



MINUTES – Planning Commission

Thursday, February 12, 2026

City of Saratoga Springs City Offices

319 S. Saratoga Road, 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 Miles.
2. **Roll Call** - A quorum was present.

Present:

Commission Members: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

Staff: David Jellen, Senior Planner; Joel Temple, Planner I; Scott Petrik, Engineer; Nicolette Fike, City Recorder; AnnElise Harrison, Public Relations Manager; Wendy Wells, Deputy Recorder.

Others: Emily Pulham, Frank Pulley, Victoria Leota.

Excused: Doug Willden.

3. **Public Input** - Public input was opened by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

Emily Pulham, resident of Saratoga Springs, said she lived south of the new High school, and had been carefully observing the school construction. She expressed that safety was her main concern, and she was worried that bike lanes might be adjacent to vehicular traffic on Bonneville, Ensign Drive and Hallmark Drive with student drivers and parent drop-offs. She felt it was very important to have separated paths, rather than painted bike lanes next to vehicles to provide safety and reduce congestion. She also thought it would be good to incorporate some good walking paths to the new school.

Public Input Closed by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

Commissioner Colton Miles explained a potential conflict of interest and recused himself from Business Item 1, and left City Council Chambers.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. **High School 722 Preliminary Plat and Site Plan located at approximately NW corner of Ensign Drive and Mountain View Corridor. Frank Pulley of Alpine School District as applicant.**

Senior Planner David Jellen presented the item. The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary plat and site plan for a new high school. The total area that is being platted is 177.87 acres, though the new high school site encompasses a total of 61.56 acres. The high school site will consist of the new 391,000 square-foot building, with a projected enrollment of 2,000 students, in addition to 1,276 parking stalls and various sports fields, as shown on the site plan (Exhibit 5). The construction of the school site will include the extension and construction of several new roads, with access from Mountain View Corridor.

Applicant Frank Pulley was in attendance to answer questions.

Commissioner Hill received clarification that the remainder of the property outside of the 61.56 acres for the school was owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and the applicant was not aware of what the plans were for that acreage.

Commissioner Hill appreciated the comments made by Ms. Pulham during Public Input. He felt if there was anything that could be done to help with the bike paths, every effort should be made to install them in such a way to be safe in every aspect providing protection to the children of Saratoga Springs.

Commissioner Mann agreed with Commissioner Hill and Ms. Pulham about the safety concerns that were brought up regarding bike paths and she felt some excellent suggestions had been made to maintain safety.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns received clarification regarding the following items related to parking:

- There were approximately 900 parking stalls at Westlake High School, and 1276 parking stalls planned at the new high school.
- The new high school was slated to be about 20,000 square feet larger than Westlake High School, but did not provide more classroom space; the design was different with more circulation and mechanical space.
- The new high school would be designed to accommodate approximately 2000 students.
- Much of the land surrounding the school would be part of the District Area Plan (DAP), and would be a mix of planned community and low density.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns felt it was really important to have great walking paths, great scooter paths and great biking paths. She was hopeful those would all be part of the plan, and asked if the City would be looking at adding additional lanes for any of those things.

Senior Planner David Jellen responded that there were discussions happening with the Trails Master Plan.

Engineer Scott Petrik advised the applicant would need to meet City Codes and standards regarding bike lanes and sidewalks, and currently they would be alongside of Bonneville Drive and Ensign Drive and were not planned to be separated. He explained that the applicant could choose to do something different than what was currently planned. He also noted that there was no designed connection from Mountain View Corridor or the trail running along it into the school yard.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns felt that safety and good trail systems should be a top priority. She was most concerned about trails that would access the school property, rather than the trails on school property.

Commissioner Rather received clarification that schools do have to meet City Codes and Standards; and there would likely be minimal changes, but there was still some discussion happening.

Commissioner Mann was concerned the City standards might not be high enough to provide adequate safety, specifically regarding the bike lanes. She asked the applicant to consider the comments made by Ms. Pulham and the Planning Commission, and suggested that the highest level of safety should be contemplated when planning a high school.

