the west is R-1. Zoning to the south is (R-1) and Neighborhood Services. The property is general planned for 'Medium Density Residential'. General Plan to the north is low density residential. General Plan to the south is low density residential/commercial. General Plan to the east is commercial. General Plan to the west is medium density residential. The requested zoning of GC is not consistent with the general plan as it currently sits. The applicant has applied to amend the General Plan to Commercial which if granted, would then make the zoning congruent with the general plan. As explained in 10.20.070 (D) (3-4), Planning Commission is the advisory body to the City Council for zoning and General Plan map amendments. The Planning Commission is required to hold a public hearing and forward a recommendation to approve, approve with modifications, or deny the request. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on July 1, 2025 and forwarded a recommendation to approve with a vote of 4-1. The City Council will then review the recommendation and make a decision. During the public meeting the City Council can approve, approve with modifications, or deny the proposal. 10.20.070 (E) explains that amendments to the zoning map are matters of legislative discretion by the City Council after considering if the application would be harmonious with the overall character of the existing development, the extent to which it may adversely affect adjacent property, and the adequacy of facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including but not limited to roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water supplies, and waste water and refuse collection.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the proposed zone change and general plan amendments. Mr. Steele explained the landowner is proposing to put in commercial businesses. Mayor Maughan stated that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) has indicated that this road will need to be widened in the future, and Mr. Steele indicated the applicant is aware of that.

The Council felt comfortable with the proposed General Plan amendment and the zone change. The Mayor concluded that this item will move forward to the consent agenda at the August business meeting.

**Planning item C2: Continued discussion/review of City Land Rental/Lease Policies**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development Director (CED) provided a comprehensive analysis of the City's practice of leasing small portions of parking lots to private vendors. The list includes:

- Financial outcomes from three existing City lease arrangements
- Market rate comparisons to similar private-sector leases
- Operational and liability concerns
- A sub-issue relating to occasional businesses operated by young entrepreneurs under Utah law

This information is intended to help the City Council determine whether these leasing activities should be continued, modified, or discontinued. A detailed list is included in the packet.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding whether they wanted to continue leasing property and if so, if the Council could give staff guidance on fees. The Mayor stated he wants the Council to be consistent and over the past few years the City has experienced growing pains, things that were appropriate to a City of 20,000 are no longer appropriate to a City of 40,000 people.

The Mayor asked Parks and Recreation Director Robinson to speak about the impacts to the City and its personnel regarding the leasing of City land. Ms. Robinson explained that safety is an issue that staff continues; she explained there are sports that go on in parks and the safety of children is a concern. She explained there is not sufficient electrical service to support a food truck, and therefore, food trucks would need to provide their own generator, which can contribute to noise complaints and pollution. Ms. Robinson explained when it comes to people selling things within a park, she understands the vendors do their best to clean up, but the people purchasing items move throughout different areas of the park and that contributes to litter. She concluded Utah Code does not allow food or drink within 10 feet of the splash pad, she explained that it can contaminate the water and potentially introduce pests.

High-level discussion between the Mayor, CED Director, Parks and Recreation Director and Council centered around whether the current rental agreements are profitable to the City and if the Council wants to consider allowing businesses to rent out parking lots and adding a protective zone around the splash pad. The Council discussed the Utah Lemonade Stand Law and wanted to discuss it more at the next work session meeting in August. The Council showed support for protecting the splash pad with a protective zone, but they wanted more information on what the market rate pricing would look like for the current businesses leasing from the City.

The Mayor concluded that staff will prepare an ordinance pertaining to a protective zone around the splash pad for the August 12 business meeting. The Mayor asked staff to prepare information for the August work session pertaining to market rate pricing and how that will look for the current businesses leasing from the City.

