

Pleasant Grove City Council Work Session Minutes
May 8, 2007
7 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mayor:

Michael W. Daniels

City Council Members:

Cindy Boyd

Darold J. McDade

Lee G. Jensen

Mark K. Atwood

Bruce Call

City Recorder:

Amanda R. Fraughton

OTHERS:

Frank Mills, City Administrator,

Gary Clay, Finance Director

Lynn Walker, Public Works Director

Richard Bradford, Economic Development Director

Ken Young, Supervisor of Community Development,

Deon Giles, Leisure Services Director

Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief

Libby Flegal, Neighborhood Chair

Sean Allen, City Planner

Karen Bezzant

The City Council members met in the City Council Chambers at 86 East 100 South, Pleasant Grove, Utah 84062 at 7 p.m.

Mayor Daniels welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that Attorney Petersen and Police Tom Paul and Deputy Burgin were to be excused from the meeting.

1. Opening Remarks:

The Opening Remarks were given by Council Member Jensen.

2. Project updates regarding the 1-15 Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) by UDOT Project Manager, Merrell Jolley; the Provo to Salt Lake FrontRunner Environmental Study Report (ESR) by UTA Project Manager, G.J. LaBonty; and the Mountain View Corridor by Teri Newell, UDOT).

Mayor Daniels noted that the presenters for this item had not arrived yet and asked to move on to the City Council discussions for the upcoming May 15, 2007 City Council meeting.

3. Discussion of Items for the upcoming May 15, 2007 City Council Meeting:

Mayor Daniels said that it had recently been suggested that the Council discuss the upcoming city council items in a more detailed fashion at the work session meetings. By doing this, they'd be better prepared for questions at city council. However, Council Member Atwood commented that the council shouldn't do all of the discussion at the work sessions. It should just be an answer/question session.

- a. **To consider Mark Ryan's request for final plat approval of a 4-lot subdivision known as Larsen Acres, Plat "B," located at approx. 301 East 1100 North, in the R1-10 (Single Family Residential, 10,000 sq. ft. lot area) zone. BIG SPRINGS NEIGHBORHOOD**

Mayor Daniels read this item and turned the time over to Planner Allen. Planner Allen asked if the Council had any questions regarding this item. Council Member Atwood asked as to who was going to finish the 1100 North road as it runs into a dirt road on the north side of 1100 North. Planner Allen responded that J.U.B. Engineer Beaumont has been working with Mr. Mark Whiting on this matter.

Administrator Mills commented that it appeared that lot 4 is the lot with the home on 1100 North. It's bounded on the east side by an irrigation and drainage ditch. If this is correct, they'd be installing the curb and gutter from where the irrigation ditch crosses under 1100 North, below Gary Larsen's place, run it down to where 300 East has currently been built, heading back towards north. The only part that would be on 1100 North, he said, would be the part by the home on the 300 East side of the road on the new part of 300 East. This is where they're building a new road to Jared Bishop's development.

Planner Allen commented that the biggest issues with this property had been the vicinity plan. He said they had tried to be sensitive with what is approved in that area and what could happen to the other properties that remain undeveloped. He said they'd drawn up several examples of vicinity plans, which they would review at next week's city council meeting. However, staff felt the vicinity plan one being discussed this evening is the one most suitable for this area.

Council Member Call asked if, "being sensitive to neighbors," included the six foot sight obscuring fence on the east side. Planner Allen responded that the ordinance only requires a sight obscuring fence. He said the applicant has agreed to put the fence all along the east boundary and around Ms. Daley's property. There wasn't going to be a sidewalk on the west side of the future road as no lots would be fronting; therefore, there wouldn't be any pedestrian activity on that side. In addition, it's a very tight fit for that road. On the north end, by the Gordon's property, there will be sidewalk on both sides of the road. That's if the Billings and Gordons agree to develop their property in that fashion, he noted.

Administrator Mills asked Planner Allen if they were planning to install sidewalk on the east side of 300 East on this development. Planner Allen answered no, only on future developments to the east. Administrator Mills said this didn't make much sense as 300 East is one of the major collector roads. Especially with the development taking place to the north and the problems the City has had trying to get the pedestrian traffic to the elementary school. However, Planner Allen said the area in question wasn't 300 East. Council Member Call noted that it was really the east side of the property that is being developed on 300 East. Planner Allen assured the Council that 300 East is done and is fully improved and will have sidewalks. He then explained the vicinity plan on page 11 of the Planning Commission Staff Report, via a map on the screen. He stated that this is the vicinity plan which Staff

is recommending. He concluded by stating that when the Billings and Gordons come forward again, they will still have to meet the vicinity plan requirements and go through this same approval process.

