

**Pleasant Grove City Council
Special Work Session Minutes
June 12, 2007
6 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor:

Michael W. Daniels

City Council Members: Excused:

Cindy Boyd Lee Jensen

Darold J. McDade

Mark Atwood

Bruce Call

Deputy Recorder:

Mary Burgin

OTHERS:

Frank Mills, City Administrator,

Tom Paul, Police Chief

Ken Young, Supervisor of Community Development

Sean Allen, Planner

Libby Flegal, Neighborhood Chair

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.

1. Opening Remarks

The Opening Remarks were given by Council Member McDade.

2. To discuss provisions and potential amendments of the recently approved Planned Residential development (PRD) Ordinance including, but not limited to, the maximum percentage of reduced lot sizes that will be permitted.

Mayor Daniels explained that the Council had asked for this meeting to further discuss the possible amending of the PRD (Planned Residential Development) Ordinance. He said that the applicant, Mr. Matt Kriser, is a member of the Planning Commission. Additionally, The Mayor said Mr. Kriser is also a developer. He said when Mr. Kriser has come before the Council; it was difficult at times to know if he was speaking as a developer or a member of the Planning Commission. The Mayor noted that without Mr. Kriser in attendance, and with staff able to come forward, the issue can be, as Council Member Atwood said, debated without a conflict of issue in the room.

Despite past issues with this kind of development, Mayor Daniels observed that the Council could determine whether the new PRD ordinance was good for the City. Or, he said, some have said the City shouldn't have this ordinance at all. Others have said that the restrictions (i.e. open space requirements, etc.) within the ordinance should be removed. He said this meeting had been called to give staff a chance to decide together the feeling and course of action, if necessary, that needed to be taken.

Supervisor Young handed out copies of the PRD Zone ordinance amendment recommendations. He explained that in looking at all of the possible actions, there were a lot of intricacies with this ordinance. He said his goal was to try to simplify the issues as much as he could. In meeting with planning staff and engineering, as well as concerned calls from City Council Members, he said he hopes to address the issues that have been raised regarding the PRD Ordinance.

On the first sheet of the report (as shown in exhibit 'A'), Supervisor Young explained that in sitting down with the applicant, he asked in what direction they wanted to head with their request. He listed the varying goals, which include a review by the applicant, Council Member Call and the planning and engineering staff. Additionally, he said it needed to be investigated as to whether the minimum of 40% of standard size lots works better and if it is easier to calculate.

Lastly, a determination will need to be made as to whether or not the ordinance amendments are recommended. He said the recommended amendments would be; 1. No required maximum percentage of gross acreage for reduced sized lots; 2. To require a minimum of 40% of the gross acreage to meet the minimum lot size of the underlying zone; 3. Open space minimum of 12% for all zones; 4. Require a good mix of sizes for reduced lots, avoiding a large number of lots at the minimum size; 5. The minimum lot width not to be less than 80% of the minimum lot width of the underlying zone; 6. The maximum density to be the same as developable densities in a standard subdivision; 7. Minimum lot sizes to follow a better scale. Supervisor Young explained that there are a lot of intricacies as well as varying scenarios with these issues.

Council Member Call asked if there was a reason for not saying in the report that if a lot had the minimum of 12,000 sq. ft, the builder reverts to the code for the lot width. Supervisor Young said that was correct, that it would give the 80% minimum lot width. Council Member Boyd said this wouldn't, then, be planned any different than a regular subdivision.

Council Member Atwood asked if this would be the same as the lots in the Apple Grove subdivision. Supervisor Young said no, that the code was different when Apple Grove was built.

Council Member Call said, then, that when he did the math and looked across the board, it looked as though what was needed was already in the City code books. He said that the page that shows the recommended minimum lot sizes makes it plainer to him the difference between the standard lot and the reduced lot. Supervisor Young explained that the maximum PRD density is the same as a standard subdivision. In reality, he said it was actually much lower. Council Member Call said this favors those that want less density.

Mayor Daniels asked Supervisor Young what he recommended. He said the figures that are underlined on the recommended minimum lot size page are the ones staff recommends. Mayor Daniels looked at the figures and said that it looked like there was less density with those figures.

Supervisor Young noted that in a development of 40 acres, with the new, proposed rules, it would be calculated as follows; It would require that 40% would be standard lots. Of the 40 acres, 32 would be standard sized lots. They would then take out 12% open space. What would be left, would be dependent upon the right-of-way percentage. Council Member Atwood asked if 56 ft. roads would be required. Supervisor Young said yes, full-sized roads would be required. Mayor Daniels asked who would own the roads. Council Member Call said that the PRD HOA would own the roads.

Supervisor Young explained that if there were 72 maximum lots with the current ordinance, as adopted, would allow up to 80 lots. This would allow 1.8 per acre. This would be eight less lots.

Council Member Call, then, said that 1.8 times 40 equals 72. He said that he couldn't find where the PRD would allow more. Supervisor Young said that those figures would be based on the right-of-way mix. Council Member Call said that would be in the lower zone. Supervisor Young said yes, that would be a much easier way to calculate it—as the ordinance is written.

Mayor Daniels asked if Supervisor Young would then run the figures on the proposed 50%. Supervisor Young said that with the 50%, you would take off the 40%, then work down to the reduced lot size. Council Member Call said that with the new rules, there would be fewer lots and they would be more standard in size. Council Member Boyd said the lots could even be larger.

Council Member Call remarked that he appreciated Supervisor Young's explanation. He said that the reduced sized lots have a broader mix, without the ultra small lots.

