



MINUTES – Planning Commission

Thursday, July 10, 2025

City of Saratoga Springs City Offices

1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER - 6:00 p.m. by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

1. **Pledge of Allegiance** - led by Commissioner Charlie Carn.
2. **Roll Call** – A quorum was present

Present:

Commission Members: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Charlie Carn, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, Doug Willden.

Staff: Mark Christensen, City Manager; Sarah Carroll, Planning Director; Ken Young, Community Development Director; Rulon Hopkins, Assistant City Attorney; Jeff Pearson, Engineer; David Jellen, Senior Planner; Gina Grandpre, Senior Planner; Austin Roy, Senior Planner; Tippe Morlan, Senior/Long-Range Planner; Kendal Black, Planner II; Joel Temple, Planner I; Wendy Wells, Deputy Recorder.

Others: Dan Garcia, Melodie Waldron, Leon Waldron, Kim Wiseman.

Excused: Commissioner Jack K. Mangum.

3. **Public Input** - Public input was opened by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns. Receiving no public comment, the public input was closed by the Chair.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. **The Break Site Plan Amendment located at 127 W. Lake Dr. Brian Gabler as applicant. Item presented by Senior Planner Gina Grandpre.** The applicant is requesting approval for a major site plan amendment for Lot 611 of Saratoga Springs Commercial Plat F, located at 127 W. Lake Drive. The proposal includes a ~1,600 sq. ft. enclosed patio addition on the north side of the building, to be used by The Break Sports Grill. Current tenants include The Break Sports Grill and Einstein's Bagels.

Dan Garcia, a co-owner of The Break was in attendance to answer questions.

Commissioner Willden asked if there was another tenant that could potentially change the need for parking.

Senior Planner Gina Grandpre explained it had originally been slated for multi-tenants, but The Break had the majority of the space. She said they met (and even exceeded) the parking requirement.

Commissioner Carn received clarification that the parking for The Break would comply with the parking amendment that had come before Planning Commission on June 26th.

Commissioner Miles asked about the pending ordinance in Public Hearing Item 2, and received clarification that there would not be a problem for The Break site plan amendment because there was not an elevation change, and it was not next to residential.

Commissioner Hill noted that the hours of the other business did not conflict with the Break's business hours, and did not cause any issues with parking.

Commissioner Carn received clarification that there was not a current parking problem; the business was required to have 41 parking stalls, and they have 80.

Planning Director Sarah Carroll advised that the parking lot was sometimes busy in the evenings, but there had been no complaints, and as noted earlier, the other business was not open in the evenings.

Motion made by Commissioner Hill that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval of the requested major site plan amendment for Saratoga Springs Commercial Plat F Lot 611, located at 127 W. Lake Drive, with the Findings and Conditions in the Staff Report. Seconded by Commissioner Mann.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Charlie Carn, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, Doug Willden.

No: None.

Absent: Jack K. Mangum.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

2. Approval of Minutes: June 26, 2025.

Motion made by Commissioner Willden to approve the minutes of June 26, 2025. Seconded by Commissioner Miles.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Charlie Carn, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, Doug Willden.

No: None.

Absent: Jack K. Mangum.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Beacon Pointe Village 8 – Porter Haven, located approximately at Ensign Dr. and Mountain View Corridor. Ryan Bull as applicant. Senior Planner Gina Grandpre presented the item. This is a 45.9-acre development within the Beacon Pointe Community Plan in Saratoga Springs. As outlined in the Community Plan, it includes 187 residential units over 45.9 acres, yielding a density of approximately 4.2 dwelling units per acre. The development incorporates a mix of traditional single-family detached homes and attached townhomes. Approximately 2.5 acres (5.44%) is designated as open space.

Senior Planner Gina Grandpre explained the item was requested to be tabled because there were some changes that the applicant wanted to make.

Public Hearing Open by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

Melodie and Leon Waldron of Saratoga Springs expressed concern about current traffic levels that were already heavy, and with the new schools slated in the area, the congestion may be too much. They felt development should be held off until roads and schools could catch up. They were concerned about safety, and wondered what the road plans were for the growth that had already been planned.

Public Hearing Closed by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

Commissioners thanked Melodie and Leon Waldron for attending and participating in the Public Hearing, and let them know how the meeting would be noticed in the future when Beacon Pointe Village 8 was on the agenda again. They advised on how to access upcoming Planning Commission packets, and also let them know that the current City Road plans could be found on the City website.

Motion made by Commissioner Hill to table Beacon Pointe Village Plan 8, located approximately at Ensign Drive and Mountain View Corridor to a later date when the packet is ready. Seconded by Commissioner Willden.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Charlie Carn, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, Doug Willden.

No: None.

Absent: Jack K. Mangum.

Motion passed 6- 0.