2. Project updates regarding the 1-15 Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) by UDOT Project Manager, Merrell Jolley; the Provo to Salt Lake FrontRunner Environmental Study Report (ESR) by UTA Project Manager, G.J. LaBonty; and the Mountain View Corridor by Teri Newell, UDOT

At 7:20 p.m. discussion began on the Mountain View Corridor Project. Mr. Reed Soper, UDOT Environmental Manager for the Mountain View Corridor Project, said he would be covering for Ms. Teri Newell as she had other engagements this evening. He thanked the Council for allowing them to give the presentation

Mr. Soper showed a study map of the Corridor. He indicated that he would be discussing the alternatives involved in Utah County, as they stand now, as well as what the impacts are and where they're headed from here. He then proceeded to explain, on the study map, the three alternatives in Utah County which are: (1) the southern freeway alternative. In this alternative the freeway comes from Salt Lake County, down to the south and then extends east to west just north of Utah Lake. It then connects in and around the Pleasant Grove/Lindon Interchange; (2) the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, which runs from Salt Lake County down to Lehi's Main Street. The north component, the freeway running from Salt Lake County to Lehi Main Street, remains the same and (3) the three arterials to handle the east/west movement --- the arterial in Salt Lake County, known as Porter Rockwell; (2) the arterial @ 2100 North and (3) the arterial near the lake at Lehi's 1900 South. He continued to explain a graph showing how well 1-15 performs based on the different scenarios that Mountain View is working on.

He then explained transit alternatives in Utah County. He indicated that, to this point, Utah County doesn't have any transit options. However, some of those station locations are being determined. They're looking at opportunities in the Mountain View Corridor Project to help support commuter rail, including park and rides, express buses, etc.

In closing, he said that they would be defining UDOT's Utah County Preferred Alternative within the next couple of months. They are planning on having their public hearings on the Mountain View Corridor in November.

(Supervisor Young arrived at 7:44 p.m.)

Next, Mr. Merrell Jolley, UDOT Project Manager, gave an update on the 1-15 Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) through Utah County. He told the Council there are currently 45 miles of 1-15 from Sandy to Santaquin. This project, he said, involves improving traffic flow along the interstate by altering some interchanges; adding new ones; building frontage roads along parts of the freeway and widening portions of the interstate at numerous points. He further explained, on a study map on the screen, as to how today's 1-15 lane configuration looks like through the corridor, and what a proposed lane configuration looks like for the year 2030: (1) at present there are 5 lanes in each direction north of Bangerter Highway. Their proposal is that this remain 5 lanes; (2) from Bangerter Highway to University Parkway, they're proposing to replace the existing four lane cross section with six lanes; (3) from University Parkway to US 6 in Spanish Fork it will be back down to 5 lanes (4) as they move through the south end of Utah County, it will drop to 4 and 3 and (5) eventually at south Payson, back to the cross section that exists today, two lanes in each direction.

He further explained, in all of the above cross sections, that north of Spanish Fork one of the lanes is a car pool lane. They're proposing to continue this lane as far as US 6 and then all the way through the Salt Lake Valley as we see it today.

He indicated that the green dots on the map represented the areas where they need to build new interchanges to help handle the growth. UDOT is looking at several proposals for improving traffic flow along the interstate by altering some interchanges, adding new ones and building frontage roads along parts of the freeway from Center Street in Orem to 800 South in Provo. A new interchange could also be added at 800 South in Provo, and UDOT is looking at the possibility of building a "flyover" at the University Parkway exit. The flyover would allow northbound drivers direct access to Utah Valley State College instead of forcing them to get off the freeway and swerve across three lanes on the parkway to turn left into the college. Another new interchange is also being proposed north of Lehi.

In closing, Mr. Jolley told the Council that that tonight's presentation would be available on their website this coming Friday. Mayor Daniels thanked him for his presentation.

Next, Mr. G. J. LaBonty, UTA Project Manager, addressed the Council regarding the Provo to Salt Lake FrontRunner Environmental Study, which is also known as the commuter rail project. He reviewed a map on the screen showing the proposed rail system which will extend from Salt Lake City to south Provo. He indicated that Utah County will have stations in Lehi, American Fork, Pleasant Grove, Vineyard, Orem and Provo.

In addition, Mr. LaBonty told the Council that the first station location in Utah County is to be on Thanksgiving Point property in Lehi. The next station out of Pleasant Grove and American Fork will be in Vineyard. He further explained that Mountainland Technical College will be opening another park and ride immediately adjacent to their campus. One stop will be in Orem at 1-15 and University Parkway. UTA is also looking at possibilities of running a bus system from the Orem station to Brigham Young University. The final station location will be in southern Provo. However, UTA also has rights to continue the commuter rail line on into south Payson. They also hope to possibly continue the commuter rail even into the south county line.