**Planning item C3: Continued discussion - request for consideration of lease of City property for a mobile food operation operated by Amanda and Michael Hildebrand.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development Director (CED) explained that the City has been approached by Amanda and Michael Hildebrand, owners of Witches Brew Coffee Co. about leasing city owned property for a mobile food operation. In summary, they are requesting to park their enclosed trailer in the museum parking lot to sell coffee year-round. They would like to plug into power, but if not allowable, they would run a generator. They would agree to pay monthly lease payments. In their proposal, there is a graphic showing their desired locations to park the trailer. Their desired locations would occupy about three parking stalls and prefer to park west of the museum building's entrance. Their proposed hours of operation would be weekdays 6 am to 4 pm, weekends 7 am to 1 pm. Also, there would be about an hour setup, and an hour take down before and after those business hours. There are two ordinances that could potentially govern the lease of this city space depending on how the Council interprets the context of the proposal. The first would be ordinance 4.25.160 which requires concession people selling food, drinks, or other items in a park to have a special contract approved by the City. In the consolidated fee schedule, 'Park Land Rental (Concessionaire)' is listed at \$250 per month. Common practice is for the Parks and Recreation Director to approve or deny proposals for concessionaires in parks. In this case, since it was presented to the City Council, it could be approved by the Council instead of the director. The second potential governing ordinance is 13.40.060. This ordinance would be applicable if the Witches Brew proposal was considered to not be a concessionaire renting park land, but a business leasing non-park, city land. The museum parking lot is on the same parcel as Centennial Park, but the exact boundary between the park and museum parking lot could be debated. In this scenario, a lease agreement with the terms and condition of the lease would be required to be presented in a public hearing. The applicant reports that the common industry standard lease rate is around \$750-900 per month.

The Mayor asked the Council if they felt they were at a point for consideration of the proposed lease for a mobile coffee shop. The Council asked to wait until they can see the revisions of the policies for the August 26 work session. The Mayor indicated that this item will be included on the agenda for the August 26 work session meeting for the Council to review following the discussion of the rental/lease of City land.

**Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) item D1: Continued discussion - proposed amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code Section 11.20 pertaining to enforcement of parking regulations on State-owned properties.**

A staff memo from the City Attorney Winchester explained this proposal originally arose because of a proposed agreement with UDOT that will require the City to maintain two park-n-ride lots along the West Davis Corridor. Among other things, the City will be responsible for parking enforcement in those two lots. The City's current parking ordinances address parking in rights-of-way and city parks, but do not address parking on other public property. The proposed amendments will apply to "public property," a term defined in the proposal to include all property owned, leased, controlled or maintained by the City. If the agreement with UDOT is signed, the UDOT-owned park-n-ride lots will be controlled and maintained by the City and thus become "public property" for purposes of the parking ordinance. The proposed ordinance also broadly defines the term "vehicle" for purposes of the parking ordinance. The proposed ordinance includes a few dozen grammatical improvements, clarifications, etc.

Mayor Maughan reviewed the staff memo, and the Council briefly discussed the proposed amendments. The Council felt comfortable with the proposed amendments and the Mayor indicated this item will move to the consent agenda at the August business meeting.

**Review and discussion of types of permits required in Syracuse City and consideration of proposal to impose a fee for working performed without a permit.**