Council Member Atwood asked why the Council should even care. Council Member Call said that it was a better idea with the PRD's in that they allow flexibility and creativity. Supervisor Young added that the 40% to 50% for the developer is better than all of the lots being of minimum size. Council Member Call noted that it would also be more aesthetically pleasing.

Council Member Atwood said he drove by a PRD in Cedar Hills and American Fork. He said he tried to look into the development to see how nice it was, and the gates were locked. He noted that he didn't get to enjoy one tree. He said he feels the Council continues to give and give. He asked what it mattered at all, as he still wasn't convinced this was best for the overall community. Council Member Boyd said she liked the fact that there was more open space within the PRD areas.

Council Member Call asked Council Member Atwood if his biggest objection was that the PRD's were so exclusive that if people didn't live in them they were not able to enjoy the amenities provided. Council Member Atwood said that being exclusive and the open space didn't really matter. He said that the amenities only gave benefit to those that live in the developments.

Council Member Boyd said that despite the fact that she doesn't swim in the pools in the multi-family housing in The Grove doesn't mean that they aren't an asset to and participating in the entire community. She went on to say that she felt that the City was raising the bar by having this kind of development coming in.

Council Member Atwood observed that the Council had already approved the 40%. Supervisor Young said that if a development comes in with 20 acres and has 40 half-acre lots, there is the same density and they would have open space. Council Member Atwood said he could care less. Council Member Call said if he could care less, then there should be no argument. Council Member Atwood said all he could see was the developer getting the biggest bang out of his buck. Council Member Boyd explained that the developer will be getting more for the land, and the Council wasn't giving them anything different other than the clubhouse and open space.

Council Member Atwood asked why the developer can't build without having to have a PRD. Council Member Boyd said it was due to the creativity that the developer can build into the PRD.

Council Member Call said that as he has looked at these developments, he feels that the argument isn't necessarily for the developer, but for the residents. He said it provides value to the citizens that move into the PRD's. "Everything doesn't have to benefit the whole populace," he explained. He said it makes it better for some residents, without hurting other residents of the City.

Mayor Daniels told the Council that he had recently visited Mrs. Dowde, who is a neighbor of Mr. Bushman and Mr. Randy Kummer. He said that where her home is located, there is development going in on one side, with existing homes on the other. He noted that she said she is tired of living in the large home she is currently in, and would like to move to a smaller home on a smaller lot. She also expressed that she would like to be in a protective environment with people of her like age. He said they looked at pictures of PRD's and she said this was the new circumstance she would like to live in. Mayor Daniels said that excluding the developer, this issue addresses the specific needs of

certain citizens in Pleasant Grove that would like to remain in the City. He said many residents are born here and want to live out their years in the community without having to leave to find the kind of development they are looking for.

The Mayor went on to say that some residents have the ability to pay for a PRD. He said that someone has to see this market and develop the product. He said this might be the only one. He also noted that the City must protect itself and make sure that the infrastructure, including the roads, etc, in the PRD's are such that, if necessary, the City could go in and take care of them.

Council Member Atwood then observed that the City had allowed the development of the Liberty Cove development off Locust Ave. He asked if they needed the same allowances for open space, etc, that was currently being asked for. Mayor Daniels said that Liberty Cove was actually twin homes with little or no open space or amenities.

Mayor Daniels said the City has a responsibility to provide the aging population in the City an opportunity to stay in Pleasant Grove. He said from this perspective, the Council needs to determine if this type of development would meet that need.

Supervisor Young added that the PRD's are just one vehicle in providing varied scenarios for various age groups and their housing needs. He said that with an aging population, there are many creative scenarios that would address their needs.

Mayor Daniels then said that he would like to hear from what he considered a highly-respected member of the community as to what she thought of the PRD philosophy. He then asked NAB Chair Libby Flegal to comment.

Mrs. Flegal said that as she has listened to the proposal for this PRD, she can see it as a great asset to the community. She said that instead of being multi-family housing, the PRD would be nicer for those that wanted to remain in a single-family home without the yard work. She also said that she would be very interested in such a development with open space, a pool and other amenities provided. She also said that many people leave the cities as they retire and look for just this kind of development.

Mayor Daniels said in his conversation with Mrs. Dowde and her neighbors the Bushmans, this type of development would be a relief for them in that they would no longer have to take care of a large yard, and would have the security they would enjoy.

Council Member Atwood said that in the PRD's that he looked into, they were not populated by older people. He also said that paying almost three quarter of a million dollars for a home in a PRD was probably making people start all over. Mrs. Flegal said that most people would have enough equity, etc, to be able to cover that cost. Mayor Daniels added that the homes she was talking about were more in the half-million dollar range.

Council Member Boyd said others in the City have their property for sale. She said it has been for sale for quite awhile. However, she feels that Mr. Kriser will probably be able to sell this kind of scenario very easily.

Mayor Daniels then asked that the Council take the information they had been given at this meeting and go through it and consider it. He said the Council had already approved the PRD Ordinance. He said it would be on the July 3, 2007 Council agenda. He asked that if the Council had questions, that they ask staff.

8. Adjourn

ACTION: At 6:50 p.m, Council Member Boyd moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Atwood seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members McDade, Atwood, Boyd and Call voting “Aye.”

This certifies that the Work Session Minutes For June 12, 2007 are a true, full and correct copy as approved by the City Council on July 3, 2007.

Mary Burgin, Deputy Recorder