

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
May 17, 2016
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Eric Jensen
Cyd LeMone – arrived at 6:46 p.m.
Ben Stanley
Lynn Walker

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Daniel Cardenas, City Planner
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator

The City Council and Staff met in the City Council Chambers at 86 East 100 South, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Daniels called the meeting to order and noted that Council Members Andersen, Jensen, Stanley and Walker were present. Council Member LeMone arrived later.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Jack Freeman.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Walker.

4) **APPROVAL OF MEETING'S AGENDA**

Several changes were made to the agenda. Item 8A was moved to after Item 10D, and Item 10C was continued to May 31, 2016.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to approve the agenda with the aforementioned changes. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Sandy Carter gave her address as 2708 North 450 West and announced that this week is Police Week. She read a poem as a way of paying tribute to the Pleasant Grove Police Department and expressed her appreciation and love for them. She noted that 123 officers were killed in the line of duty last year and so far 39 law enforcement officers have lost their lives this year.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the open session.

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- a) **City Council Meeting Minutes:
City Council Minutes from the April 19, 2016 Work Session Meeting.**
- b) **To Consider Approval of the Agreement and Notice to Proceed to Geneva Rock for the Locust Ave and 300 South Rehabilitation Project.**
- c) **To Consider Approval of Payment Vouchers for (May 5, 2016)**

Council Member Stanley remarked that it is challenging to review a Council packet when they are received on the same day as the meeting. He requested that staff give the Council more advance notice on these and other items.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to approve the consent items. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7) **BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

- A) TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF KELLY OVARD, KYLE AND CARISSA HOOPES AS BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION MEMBERS.**

Director Giles mentioned that the above individuals applied and were interviewed for the vacant positions on the Beautification Commission. Furthermore, they have also attended a few meetings. Their names were submitted for approval by the City Council.

ACTION: Council Member Walker moved to appoint Kelly Ovard and Kyle and Carissa Hoopes as Beautification Commission Members. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8) PRESENTATIONS

A) DISCUSSION ON THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING COMMITTEE PROPOSAL WITH THINK ARCHITECTURE.

Mayor Daniels reviewed the work done by the Public Safety Building Committee to this point. He invited Scott Wilkinson of Think Architecture to give a presentation.

Scott Wilkinson explained that there are six phases that architects undergo for projects. For this project they are currently in Phase 1, which is Programming and Preliminary Design. This phase is typically outlined as follows:

- Review square footage requirements and adjacencies contained in existing reports.
- Conduct in-depth interviews with building users (police, fire, court) to refine the program, adjacencies, and square footage requirements.
- Submit final program to Pleasant Grove City for review and comment.
- Provide preliminary site plan for two options:
 1. Fire station at pipe plant with the Police/Courts downtown.
 2. Fire station and Police/Courts downtown in two buildings.
- Provide preliminary floor plans and elevations for both site options.
- Digital modeling/rendering.
- Provide cost estimates for both site options.
- Reconcile program with construction budget.

Phases 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were then reviewed and discussed.

Phase 2: Schematic Design:

- Site plan.
- Building Plans.
- Building Sections.

- Exterior Elevations.
- Digital Modeling/Rendering.
- Major building systems and construction materials are selected; wood, steel, masonry, concrete.
- Updated cost estimate.

Phase 3, Design Development, includes additional work with the building plans, sections, exterior elevations, and construction details. Furthermore, it includes the selection of structural, mechanical and electrical systems. Cost estimates are also updated during this phase. Phase 4, Construction Documents, involves the completion of drawings and specifications setting forth in detail the quality levels of materials and systems, and other related requirements. Phase 5 includes the bidding process from start to finish. Phase 6 involves a series of administrative construction tasks.

Mayor Daniels asked if these phases are typical of most architectural firms. Mr. Wilkinson answered in the affirmative. He explained that while there might be a smaller project with fewer steps, those types of instances are rare. Mr. Wilkinson presented a slide of architectural fees based on each phase and explained that the majority of the firm’s time is spent creating construction documents.