A staff memo from Administration explained that the City requires building permits to be obtained prior to commencing various types of construction. This practice is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of our residents. Building permits are generally required for any work that alters a building's structure, systems, or use, as well as for new construction. Common examples include new construction (homes, garages, sheds), additions, remodels, decks, and work on electrical, plumbing, or mechanical systems. Included in the list are water heater replacements. Improper installation of a water heater, particularly a gas water heater, can lead to significant risks, including gas leaks, carbon monoxide poisoning, fires, explosions, and water damage. Even electric water heaters pose risks like electrical shocks and fires if not installed correctly. The building permitting process involves reviewing plans prior to construction and conducting inspections throughout the process. Without doubt, these requirements have prevented loss of life and property. Title 9 of the Syracuse Municipal Ordinance governs the city's Building Department. Chapter 9.05.030 says, "Building permit fees, plan review fees, and inspection fees shall be established by the City Council and adopted by resolution from time to time." Sections 9.15.010 through 9.15.060 explains that the city has adopted the International Building Code, Uniform Plumbing Code, National Electrical Code, Uniform Mechanical Code and Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings. Ordinance 9.05.090 explains that penalties for not complying with the building regulations can be imposed. Penalties may include class B misdemeanor, recording a notice of violation on the property's title, closing a building to occupancy, and/or impose civil fines or fees. The Consolidated Fee Schedule enumerates building-related fees including plan check fees and inspection fees. Currently, under the Public Works fines, there is a line item for "Construction Activity Without a Permit when required" set at \$100 per incident. During the July 8 meeting, it was proposed to increase this fine to \$500 for the 1st incident and \$1,000 each additional incident. It is anticipated that this fine would most commonly be imposed to commercial companies caught replacing a roof, or perhaps a water heater without getting the required permits even though they know they should.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained that this discussion item pertains to contractors performing work that needs to be inspected, and the contractors know that a permit and inspection is needed. Building Official Brian Lemons explained that a homeowner can do any work in their home, and they would need a permit, or a homeowner can hire a contractor to do the work, and the contractor would then get a permit. Mr. Lemmons explained the issue his department is currently seeing is that contractors are either not getting permits or if they do, they are not having their work inspected and that negatively impacts the homeowners.

Councilmember Watson asked how many water heater and furnace replacement permits the City issues yearly and if everyone gets a permit when they are required to for replacement of those, can the City accommodate that many. CED Director Steele provide the permit numbers to the Council for the month of May.

Councilmember Savage expressed concern regarding emergencies or after-hour replacements of water heaters and furnaces. CED Director Steele explained there are provisions for that, and the homeowner can take care of the issues and then get a permit after.

The Mayor and CED Director facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the proposed fee for working without a permit and the importance of inspections for building permits. Mr. Steele explained that the fines are at the discretion of the Building Official and Mr. Lemmons does not fine the homeowner if they were not aware a permit was required. Fines largely pertain to contractors that know better and choose not to get a permit. The Council recommended that the City post educational information about building inspections and the importance of permits and inspections on social media and in the newsletter.

The Mayor concluded that staff will work on getting information to the public regarding building inspections and additionally staff will revise the fees and outline a fine for working without a permit and working without a license for a contractor. This information will be included on the agenda for the Council to take action on at the August 12 business meeting.

### **Discussion regarding code enforcement ordinances related to business landscaping maintenance standards.**

A staff memo from Administration explained that Councilmember Savage has requested this discussion item following complaints about the maintenance and upkeep of commercial properties. Complaints include dead grass, exposed weed barrier, dying plants and a general lack of maintenance of many private commercial properties around town. Chapter 6 in the Syracuse Municipal Ordinance concerning property maintenance says that weeds/grasses are required to be cut down to six inches. It also says that property owners are required to remove dead trees that are a hazard to public or private property. The city can abate only for those two reasons.

*6.10.030 Weed control. - (A) Premises. It is unlawful for any owner, occupant, agent, and/or lessee of real property in the City to fail to maintain the height of weeds and grasses, in the manner provided herein, on such property, or to fail to remove from the property any cuttings from such weeds or grasses. (C) Weed Control Specifications. (1) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (C)(2) of this section, weeds and grasses shall be maintained at a height of not more than six inches at all times,*

*6.10.060 Dead or diseased trees located on private property. - It shall be unlawful for the owner or occupant of any real property to keep dead or diseased trees that constitute a hazard to public or adjacent private property*

Chapter 10 includes many requirements about how landscaping needs to be installed upon completion of a new project. It says that improvements shall be maintained in a neat and attractive manner. Unfortunately, 'neat and attractive' is a bit of a subjective statement that is difficult to enforce.

