

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council and Planning Commission
Joint Meeting Minutes
August 30, 2016
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Lynn Walker

Planning Commission: Jennifer Baptista
Matt Nydegger
Drew Armstrong
Scott Richards
Peter Steele
Lisa Coombs
Amy Cardon

Staff Present: Denise Roy, Finance Director
Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech
Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Mario Gonzalez, Staff Engineer
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
Daniel Cardenas, City Planner

EXCUSED:

Council Member: Eric Jensen

The City Council and Staff met at the Fox Hollow Golf Course, 1400 North 200 East, American Fork, Utah, 84003.

1) Introduction.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, introduced the layout of tonight's program. He

explained that in creating a list of both worries and wishes for the community, they will identify as a group which issues are the main talking points and should thus be prioritized. He continued that the current City's General Plan has a vision statement that addresses the organization of Pleasant Grove City; however, it does not necessarily speak to the community. Therefore, as a group they will identify key elements to be included in the General Plan Vision Statement. Afterwards, there will be a breakout session during which the entire group will be divided into four subgroups to discuss specific areas within the City. Each subgroup will assess two different areas of focus, and subsequently report their findings back to the group.

Director Young explained that the City went through a comprehensive process of developing the General Plan in 2007. A public survey was taken in 2011 with the intent of updating the General Plan at that time. There were, however, several issues that arose through that surveying process, and a comprehensive update did not occur. Minor revisions were made in 2013, 2014, and 2015; however, staff felt that it is now time for the City to undergo more comprehensive revisions.

Director Young stated that the value of the General Plan is as only as good as the support it receives from the City. He reviewed the discussion that took place during the Joint Planning Commission and City Council Meeting held on June 29, 2016, at which time there was discussion regarding General Plan objectives the City could pursue. Those objectives were identified as follows:

- Simplify goals and make the General Plan more of a Vision Statement and less specific.
- Focus on key elements required by the State, such as land use, transportation, and housing.
- Create a one-page summary of the General Plan Vision.
- Hold an annual review of the General Plan.

2) Worries and Wishes.

Director Young asked the participants to identify the concerns they have about the future of Pleasant Grove. The following areas of concern were identified: money, roads, water, build out, green space, quality of life (live, work, play), library, high-density housing, economic development, downtown, staffing (including retention), earthquakes and natural disasters (as well as the City's ability to recover from such events), park upgrades and maintenance, promotions (events), public safety, cooperation from other cities, general infrastructure, and miscellaneous transportation needs.

Director Young asked participants to identify the wishes they have for the future of Pleasant Grove. He asked participants to identify areas of improvement as if money was no object. The participants identified the following hypothetical situations and areas for improvement: new and/or upgraded facilities, quality roads, a Pleasant Grove NFL team, big box retail stores (such as Costco), and secondary water meters.

3) Top Issues.

Director Young read through each of the issues that were identified by meeting participants. The top three issues were narrowed down as follows:

- Money – Money was voted as a top issue by 21 participants.
- Roads, Water and Infrastructure – Roads, Water and Infrastructure were voted as a top issue by 21 participants.
- Quality of Life – Quality of Life was voted as one of the top issues by most participants.
- Economic Development – Economic Development was voted as one of the top issues by most participants.

Other issues from the aforementioned list were also reviewed and each received a handful of votes with regard to their level of importance.

4) Vision Statement Elements.

Director Young asked participants to consider which key words or elements should be included in the General Plan Vision Statement. The following suggestions were made: safe, sustainable, financially responsible, maintain, traditions, heritage, viable, welcoming, family-friendly, schools, open space, opportunity, outdoor recreation, trails.

5) Tables – Mapping Exercise – Post-it Notes, Markers.

Note: Meeting participants divided into subgroups to discuss the following areas within the City.

- a) **Commercial Areas: The Grove, Commercial Retail, Industrial**
- b) **Downtown Village Zone**
- c) **Residential Areas: Low, Medium, High Density, East Bench**
- d) **Very Low Density Residential**

6) Issues and Goals Discussions.

Director Young explained that each group was assigned two specific issues to address. He noted that a copy of the existing General Plan and overall goals from Chapter 1 were available for review. The Commercial Planning Districts in the Land Use Chapter of the General Plan were also available as a reference to participants. He asked the subgroups to consider whether the City should continue planning in each of the respective areas listed below. It was noted that each table contained additional suggestions for participants to consider throughout the exercise. He asked participants to address as many items as possible in relation to their respective topics, which were outlined below.

Director Young made additional assignments, based on the top issues identified earlier. The “Red” Group was asked to address money (revenues and expenditures). The “Blue” Group was asked to address roads, water, infrastructure and transportation. The “Green” Group was asked to address quality of life. The “Yellow” Group was asked to address economic development. Director Young explained that the goal of the exercise is to create verbiage that will help the City create goals within the General Plan.