In response to a question from Council Member Jensen, Mr. Wilkinson explained that architectural fees are a percentage based on the cost of the materials, plus overhead and contractor expenses. The State Division of Facilities and Construction has a recommended schedule for architectural fees, which Think Architecture references when creating their own project fee schedules. Mr. Wilkinson recommended that the City refer to those fees as well, because they are defensible. He mentioned that 6% is a good average percentage for architectural fees. Typically, larger projects have lower percentages. Mr. Wilkinson stated that the City has the ability to stop a project at any time.

Note: Council Member LeMone arrived at 6:46 p.m.

Administrator Darrington asked Mr. Wilkinson how an architectural firm can formulate a fee schedule before an overall project budget is established. Mr. Wilkinson explained that usually by the time a contract is signed, a municipality has assigned a project budget based on cost estimates. Through each phase, cost estimates are continually updated. Mr. Wilkinson stated that he understands that the City needs to know a number before bonding. Council Member Andersen remarked that she believes the numbers presented by Think Architecture are knowledgeable.

Mr. Wilkinson presented the proposed architectural fees based on project phase, as well as an example of fee schedules. The following charts were reviewed:

Schematic Design.....	15% of total fee
Design Development.....	20% of total fee

Construction Documents.....45% of total fee
 Bidding.....5% of total fee
 Construction Administration.....15% of total fee

*Architectural/Engineering Fee for Fire Station at the Pipe Plant..... \$215,936**

Schematic Design.....15% x \$215,936 = \$32,391
 Design Development..... 20% x \$215,936 = \$67,533
 Construction Documents..... 45% x 215,936 = \$97,171
 Bidding..... 5% x 215,936 = \$10,796
 Construction Administration..... 15% x \$215,936 = \$32,391

*Architectural/Engineering Fee for Police and Court Downtown..... \$337,666**

Schematic Design.....15% x \$337,666 = \$50,650
 Design Development..... 20% x \$337,666 = \$67,533
 Construction Documents..... 45% x 337,666 = \$151,950
 Bidding..... 5% x 337,666 = \$16,833
 Construction Administration..... 15% x \$337,666 = \$50,650

*Architectural/Engineering fee taken from the Public Safety Facilities Cost Estimate Report dated 03.23.2016.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that the total estimated fee for the Programming Scope (Phase 1) is \$4,500. The Preliminary Scope Design for the two options listed above is projected to have a fee of \$44,000. The second part of Phase 1 will also include digital modeling/rendering, cost estimations made for both sites, and will reconcile the program and construction budgets.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that they may be designing four different buildings:

1. A single-story fire station.
2. A two-story fire station, located downtown.
3. A single-story police station, with an extension of the Courts building downtown.
4. A two-story police station downtown.

Mayor Daniels commented that the second option seems like a fallback plan if they find that a single-story of each facility doesn't physically fit on the land that is available. Mr. Wilkinson proposed that they start with two, single-story schemes and see if they work because they are less expensive, unless the Public Safety Building Committee and City Council have reasons to indicate otherwise. He explained that cost estimates will be done for each option, thereby giving the City a sufficient cost comparison of the two sites.

Mayor Daniels asked if another architectural firm would propose different fees, or if they would follow the same guidelines. Mr. Wilkinson indicated that fees from another firm would be different. Mayor Daniels asked within what percentage tolerance the actual costs would fall.

Mr. Wilkinson replied that while Think Architecture's estimates are slightly higher, he estimated that they would fall within 10%.

Council Member Andersen asked about the timeframe of the preliminary phase, to which Mr. Wilkinson answered that this phase usually takes six to seven weeks to complete. Council Member Stanley asked at what point during the six phases the municipality would set a budget. Mr. Wilkinson answered that a tentative budget is set during Phase 1. Council Member Stanley asked what phases VCBO and MOCA worked through in their processes. Mr. Wilkinson explained that their work was representative of Phase 1. Administrator Darrington added that MOCA went further than VCBO. VCBO did initial programming, but they did not get to an actual layout of the floor plan. Council Member Andersen asked what the original RFP covered. Administrator Darrington replied that it covered review of previous work and cost estimates of various options.

There was further deliberation on the fee schedules presented, and which plan appears to be the most feasible in terms of space and costs. The Council discussed how to move forward on making a decision. Council Member LeMone suggested that the Council and Public Safety Building Committee start working together more frequently and that the public be invited to speak during open sessions at Committee Meetings.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to receive public input for this discussion item. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Mayor Daniels opened the discussion to the public.