*10.20.090 Site plan review. (2) All improvements shown on the approved site plan or amended site plan shall be maintained in a neat and attractive manner.*

The ordinance does not reference bark mulch replenishing, green grass, planting flowers, sprucing up, or making things look nice in general. As an idea, Clinton uses their RDA funds for the hanging flower baskets. Syracuse could use their RDA funds to fund a similar program. Use of RDA funds requires approval from the RDA board, which is also the City Council. Currently, there is a request to use RDA funds for a transportation project. Because of the high dollar amount for transportation projects, using the RDA funds for such projects may quickly deplete the funds, leaving insufficient funds for aesthetic type projects such as this.

### **Consolidated Fee Schedule**

The code enforcement fine section of the consolidated fee schedule includes a \$100 noncompliance fee of \$100 per incident. It also allows for charging abatement contractor costs along with an additional administrative fee.

The Mayor and CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a high-level discussion that centered around minimum landscaping requirements or maintaining the landscaping per the site plan, and whether the City wanted to use RDA funds to incentivize businesses to maintain landscaping. Councilmember Weston expressed concern regarding the City possibly changing the ordinance and requiring businesses to change their landscaping. Councilmember Watson said a struggling business may not be able to afford to put in new landscaping and suggested a very minimal standard such as mulch. The CED Director indicated he had enough information from the Council regarding a minimum landscaping standard and can work on the revisions to present back to Council at the August work session meeting.

The Mayor concluded that staff will work on the first draft of this ordinance and have that ready for the Council to review at the August 26 work session meeting.

### **Discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Syracuse City budget for the Fiscal Year (FY) ending June 30, 2026.**

A staff memo from the Assistant City Manager Marshall explained that the City has two items that are time-sensitive that staff would like the council to consider in an upcoming budget opening. Staff would like to have the discussion now and get authorization to move forward as soon as possible.

**Fire Engine Purchase** - Syracuse Fire currently has a fire engine on order with Pierce Manufacturing with an anticipated delivery date in late FY27. With the opening of Station #32, we need a reserve engine to fill the gap until the delivery of our new engine. We have an opportunity to purchase a 1996 Pierce Engine (refurbished in 2016) from South Davis Metro Fire Department that can be used as a reserve/training engine. The cost of the engine with

equipment will be \$40,000. The purchased equipment will be transferred to the new engine, reducing the cost of equipment needed in FY27. We had savings from our FY2025 capital projects budget that could be used to pay for this engine.

**Public Works Precast Concrete wall** – Woodside Homes is building homes directly east of the public works building. They are required to install vinyl fencing on the backside of those homes bordering the public works yard. In lieu of installing the fence, we have an agreement in which they will give us \$17,340 to go towards a precast concrete wall to match the wall that surrounds the rest of our public works yard. The estimated cost to install the precast concrete wall is \$145,000. This expense could be funded by savings in the capital projects fund from FY2025.

Assistant City Manager Marshall reviewed his staff memo and explained that typically staff will recommend a budget opening in September or October once the fiscal year has ended. Mr. Marshall briefly reviewed the two time-sensitive items and explained these items will appear on a budget opening at the October business meeting.

The Council showed support for this matter and the Mayor concluded that staff could proceed and these items will be included in a budget opening at the October business meeting for Council to take action on.

**Consideration of use of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding to widen 1000 West near Antelope Drive.**

A staff memo from Administration explained that the traffic volumes at 1000 West near Antelope Drive have increased, impacting the level of service with longer wait times and accidents. A simple concept plan has been included in the packet to consider possible improvements that could be made to improve traffic handling and safety measures. Nothing in this concept plan is absolute. It is only a simple exhibit for discussion.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained the City has RDA funds that could help with the traffic volumes at the intersection of 1000 West. The Council briefly discussed this item, and they felt comfortable with the proposed road widening. The Public Works Director Whiteley stated staff is recommending having a third-party engineering firm complete the preliminary design, cost estimate, and an environmental study.

The Mayor indicated this can move forward with preliminary approval and this item will come back to an RDA business meeting at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

---

Dave Maughan  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: August 12, 2025