In closing, Mr. LaBonty indicated that they're hiring a designer for the rail system this month. They expect the design to be ongoing for the next year or year and a half. They hope to start construction in 2008/2009 with operations in 2011/2012.

3. Discussion of Items for the upcoming May 15, 2007 City Council Meeting.

(Please note: At 8:12 p.m., after Mr. LaBonty's presentation, the Council discussed Item b of the discussions for the May 15, 2007 City Council agenda.)

- b. To consider Trent Thayne' request for final plat approval of a 1-lot flag lot subdivision known as Nick's Place Subdivision, Plat "A," located at approximately 634 West 4000 North in the RR (Rural Residential 21,780 sq. ft. lot area) zone. MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD**

Mayor Daniels read this item. Supervisor Young noted that Trent Thayne is asking for final plat approval of a 1-lot flag lot subdivision at approximately 634 West 4000 North. Although the flag stem portion of the lot is 56 ft. wide, it's a remaining parcel that ended up being configured this way. The applicant is asking that a road be constructed in the 56 ft. wide area to access properties to the north. As suggested in their vicinity plan, which is attached in the

council packets, staff feels comfortable to prepare the one-lot subdivision as proposed considering it to be an abnormal sized flag lot. He indicated that there would be two cul de sacs. The one to the west already exists; the one on the east side is the one proposed to access properties north of the proposal.

The Council reviewed the maps in packets, but there was no further discussion

- c. **To consider Doug Chamberlain’s request for final plat approval of a 6-lot subdivision known as Tuscan Gardens Subdivision, located at approximately 600 West Garden Drive, in the C-N (Commercial Neighborhood) zone. MUD HOLE NEIGHBORHOOD**

Supervisor Young noted there were two requests from Mr. Doug Chamberlain, Item ‘c’ and Item ‘d.’ Item ‘c’, he stated, is a final plat approval request for a 6-lot subdivision known as Tuscan Gardens, which basically divides the property into 6 different parcels. The other request, Item ‘d,’ is a final condominium plat approval which involves dividing the different parcels into condominium plats. Mayor Daniels asked if there were any questions. There were none.

- d. **To consider Doug Chamberlain’s request for final plat approval of Tuscan Gardens Condominium, Plats “A” through “F,” including the Tuscan Gardens Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for property located at approximately 600 West Garden Drive in the C-N (Commercial Neighborhood) zone. MUD HOLE NEIGHBORHOOD**

Mayor Daniels read this Item. Supervisor Young explained the map in the Council packets. In addition to the comments he made in the discussion of Item ‘c’, above, he asked the council to be aware of the attached elevation drawings. He indicated that these are office condominiums. There are three office buildings, one is a medical building and three are for commercial/retail uses. One of those is intended to be a restaurant.

- e. **Public Hearing to consider an Ordinance in regards to amending Section 10-18-2 “Parking Design Standards,” of the Pleasant Grove City Municipal Code, to modify tandem parking to not count towards visitor parking for multiple family units which have a minimum sized driveway in front of attached garages. CITY WIDE IMPACT**

Mayor Daniels read this item. Supervisor Young told the Council that two months ago the Council had approved an ordinance amendment allowing tandem parking in multi-family unit projects. However, that ordinance amendment didn’t specify that tandem parking spaces in driveways of multi-family units are not to be counted towards visitor parking requirements. This ordinance is simply making that clarification, he stated.

Council Member Atwood commented that the police department is now having to tow cars away and they’ve had to place “no parking” signs at Belle Monet. The police department shouldn’t have to do deal with this extra pressure. Supervisor Young indicated that this ordinance amendment would be a good test at the Mayfield development. He noted that most of the previous multi-family projects had been built under less restrictive parking requirements. They’ve now gone from 2.15 per stall per unit to 2.5 stalls per unit. He concluded by saying he hopes these changes will make thing better.

4. Mayor, City Council and Staff Business:

- Director Walker said that all of the painting of turn lanes, etc. had been completed in the lower area of the Boulevard at Sam White's Lane by the BMW Dealership. In addition, reflectors, which will make the cement barriers in this area more visible in the dark, are also in place.
- Supervisor Young said he wanted to give an update regarding Mr. Ken Bushman's (lot 11 in the Falcon View Subdivision) complaint that setbacks were not being met. He said they had reviewed the setbacks, putting a stop order on the project for a half day until they measured both property lines. After measuring and review of the recorded survey plat, it was determined that it is more of a problem of the fence not being on the correct property line vs. the setback not being met to the property line. He said that he and the Mayor would be meeting with Mr. Bushman on Friday, May 11, 2007.
- Director Bradford reminded the Council that the BMW Dealership ribbon cutting would be held at 6 p.m. on May 16, 2007.
- Council Member Boyd told the Council that the Lions Club had called to ask if they could still serve breakfast at the Heritage Festival. They feel they can stand on their own. Director Giles responded that it would be okay for them to do the breakfast.
- Council Member Call thanked the Mayor for the allowing the Council to discuss the upcoming city council agenda items in more detail at tonight's work session. This will help the Council to be better informed for the upcoming meeting.
- Administrator Mills told the Council that Mrs. Heather Beagley was wanting to file a disconnect from Pleasant Grove City and annex into Cedar Hills. He then turned the time over to Recorder Fraughton as she is the one Mrs. Beagley has been talking to.