Christy Belt gave her address as 266 East 1640 North and explained that she is a member of the Public Safety Building Committee speaking as a citizen. She expressed that it has been great to work as a committee but she believed that working separate from the Council is slowing down the process. She opined that they are at a point where things can and should move along more quickly. She felt that everyone should be involved including the public. Ms. Belt asked Mr. Wilkinson if the fees will be lost if and when a preliminary project is turned over to a new firm. Mr. Wilkinson explained that a new firm should be able to move forward with the work that has already been done. However, he pointed out that there is history lost once a project is turned over, because not everything can be recorded in meetings.

Evan Thomas gave his address as 1317 West 2600 North and was representing Viking Youth Football. Mr. Thomas was concerned with the lack of field space in the City for youth sports. He stated that his organization supports using the Pipe Plant property for as much playing space as possible.

Jennie Pusey gave her address as 505 North 100 West and echoed Mr. Thomas' remarks that there is a high need for field space in the community. Youth are playing on nicer fields in other cities. She mentioned that she read somewhere that soccer participation is doubling every two years. Ms. Pusey stated that public safety facilities are needed and asked at what point in the process public input will be allowed.

Debby Llewelyn gave her address as 848 South 1450 East. She mentioned that she volunteers for Pleasant Grove's Youth Football League and she agreed with the comments made by Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pusey. She expressed concern with the safety of the old Recreation Center. In her opinion, it is not worth trying to salvage the building just to save a few hundred thousand dollars. She expressed support for building new public safety facilities.

Lonny Lewis gave his address as 696 Mohican Lane and explained that there have been accusations in Public Safety Building Committee Meetings that the citizens are "stupid". Mr. Lewis referred specifically to the audio of the meeting held March 23, 2016. He was concerned about the public having the opportunity to weigh in on these discussions. He did not think that the Council should get involved and explained that there are rumors that the Council has already made a decision on the matter. He was of the opinion that the issue needs to remain with the Public Safety Building Committee until they can provide recommendations to the Council, which is the reason the Public Safety Building Committee was chartered. Mr. Lewis stated that the Council needs to be concerned with costs and the Public Safety Building Committee should make an economical and safe proposal.

Mayor Daniels asked Mr. Lewis if he had any suggestions on how to create more citizen involvement. Mr. Lewis stated that there are a lot of citizens who believe the decision has already been made. Mayor Daniels asked how to get more citizens involved assuming that a decision has not been made and that the Council, Public Safety Building Committee, and staff are all seeking further public input. Mr. Lewis explained that it is a grassroots effort on the part of the Public Safety Building Committee to encourage citizen attendance. Furthermore, he expressed that people need to be heard and their opinions respected.

Tim Clyde gave his address as 12 West Sienna Drive and identified himself as the President of Pleasant Grove Youth Football. Mr. Clyde reiterated that it is a struggle to find available field space for youth sports leagues. He hoped to see open space at the Pipe Plant Property left for fields. Mr. Clyde expressed concern with regard to the dilapidated state of current downtown buildings. He asked how the title for a portion of the Pipe Plant Property will be transferred as part of this process. Mr. Clyde acknowledged that there are significant needs in the City and encouraged the Council to carefully consider all options.

Council Member Stanley commented that he received numerous calls earlier in the day and acknowledged that he listened to all of the public comments.

Christopher Williams gave his address as 845 North 100 East and asked how costs would be factored into razing the Old Recreation Center. Mr. Wilkinson replied that it would be up to the Council to determine whether to bond for the cost. Council Member Andersen commented that demolition was included in the six preliminary options. Mr. Wilkinson interjected that the demolition cost that was included was for the fire station not the old rec center so that would be an additional cost.

Blaine Thatcher gave his address as 120 North 400 East and explained that there are numerous uses for the Pipe Plant Property other than using the space for a Public Safety Building. However, not all of the property will be made available for ball fields. Mr. Thatcher explained that last week

a developer presented a plan for several soccer fields to be donated to the City as part of their proposal and that was hands down turned down by the Council. He said that during his campaign last year he heard that there is a desperate need for youth football fields and he thought that that needs to be brought into context with the other uses that the City is already planning for the Pipe Plant property.