7) Report Discussion Results.

a) Red Group:

Attorney Petersen stated that the “Red” Group was asked to determine whether the mixed sub-uses in the Grove Zone were satisfactory. She noted that they were of the opinion these uses were satisfactory. Next, they were asked to assess whether the City should change the BMP Zone to the Grove and MD Zones. The “Red” Group determined that the BMP is supposed to be a buffer zone, as it abuts the Grove Commercial area therefore they recommended keeping it. However, they suggested reviewing the landscaping requirements for possible changes that could be made.

With regard to low density residential, the “Red” Group suggested removing the R1-20 option out of the “Very Low Density” section of the General Land Use Map. This change would reflect the Council’s policy to keep the rural fell in the north area of the City and clarify the process for developers wanting to change a zone from R-R to R1-20 in that area. Director Young stated that the area between 1800 North and 2600 North is considered part of the Very Low Density area, where there is a significant amount of R1-20 zoning. He suggested that they keep this area designated as Very Low Density and designate the area above 2600 North as Rural Density. Attorney Petersen agreed that would be a good change to the plan.

Last, the “Red” Group determined that there are too many commercial planning districts and suggested simplifying them.

- i. Land Uses
- ii. Other Issues

Note: The “Red” Group was comprised of the following individuals: Mayor Daniels, Council Member Walker, Commissioner Cardon, Commissioner Nydegger, and Attorney Petersen.

b) Yellow Group:

- i. Economic Development
- ii. Downtown

Note: The “Yellow” Group consisted of the following individuals: Council Member Andersen, Commissioner Armstrong, Commissioner Coombs, Administrator Darrington, Assistant Larson, and Engineer Gonzalez.

Administrator Darrington explained that the “Yellow” Group determined that economic development in the downtown area and Grove Zone are two different types of development. He noted that what pertains to the Grove Zone does not necessarily pertain to downtown. Therefore, two different economic development plans are needed for each area. The “Yellow” Group also discussed redevelopment along State Street between Center Street and Geneva Road. The City has some industrial uses on a commercial corridor. Administrator Darrington explained that his subgroup suggested repurposing the area and changing it from a manufacturing/industrial zone to

a commercial use. If the City were to make this change they would need to figure out a way to get developers to invest in the area.

Next, the “Yellow” Group discussed the definition of “terms”. Some of the terms used often have different meanings to different people. Such terms include retail, office, commercial, high density and mixed use. Administrator Darrington referenced the Bella Grace development, which has frontage on Main Street. It has commercial on the ground floor and residential on the top level. He explained that better definitions could have helped gear the Bella Grace development into a project that was more in line with what the City envisioned.

Administrator Darrington stated that Council Member Andersen inquired about ways to incentivize quality improvements for those already in the community. He mentioned that some cities have implemented a revolving loan fund, which is a way of helping local businesses make improvements to their buildings. Furthermore, the “Yellow” Group discussed ways to improve marketing strategies to help boost economic development within the City. Last, his group discussed the importance of remaining consistent with what is outlined in the General Plan.

c) Blue Group:

- i. Transportation
- ii. Public Services

Note: The “Blue” Group was comprised of the following individuals: Council Member Stanley, Commissioner Richards, Director Britsch, Director Beaumont, Chief Thomas and Chief Smith.

Director Beaumont explained that one point of discussion in the “Blue” Group was that of road funding and whether at some point the City will have the additional funding needed to address some of the immediate concerns, as well as create a long-term sustainable system. He stated that replacement of the City’s infrastructure needs to be tied in with roads. In looking at the bigger picture, they need to determine how to achieve growth in both areas over a 20-year period. Director Beaumont explained that the coordination of efforts in both areas was the main focus of his subgroup’s discussion. The “Blue” Group also briefly discussed the Public Safety Building and how to address the City’s need for adequate Public Services into the future. Last, his subgroup discussed parking at the Library.

d) Green Group:

Commissioner Steele explained that the “Green” Group discussed creating smoother transitions between housing zones. He noted that this issue has come up with different cases between the R-R, R1-20 and Downtown Village Zones. Furthermore, they discussed updating the building design standards throughout the City, in particular within the Grove Zone. In relation to this discussion, they reviewed the importance of code enforcement.

With regard to parks, the “Green” Group determined that the City should focus first on improving their existing parks. Next, in planning for future growth, the City should make plans to expand

the cemetery. Other additions can be considered thereafter, such as a splash pad, pool, City-wide trails, and the preservation of open space.

The “Green” Group also discussed quality of life and the importance of building a community that is conducive to living, working and playing. They felt that by balancing development moving forward, they will be able to create more opportunities in the community.

- i. Housing
- ii. Parks and Recreation

Note: The “Green” Group was comprised of the following individuals: Council Member LeMone, Commissioner Steele, Commissioner Baptista, Director Roy, Director Giles and Recorder Kresser.

Director Young stated that he would like to bring this information forward in future City Council and Planning Commission Meetings and review what has been discussed tonight. Staff will begin creating questions for a public survey and schedule a community visioning workshop, which will be similar in format to tonight’s meeting.

8) Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

The minutes of August 30, 2016 Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting were approved by the City Council on September 20, 2016.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

Planning Commission Chair

Date

Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder’s office.)