Recorder Fraughton said Mrs. Beagley had first called her immediately after the April 24, 2007 joint meeting with Cedar Hills @ Deerfield Elementary as to what she needed to do to file a disconnect from Pleasant Grove City. Since then, she has also emailed the Recorder regarding this matter. Yesterday, Mrs. Beagley's mother came in to talk to the Recorder. Recorder Fraughton told Mrs. Beagley's mother that she would talk to the Council at tonight's meeting to see if they would entertain a boundary adjustment or if she'd need to proceed with a disconnect request. Recorder Fraughton asked the Council as to what they would like her to tell Mrs. Beagley regarding this matter.

Council Member Boyd noted that neither Pleasant Grove City or Cedar Hills can provide sewer to the Beagleys. Why can't they stay in Pleasant Grove and the City work on getting sewer to them, she asked. Administrator Mills replied that there is a sewer line on the east side of Canyon Road through Pinnacle Point. He further stated, that if the Council was interested, it would be a lot easier to do a boundary adjustment than a disconnection. He said he was bringing this up because of the discussion the Council had last week in regards to adopting a resolution designating an area for boundary adjusting with Cedar Hills.

Council Member Call stated it made sense to decide on a starting point as to what the Council projects to be the boundary. "We need a template, something semi-official of the areas we can best service," he stated.

Council Member Boyd noted that the Council needs to determine the area the City can best service. She suggested the City then allow those they can't service to individually boundary adjust into Cedar Hills. Cedar Hills wouldn't have to agree with our service area, just individually with each individual's request to boundary adjust. This would be better than having them go through the

disconnect process, she stated. Council Member Atwood interjected that Cedar Hills would still have to agree to each boundary adjustment request.

Council Member Call asked if the Council was in agreement with the boundary line which was recently drawn up. Council Member Atwood said he felt the line should be made cleaner. Council Member Call suggested that this matter be placed on a work session agenda for further discussion. Council Members Boyd, Jensen and Call agreed.

(Council Member Atwood left at 8:22 p.m.)

Mayor Daniels noted that he and Mayor McGee had been in contact since the April 24, 2007 joint meeting. Cedar Hills is working on an interlocal agreement where residents can remain in Pleasant Grove and still hook up to Cedar Hills' services. Pleasant Grove would collect the fees and then reimburse Cedar Hills. He said he and Mayor McGee are pretty close to having a second draft.

At this point, Council Member Call stated that there is more to this matter than services. Residents also want the option to develop smaller lots, as City Hills allows, in the boundary area. Supervisor Young suggested changing the current zoning in the areas outside our service area to be contiguous with Cedar Hills' zoning.

(Administrator Mills left at 8:40 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mayor Daniels directed staff to prepare an interlocal service agreement with Cedar Hills, which would allow residents of both cities to:

1. Hook up to the services of the city closest to them without changing them from the city they currently belong to.
2. The billing would be handled by the city they reside in.
3. They would be required to pay the other city's full costs, not a subsidized fee.
4. The city providing the services would bill the other city on a monthly basis for all such hook ups.
5. Wedgewood Subdivision would have a special fee since their sewer dumps into a Cedar Hills line.
6. Where duplicated services exist, that person would hook up to the city they belong to.

Mayor Daniels also directed staff to:

1. Prepare a zoning map, as Community Development Supervisor Young suggested, as to how the area is developing.
2. Prepare an ordinance so our zoning matches as close to Cedar Hills as we can, with the best interests of the City.

The above presentation is to be done at a future work session to see how the Council feels about such an agreement and ordinance.

Recorder Fraughton will inform Mrs. Beagley that the City is currently working on a service agreement with Cedar Hills to allow residents to use services from Cedar Hills, but still remain in Pleasant Grove City. The City is also looking at allowing downsizing of lots in that area.

6. Adjourn: At 9 p.m. Council Member Jensen moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members McDade, Jensen, Boyd and Call voting “Aye.”

This certifies that the Work Session Minutes
For May 8, 2007 are a true, full and correct
copy as approved by the City Council on
June 5, 2007.

Amanda R. Fraughton, CMC
City Recorder