Council Member LeMone stated that she values comments made from fellow soccer parents. She clarified that last week a developer made a proposal for a development with four residential units per acre on property near Manila Pond in exchange for soccer and football fields on the same property. Council Member LeMone explained that citizens have expressed that they do not want more density in that area. As a Council Member, she felt that the development they were proposing did not make sense. Furthermore, the current zoning allows for animal rights and the new proposed zoning would take away those rights. She stated that while she is in favor of having more fields in Pleasant Grove, they should not come at the expense of the residents in that particular area.

Mr. Thatcher then said that he got the impression from that meeting and he could be interpreting this, but he got the impression that the City basically said that the Council didn't want soccer fields out there, they wanted them down at a central location like the Pipe Plant.

Jan Van Orman gave his address as 1848 North 275 East and noted that he is also a member of the Public Safety Building Committee and has attended every meeting since September. He stated that Mayor Daniels has invested a great deal of time and effort in trying to form a representative group on this issue. The Committee includes an impressive cross section of opinions and experience. He commented that he was startled and disturbed by Mr. Lewis' comments regarding the Public Safety Building Committee's perception of the community and stated that no such comment was made in a meeting he attended. Mr. Van Orman complimented the process and stated that it has been vital in rallying the citizens. He also apologized for any misunderstandings that have occurred between the Public Safety Building Committee and the citizenry.

There were no further citizen comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public portion of the discussion.

Council Member Stanley stated that there is value in the function of the Public Safety Building Committee as well as their independence from the Council. He was in favor of allowing open sessions at the Public Safety Building Committee Meetings. He stated that the Council should be able to observe meetings and stated that one of his highest priorities is for government to have clear lines of accountability.

Council Member LeMone stated that it is time for everyone to come together on this issue. Everyone is a part of the community, regardless of whether they are on the Council, Public Safety Building Committee or the general citizenry. She stated that the Council has been elected to represent their constituents and that the Council formed the Public Safety Building Committee. She was also in favor of allowing public comments to be made at Committee Meetings.

Council Member Andersen stated that she lives downtown and is concerned that some members of the public have a perception that a decision has already been made by the Council. She

explained that each of the elected officials ran because they wanted to be engaged. While she loves what the Public Safety Building Committee is doing, she has felt separated from them. She was concerned that the Public Safety Building Committee might present an option for which she hasn't had an opportunity to provide input. Mayor Daniels asked Larry Nelson of the Public Safety Building Committee to respond.

Larry Nelson remarked that there has been tension in the City and explained that they need to get this project done. As a Committee, they hope to formulate a decision that is based on discussion, data and evidence, and not just preference. They hope that preference doesn't trump the process because it will compromise the work done by the Public Safety Building Committee. Mr. Nelson acknowledged that in the end, the decision rests with the Council and he hopes the Committee can present options that the whole community can support.

Council Member Andersen stated that as a citizen she would like to have an opportunity to express her opinion on the matter at some point. She and Council Member Stanley would also like to see a plan come forward that the community can support. Mayor Daniels commented that it is encouraging that there are people who want to provide input.

Mayor Daniels recapped the presentation and discussion that has taken place to this point. He stated that the Council needs to decide whether to move forward with authorizing the expenditure of funds. They also need to decide whether to leave the Public Safety Building Committee intact to further shepherd the process. Administrator Darrington suggested that the Council give staff direction to work on a contract that they will have ready for review at the May 31 meeting. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, reminded those present that this item needs to be on an agenda in order for action to be taken. Council Member Stanley was hesitant to move forward because they may have a donor who will provide pro bono work. Mayor Daniels explained that the Council is the only body that can approve the expenditure of funds. If the Public Safety Building Committee requests more work to be done involving professional services, or whether there are expenditures paid through the General Fund, donated funds, impact fees or pro-bono work, the same level of care and concern will be applied.

The Council advised staff to proceed with the first programming phase by drafting a Professional Services Agreement and putting it on an agenda. There was deliberation on whether another RFP was needed. It was determined that the City could legally move forward to draft an agreement that includes Phase 1 services in their entirety.

Note: There was a break from 8:23 p.m. to 8:36 p.m.

9) PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2016-10) TO REZONE A PORTION OF THE WEST SIDE OF PROPERTY AT 200 EAST STATE STREET FROM R1-8 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE TO C-S (COMMERCIAL SALES) ZONE. (STEVE ALLRED, APPLICANT) *Presenter: Director Young.***

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to discuss the above item prior to the Public Safety Building Committee presentation. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, presented the staff report and displayed an aerial map of subject property. He explained that the applicant is requesting a zone change for the Southwest corner of the property located at approximately 200 East State Street. The proposed rezone is from existing R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) to C-S (Commercial Sales) Zone, in order to accomplish the approval of a new use and expansion of a non-conforming building. The request for the rezone was reviewed. A request to approve the expansion of a non-conforming use was approved by the Planning Commission on April 28, 2016, subject to the approval of the zone change by City Council.

The proposed rezone to the C-S Zone meets the provisions of the General Plan, which designates the area as Commercial Retail. A larger part of the lot, approximately 31,460 square feet, is already zoned C-S; however, a sliver piece of property on the southwest corner of the lot, approximately 5,246 square feet, remains R1-8. When the applicant proposed the modification to the buildings in the southwest corner, City staff, including the City Attorney, determined that the best approach would be to rezone the residential part of the lot to commercial to obtain consolidation. The Planning Commission recommended unanimous approval.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Council Member Jensen asked if pictures of the physical building were available. Director Young did not have them as part of the presentation. Council Member Stanley asked if other upgrades will be done to the pavement area as well. Director Young answered in the affirmative.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt an Ordinance (2016-10) to rezone a portion of the west side of property at 200 East State Street from R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to C-S (Commercial Sales) Zone. A public hearing was held. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley, and Walker voting “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

B) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2016-8) FOR A REZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 3.4 ACRES FROM R1-20 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO R1-12 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1040 EAST GROVE CREEK DRIVE. (GROVE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD) (Sam Walker, Applicant) Presenter: Director Young *Please Note: Continued from the May 3, 2016 Meeting.

Director Young stated that the property is General Planned for low density residential, and is zoned R1-20. The R1-20 zone is older zoning and most of the surrounding properties are zoned at higher densities, particularly to the north and south. The General Plan provides for the possibility of R1-12 and based on the surrounding areas it would be appropriate for this area. The request was for

a forthcoming plat to be approved. Director Young noted that this item recently went to the Planning Commission who unanimously recommended approval.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt an Ordinance (2016-8) for a rezone of approximately 3.4 acres from R1-20 (Single Family Residential) to R1-12 (Single Family Residential) on property located at approximately 1040 East Grove Creek Drive. A public hearing was held. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voting “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

10) ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE

- A) CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A SIX-LOT FINAL PLAT CALLED WALKER GROVE PLAT A CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 3.317 ACRES ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1040 EAST GROVE CREEK DRIVE IN THE R1-20 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. (GROVE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD) Presenter: Director Young *Please Note: Continued from the May 3, 2016 Meeting.**

Director Young presented the proposed plat and noted that this is same area that was recently rezoned to R1-12. All six properties face Grove Creek Drive and there are various easements for drainage. There is an access easement to the west of Lot 1 that would provide secondary access to the property. The engineer indicated that there is an attempt to negotiate the removal of the easement, but until then they are moving forward with the request to leave the easement in place. This was approved by the Planning Commission without the easement in a preliminary format. The easement does not affect lot size and staff is comfortable with the development with or without the easement.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve a six-lot final plat called Walker Grove Plat A consisting of approximately 3.317 acres on property located at approximately 1040 East Grove Creek Drive in the R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) zone. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

- B) CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-017) INDICATING THE INTENT OF PLEASANT GROVE CITY TO ADJUST THE COMMON BOUNDARY WITH THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS. APPLICANTS GINA AND SCOTT DAY (PARCEL #55:090:0005) BRENT AND NEVA WILSON (PARCEL #55:218:0002) GORDON AND KAREN DAVIES (PARCEL # 55:090:0007) AND CHRISTOPHER AND SARAH EAGER (PARCEL # 14:002:0144) Presenter: Attorney Petersen *Please Note: Continued from the May 3, 2016 Meeting.**

Attorney Petersen explained that State Statute allows for municipalities to mutually adjust their boundaries when they are adjacent to one another. The process involves both cities adopting a resolution indicating an interest in making the adjustment. She noted that 60 days from now there will be a public hearing where citizens can express their opinion on the matter. An ordinance will subsequently be adopted approving the boundary adjustment and authorizing the City Recorder to send an amended municipal incorporation boundary to the State so that they can also formally make the adjustment. The aforementioned requests are made because Cedar Hills can provide sewer services whereas Pleasant Grove cannot. A public hearing will be held on July 19, 2016.