Motion made by Commissioner Hill to forward a recommendation for approval of the requested Preliminary Plat and Site Plan for the Alpine School District High School 722, located at the northwest corner of Ensign Drive and Mountain View Corridor, with the Findings and Conditions in the Staff Report. Seconded by Commissioner Mann.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

No: None.

Absent: Doug Willden.

Recused: Colton Miles.

Motion passed 5 - 0.

Commissioner Colton Miles rejoined the Planning Commission meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes: January 29, 2026.

Motion made by Commissioner Miles to approve the minutes of January 29, 2026. Seconded by Commissioner Hill.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

No: None.

Absent: Doug Willden.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Amendments to Title 19 Land Development Code of the City of Saratoga Springs, Chapter 19.18 – Sign Regulations. City-wide City Initiated. Planner II Sam Stout and Code Compliance Inspector Manny Monroy.**

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

The item was not presented, but will be presented at a later date.

Motion made by Commissioner Hill to delay the amendments to Title 19 – Land Development Code of the City of Saratoga Springs, Chapter 19.18 – Sign Regulations Citywide, City-initiated to a later date under the direction of Staff. Seconded by Commissioner Miles.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

No: None.

Absent: Doug Willden.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

2. **Amendments to Title 19 Land Development Code of the City of Saratoga Springs, Chapter 19.09 – Off-Street Parking. City-wide City Initiated.**

Planner I Joel Temple presented the item. This is a staff-initiated code amendment to define development standards for the provision of bicycle parking including design standards and parking ratios. He presented best practices, and gave examples of where bike parking might be needed. He also explained the differences between short term and long-term bike parking.

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

Commissioner Mann really liked the idea. She wondered if the number listed for required stalls for a store like Smith's might be too high.

Commissioner Rather also really liked the idea. He wanted to know if it would alter vehicular parking or if there could be any parking reductions.

Planner I Joel Temple responded that parking reduction language had not been added, but was something that could be looked at. He mentioned that he'd seen a typical reduction standard of one car stall for every six stalls of bicycle parking, and a one for one reduction for every long-term bicycle stall that was provided.

Commissioner Hill shared he was from the Pacific Northwest, and was familiar with a big focus on walking and biking, and felt it was a really good idea to put effort into providing good biking and walking paths. He thought it could provide the younger population with some options, rather than driving vehicles, and could potentially help reduce some of the road congestion.

Commissioner Miles thought the presentation was very clear and helpful. He asked if the amendment was proposed new language for City code for new construction, or if it would be retroactive.

Planner I Joel Temple advised it would be for new construction going forward, but if any existing pads were to apply for a change of use with a new tenant, then it would apply.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns received clarification that there was not typically a cost for the long-term bike storage, and employers usually provided it as an amenity and an incentive to use bicycles in place of their cars.

She was concerned that a fee could be charged and did not feel that would be a good idea. She asked about long-term parking at Park and Ride facilities.

Planner I Joel Temple clarified that Park and Ride Facilities such as a Bust Rapid Transit (BRT) had much higher parking requirements.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns thought that some language should be added regarding any fees or costs associated with using bike parking or long-term bike storage.

Senior Planner David Jellen advised that Legal may need to provide input for language additions.

Planner I Joel Temple explained that there was a condition in section 19.09.11 (4) listed in the redlines in the Staff Report regarding a requirement for shower facilities and lockers in buildings larger than 25,000 square feet, and were primarily provided for employee use. He advised that Commissioners would need to make a selection, and choose if that should be included or not.

Commissioners Sprosty Burns and Hill liked the idea, but thought the condition requiring showers and lockers was a little premature, and felt it might be asking too much.

Commissioner Rather felt the condition could actually be really useful and suggested taking another look at the thresholds. He pointed out that people don't always see the value in something when they're not familiar with it or haven't experienced it before, but he was not certain the City is ready to add that to the Code at this time.

Commissioner Miles wondered if it was possible to move it forward without requiring a decision on the shower and locker condition. He asked if there could be more information and data provided before deciding that part of it. He thought it would be good to consider if there could be liability issues as well.