2. Amendments to Title 19 Land Development Code of the City of Saratoga Springs for Grading Buffer, Chapter 19.09 – Off-Street Parking and Chapter 19.16 – Site and Architectural Design Standards. City-wide. City Initiated. Item presented by Senior Planner David Jellen. The proposed code amendments establish a setback requirement where drive-thru lanes are proposed adjacent to existing residential development (Chapter 19.09). Additionally, the proposed code amendments include requirements for a new buffer for proposed nonresidential developments that will be at a higher grade than adjacent existing residential development (Chapter 19.16).

Public Hearing Open by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns. Receiving no public comment, the Public Hearing was closed by the Chair.

Chair Sprosty Burns asked why the amendment was written specifically for existing residential. She wondered if there had been discussion to have it apply to any construction that would be next to a residential area. She felt that future residents should be protected too.

Senior Planner David Jellen responded that it was to provide protection for existing development where a property owner had built a home, and had no idea what was going to be built next to them.

Commissioner Hill was pleased with the amendment, and expressed appreciation for the Planning Department's due diligence.

Commissioner Miles asked if the amendment would help with any existing issues.

City Manager Mark Christensen advised that when an application was received by the City from an applicant, they would be subject to the code in effect at that time, and was not retroactive.

Commissioner Willden received clarification that Staff had worked hard to keep criteria consistent under the buffer section in the Staff Report so applicants would receive consistent treatment by the Land Use Authority.

Commissioner Carn asked about some areas that had existing issues, and wanted some understanding about physical separations, and exceptions listed in the Staff Report. He also received clarification that the drive-thru restriction was not retroactive.

Senior Planner David Jellen noted there could be an exception to the buffer requirement if a non-residential development was separated from an existing residential area by something, such as a canal or power line.

Chair Sprosty Burns thought the amendment wording should be changed to “any residential” areas, and not just “existing residential” areas. She felt the City had an obligation to help alleviate setback or buffering problems, and make things more beautiful. She felt changing the wording could protect the final end product.

Commissioner Willden was uncomfortable with changing the wording, and wanted to further the discussion.

Commissioner Carn posed a question asking if there could be potential issues in those instances where commercial was built first. He wondered if it might be hard to know the final grade in those situations, and also suggested that the grade could end up being such that compliance would not have even been necessary.

Senior Planner David Jellen advised that the City had screening requirements currently in the code for commercial that may be adjacent to residential, but Staff had been concerned it wasn't enough for some of the existing situations, and the amendment was to protect existing residents.

City Manager Mark Christensen also pointed out that zoning could change, and resources could have been expended that did not need to be.

Chair Sprosty Burns felt that part of the job as a Planning Commissioner was to plan and think ahead to help residents. She was concerned that not every resident would have full awareness of where they may be buying a home, so she leaned toward a protectionist view.

Commissioner Miles asked if an applicant would be able to come back and comply with requirements at a later date if they were not certain of their project.

City Manager Mark Christensen advised that it would be really hard to bond for something that was uncertain or could be a future eventuality.

Commissioner Carn received clarification that based on the slopes of our city, setback and buffer issues were likely to arise again.

Commissioner Willden felt it was important to be fair to the developer, and recognize they may not have been expecting additional expenses.

Motion made by Commissioner Carn that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval of the requested code amendments to Chapters 19.09 and 19.16, with the Findings and Conditions in the Staff Report. Seconded by Commissioner Mann.

Yes: Charlie Carn, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, Doug Willden.

No: Rachel Sprosty Burns.

Absent: Jack K. Mangum.

Motion passed 5 - 1.

Chair Sprosty Burns explained that her vote was because she felt that the Planning Commission had a duty to both existing and future residents.

REPORTS

1. **Commission Comments.** Commissioner Hill explained that APA was meeting on Tuesday, August 19th from 12 pm-1 pm, and Saratoga Springs would be presenting on the development of the downtown area. It would be a good opportunity to participate, but would not count toward training hours.
2. **Director's Report.** – Planning Director Sarah Carroll advised of upcoming agenda items and recent City Council actions. She also reminded Commissioners that the next meeting would be July 31st.
3. **Transportation Update and City Manager Discussion.** – City Manager Mark Christensen gave an update on transportation. He recounted the history of road construction in Saratoga Springs, beginning in 2010. He summarized many of the current road projects, and explained the information could be found on the City website. He also reviewed future road construction projects.

Planning Commissioners discussed:

- Public Transportation.
- Transparency of information for future road projects.
- Traffic calming measures.
- Staff efforts to create good long-range plans.
- Managing growth and infrastructure.

CLOSED SESSION

Possible motion to enter into closed session – No closed session was held.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned Without Objection 8:12 p.m. by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

7/31/2025
Date of Approval

Wendy L. Wulf
Deputy City Recorder



Rachel Burns
Planning Commission Chair