In response to a question from Council Member Stanley, Attorney Petersen briefly reviewed the history of sewer in the area. Council Member Jensen asked if this creates an island for the neighbors to the west. Attorney Petersen explained that it is her understanding that it will not, however, she added that the State Statute was amended last year to allow for certain circumstances where an island could be created.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt a Resolution (2016-017) indicating the intent of Pleasant Grove City to Adjust the Common Boundary with the City of Cedar Hills. Applicants Gina and Scott Day (Parcel #55:090:0005), Brent and Neva Wilson (Parcel #55:218:0002), Gordon and Karen Davies (Parcel #55:090:0007), and Christopher and Sarah Eager (Parcel #14:002:0144), and for a public hearing to take place on this item on July 19, 2016. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

C) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-020) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN A CONTRACT FOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS WITH CHARLES “JAKE” CARSTEN AS THE PROJECT MANAGER TO ASSIST IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MULTI-USE TRAIL. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington *Continued to May 31, 2016.*

D) TO CONSIDER ADOPTING STANDARD DRAWING 1-D “56’ COMMERCIAL STREET CROSS SECTION WITHOUT STREET SIDE PARKING”. *Presenter: Director Beaumont.*

Public Works Director, Marty Beaumont, explained that staff is reviewing a site plan in the Grove area and there was discussion on the ability to approve smaller street cross sections that would allow for no on-street parking. He presented a drawing and noted that they are taking away an eight-foot wide parking area and reducing it to five feet, which will provide an asphalt pavement area of 34 feet. There will be a lot of utilities under these roads, including water, sewer and storm drain. Therefore, the City needs to make sure that they have enough room to work in those rights-of-way. In looking at non-vehicular traffic, they need to make sure they are accommodating bike lanes as well. Staff wants these alternatives to be available in commercial and other non-residential zones that might have off-street parking.

Council Member Stanley asked if future approval would have to come before the Council. Director Young answered in the affirmative. It would also depend on whether they have adequate off-street parking with their site and whether it makes sense based on traffic volumes. Council Member Andersen asked if this will accommodate everything that happens in the future. Director

Beaumont explained that with regard to changes to the development, staff will verify that they have sufficient parking that doesn't require on-street parking.

Mayor Daniels asked staff to give an example of a specific street where this will be applied. Director Beaumont explained that the new standards are being proposed on Grove Parkway at North County Boulevard and going north past Riverwood. He noted that staff is currently working with The Void to meet their parking needs while implementing the new standards. Council Member Andersen asked if the new standards will accommodate construction in the event that a portion of the road needs to be shut down. Director Beaumont replied that it will depend on the utility since traffic may need to be routed around the construction.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to adopt Standard Drawing 1-D "56' Commercial Street Cross Section without street side parking". Council Member Walker seconded the motion. The motion carried with the unanimous consent of the Council.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no further items for discussion.

12) DISCUSSION ON THE MAY 31, 2016 JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Staff noted that there will not be a meeting next Tuesday, May 24. Staff and the elected officials briefly reviewed the agenda items for May 31 meeting. Director Young explained that with regard to Items 9A and B, the adoption of ordinance to amend the Rural Commercial Overlay, the applicant is requesting that the Rural Commercial Overlay be amended to be the Residential Commercial Overlay and applied to both rural and residential properties. This would allow for the type of expansion they desire for their business. It was noted that the applicant, Paige Westover, currently resides on 3.5 acres.

Item 9C, an ordinance amending City Code Section 10-14-20, "Urban Design Standards", pertains to changes that will be implemented based on how other cities have addressed the issue, namely the City of Lehi. Staff is rushing to get the amendments approved because of a forthcoming application from The Void, which currently has proposed design standards that are non-compliant with the Urban Design Standards set forth in City ordinance. Staff explained that should the new ordinance not be ready in a timely manner, they recommend that the Council grant a waiver. Director Young presented an aerial map of where The Void will be located and the plat that will precede the site plan.