Commissioner Roman noted that he was aware of some companies that had provided facilities with showers and lockers for employees, and he felt they could be very helpful, particularly for those working double shifts. He said he would like to see the cost impact, but felt like it could be beneficial.

Motion made by Commissioner Hill that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval of the requested Code Amendment, with the Findings and Conditions in the Staff Report, and selecting "Shall Not" for condition #4, and that long-term City bike parking shall not have a fee. Seconded by Commissioner Mann.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

No: None.

Absent: Doug Willden.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

3. Amendments to Title 19 Land Development Code of the City of Saratoga Springs, Chapter 19.08 – Home Occupations. City-wide City Initiated.

Planner I Joel Temple presented the item. This is a staff-initiated code amendment to define consistent performance standards for all home businesses and promote equitable opportunities for residents. He clarified that businesses were required to renew their business licenses annually. However, if there had been any changes to the nature of the business beyond what was originally approved, the business would be required to submit a new application for review and approval rather than simply completing a standard renewal.

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

Commissioner Hill felt the amendment would provide economic growth and flexibility. He was concerned about larger vehicles parked on streets that were not designed for it, and received clarification regarding business parking and work vehicles.

Senior Planner David Jellen explained the process of applying for a home occupation permit, and that it is in conjunction with the business license application. He advised that the home occupation permit did not need to be reapplied for annually like the business license did, unless the business had changed or expanded.

Commissioner Rather received clarification about the approval process, and that Home Occupations Class I and II were handled administratively, while Home Occupations Class III were required to come before Planning Commission as the approving body.

Commissioner Miles had a concern about parking and wondered why curbs near stop signs and hydrants were no longer painted red.

Engineer Scott Petrik informed Commissioners the City did not paint curbs red as a general practice and used “No Parking” signs instead, but State Code restricted parking in front of hydrants so it would be enforceable.

Commissioner Rather asked how many Home Occupation applications had been submitted.

Planner I Joel Temple provided insight and stated he had personally reviewed approximately 20 applications this last year, but had to deny several of them due to the requirement for Home Occupations Class II and III only being allowed in single-family homes. However, because multiple planners were responsible for reviewing those applications, an exact total of applications received could not be provided at that time.

Commissioner Hill received clarification regarding what would qualify as a Home Occupation.

Commissioner Sprosty Burns was concerned that City requirements did not match what State Licensing required. She felt that if they matched, it could provide more safety.

Planner I Joel Temple explained that there was a registry of all childcare providers in the State and he had matched those to the City’s approved Home Occupations, and found that all but one had the higher tier of licensing. He noted that the way the Home Occupation code was written did not allow the City to require that higher standard, but he said it could be looked at.

Commissioner Roman asked if there was a baseline for the traffic increase. He wondered what was meant by minimal traffic and how that could be gauged.

Planner I Joel Temple advised the City did not require a professional traffic engineer’s plan, and explained the process for reviewing the traffic plans for Home Occupations.

Commissioner Hill shared that he thought there had been three or four daycares come before the Planning Commission in the last 8 months. He explained that the Planning Commission had really looked at the number of children, and had looked carefully at the traffic pattern created, and how the drop-offs and pick-ups had been staggered.

Motion made by Commissioner Mann that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval of the proposed Code Amendment, with the Findings and Conditions in the Staff Report. Seconded by Commissioner Roman.

Yes: Rachel Sprosty Burns, Scott A. Hill, Virginia Rae Mann, Colton Miles, NH Rather, Chris Roman.

No: None.

Absent: Doug Willden.

Motion passed 6 - 0.

REPORTS

1. **Commission Comments.** Commissioner Sprosty Burns advised that she would be absent from the next Planning Commission meeting on March 12th.
2. **Director’s Report.** – Senior Planner David Jellen advised of upcoming agenda items and recent City Council actions.

CLOSED SESSION

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

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned Without Objection at 7:30 p.m. by Chair Rachel Sprosty Burns.

02.26.2026
Date of Approval
Mandy Welf
Deputy City Recorder



[Signature]
Planning Commission Chair