Items 9D and 10A pertained to budget amendments for Fiscal Year 2015/2016. The line items were presented by Administrator Darrington.

Note: A copy of the proposed budget was made available in the Recorder's Office, 70 South 100 East; the Library, 30 East Center Street; and Community Development, 86 East 100 South.

Last, the Council will review the City's Parks Ordinance. Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, explained the ordinance was updated this year, including new requirements for fireworks,

and changes to Grovecrest Elementary. He noted that essentially, the entire ordinance was being changed. It was noted that the fireworks display has been moved to Discovery Park this year.

13) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Director Beaumont reported that Questar will be back in 10 to 14 days to conduct final cleaning, testing, and reconnection of 100 East. He noted that they will not be working during Strawberry Days. He also reported that the Locust Avenue Reconstruction Meeting is scheduled for next week and the project is scheduled to begin the first week of June. After the construction schedule is determined, they will notify area residents. Director Beaumont mentioned that John Goodman has already spoken with the residents in the area to inform them of impacts to neighborhood. Next, he reported that pothole repair on Pleasant Grove Boulevard will take place the day after Strawberry Days, which will be a Sunday. Geneva Rock wants to shut down the road in order to mill out, repave, and resurface Pleasant Grove Boulevard between 1300 West and North County Boulevard. Last, Center Street will be completed by the end of May. Project updates will be posted to City's website.

Fire Chief, Dave Thomas, reported that on May 26 the Fire Department will be hosting a mandatory training day with burn and training exercises going on all day. He will also be meeting with the fireworks company the following day to solidify plans for July 4 as well as with Manila Elementary and local LDS chapels.

Police Chief, Mike Smith, thanked the community for treats, ribbons, and the many kind gestures that have been shown during Police Week. He explained that May 15 was established by President John F. Kennedy as the National Memorial Day for law enforcement officers. The week of May 15 memorializes those who gave their lives protecting communities throughout the United States. Every year there is a memorial service held in Washington D.C. where the names of the fallen are added to the National Law Enforcement Memorial Wall.

Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, reported that the Library is close to going out to bid for the elevator. Currently they are waiting for City approval. Other updates will be made to the Library as well, such as walling off the checkout area. This area won't be used as desk anymore, and will be office and storage area. Alternatively, podium desks will be put out on the floor in order to assist patrons in a more visible area. Director Britsch spoke about a recent visit to another library where they had revolving bookcases to provide a multipurpose use of the space. She noted that there will be a lot of moving around during the various construction projects.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the June calendar. On June 7 there will be a public hearing on the tentative budget. Next week staff will be sending out a letter to the residents regarding the potential road fee and utility fee increases and explaining the changes. There will be no meeting on June 14 due to Strawberry Days. On June 21, the Council will adopt the budget for the next Fiscal Year. June 28 was scheduled to be off; however, staff recommended meeting be held that night to review other items being pushed back; namely, review of the General Plan.

Council Member LeMone requested that staff include a notice on the City's website where comments can be submitted on the budget electronically for those who cannot attend meetings.

Administrator Darrington stated that he would include his email in the letter and forward public responses on to Council. Mayor Daniels asked if the meeting on June 7 should be relocated. Administrator Darrington stated that staff will have an alternative location, just in case.

Attorney Petersen reported on the Utah Municipal Attorneys Association Conference in St. George. She reported that she received an email from the Hammons earlier in the day and they mailed their executed copies of the extension agreement. This matter will need to be placed on upcoming agenda for finalization.

14) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member Andersen reported that several citizens have expressed frustration that the Strawberry Days Rodeo tickets are reserved only this year. She also commented that she is aware that there are a lot of servicemen and women who are up all night making sure things are taken care of in the community. She was aware that there are professions where people have taken an oath to protect the community to their death. She expressed appreciation for the service of these individuals. Council Members LeMone, Jensen, and Stanley echoed her remarks.

15) SIGNING OF PLATS

There were no plats signed.

16) REVIEW CALENDAR

There were no additional calendar items to review.

17) ADJOURN

ACTION: Council Member Walker moved to adjourn. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

The minutes of May 17, 2016 City Council Meeting were approved by the City Council on June 21, 2016.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder, MMC

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