

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Work Session
June 1, 2021
4:30 p.m.**

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Brent Bullock
Eric Jensen
Cyd LeMone
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Deon Giles, Parks Director
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
Mike Roberts, Police Chief
Drew Engemann, Deputy Fire Chief
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Denise Roy, Finance Director
Tyler Wilkins, Recreation Director

The City Council and staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

4:30 P.M. WORK SESSION

1) Introduce New Employees.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, began by reminding the Council that they are not required by law to stream meetings, which are recorded and available to the public. Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, introduced Melissa Cook who has been with the City since April 2021. She has been processing Business Licenses and has been doing a fantastic job. Ms. Cook addressed the Council and stated that she lives in Pleasant Grove and is married with five stepchildren. She commented that she enjoys working for the City.

Deputy Fire Chief, Drew Engemann, introduced Scott Slater, Colin Moore, and Toby Tobler. He stated that each of these new hires is experienced and the Fire Department is lucky to have them. Mr. Moore addressed the Council and stated that he previously worked for the South Salt Lake

City Fire Department. He was impressed by the Pleasant Grove Fire Department and its relationship with the City Council.

Mr. Slater next addressed the Council and reported that he spent the last five years working for the American Fork Fire Department. He enjoys working in Pleasant Grove and was happy to be with the Pleasant Grove Fire Department. Mr. Tobler addressed the Council and stated that he spent two years with Utah County Fire. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work in Pleasant Grove and the support given to the Fire Department by the City Council.

2) **UDOT Presentation.**

Administrator Darrington introduced Eric Mason, Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Project Manager, to provide an overview of the projects presently planned for Pleasant Grove. Mr. Mason updated the Council on three projects. The first project was the Pleasant Grove Boulevard/North County Boulevard Intersection Improvement Project. The project seeks to address a major choke point at this intersection, as well as the soft spot on North County Boulevard approaching State Street, as well as two signals located at Grove Parkway and at 1300 West.

Mr. Mason presented the proposed design for the intersection at Pleasant Grove Blvd and North County Boulevard. The design includes triple left turns on North County Boulevard towards the freeway, triple left turns on Pleasant Grove Boulevard towards State Street, and double left turns in the other directions. The design also calls for double right turns on southbound North County Boulevard toward the freeway.

It was noted that there is a problem further east with the right turns toward the freeway. Mr. Mason stated that the improvements he described are to the area that approaches I-15. They are increasing the number of left-turn lanes from two to three. One of the issues with having only two turn lanes is that it creates a lot of jockeying for motorists depending on what direction they want to travel on I-15. He stated that the new design should clean up a lot of the jockeying since even the center turn lane will not require a lane change once the turn is complete.

Mr. Mason continued by stating that the design includes two northbound right-turn lanes. He identified the location of the southbound storage, noting that there will be plenty of storage with this configuration. They were able to avoid impacts to Central Bank, but these changes will be impacting properties that have open fields. They are working closely with the City to ensure that the City’s needs are addressed.

He reported that the 2019 statistics for average delays at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard/North County Boulevard intersection were 42 seconds in the morning and 43 seconds in the evening. If no improvements are made, they project that by the year 2030, the average delay will increase by nearly four times.

Mr. Mason stated that this project is currently in the design phase and UDOT is currently conducting outreach to the property owners and the City. They plan to complete the design by the fall and begin construction next summer, with a projected completion date in October 2022. It was clarified that this project does not tie into the project on I-15, other than some widening on

the ramp. The plan will be made available to the City and will be available on the UDOT website for viewing.

Mr. Mason next presented the project at the interchange of I-15 where they plan to construct off-ramps at Proctor Lane. They are still in Phase 1 of this project and are collecting data and conducting surveys. UDOT plans to have the environmental study ready by Fall 2022.

Mr. Mason updated the Council on the State Street Project, which involves improvements from 500 East to 220 South just before the bridge. They moved up their funding from 2024 to 2023. He provided the contact information for that project. Mr. Mason added that the signal at 1650 West is already operational.

3) **Presentation/Discussion on the Downtown Zone Progress – Presenter Director Cardenas.**

Prior to moving onto the presentation of the Downtown Zone, Administrator Darrington raised an issue with one of the public hearing agenda items regarding the Rural Residential (RR) zones and building height in relation to conditional use permits. He provided a summary and history of what is being proposed during the public hearing portion of the Business Meeting.

There is a potential project in the northern part of Pleasant Grove that includes a reception center with other activities. As the project was being reviewed, it was discovered that part of the Code provides that if a developer wants to construct a primary use structure above the allowable height of 35 feet, they can petition the Planning Commission for a conditional use permit. The language in the Code does not include any criteria for the Planning Commission to assess such requested Conditional Use Permits under this section. Because of this ambiguity, Director Cardenas thought it would be better to remove this section from the Code and maintain the maximum building height of 35 feet in RR zones for primary use buildings.

Administrator Darrington stated that the Planning Commission supported this change to the Code. The Planning Commission also recommended that this change applies to all Residential (R-1) zones. Administrator Darrington stated that this ended up being two separate ordinance changes because of the timing of the recommendation by the Planning Commission. Six weeks ago, the Council reviewed a request to remove that section of the Code that allowed a builder to apply for a Conditional Use Permit for a building in excess of 35 feet in height in an RR zone. The change adopted by the Council impacted the developer of the reception center who expressed concerns about the change.

The item before the Council tonight involves the same change to the remaining R-1 zones and removes the process for seeking a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Commission for a portion of a building extending higher than 35 feet.

Administrator Darrington reported that the developer of the reception center has asked the Council to reconsider the ordinance change made in the RR zone. If the Council wishes to reconsider it, there is a process required to get that matter back on the Council's agenda. He stated that there

are a few issues with the developer that are not related to tonight's public hearing. Additionally, some residents have submitted emails disagreeing with the City's calculation of building height based on topography. The Code defines how those heights are calculated and the City has been consistent in its calculations. The developer likewise disagrees with how they have calculated building heights according to the Code. The developer also has a separate issue regarding the definitions of primary structure and secondary structure. The mechanism for developers who disagree with the conclusions of the staff or the Planning Commission is to go to a hearing officer.

Administrator Darrington stated that they have advised the developer to submit his concerns to a hearing officer for a determination of the City's interpretation of the Code. They have not yet received an application from the developer to submit this issue to a hearing officer.

A separate issue not before the Council tonight was the developer's position that the change in the Code was improper because they had started the application process when the change was made. Administrator Darrington noted that the developer had not, and has not yet, submitted a site plan. They, therefore, do not know the height of the proposed structure.

Administrator Darrington stated that they have also advised the developer that if they feel that they should be grandfathered in, that that issue should be submitted to the Hearing Officer as well. He stated that at tonight's public hearing, there may be questions as to how they calculate the heights of buildings, however, that is not what is in front of the Council and they are not contemplating changing that definition at tonight's meeting. The only item before the Council is addressing the comments that support keeping the authority of the Planning Commission to issue Conditional Use Permits.

It was confirmed that prior to the recent change to the Code, the method for calculating building height was already in the Code and has not changed. Administrator Darrington stated that staff is not contemplating changing that portion of the Code, but if the Council wants to review it, they can bring it back for further discussion at a later date.

In response to an inquiry, Administrator Darrington commented that he is unaware of any current projects that would be impacted by the discussions to be held during the public hearing. Council Member Bullock recalled a prior discussion about the intention to make this Code change, and although the developer had started the application process, they had not filed their application. The application was filed one week after the change and their Conditional Use Permit was denied based on the changes to the Code.

Administrator Darrington commented that these changes are in the long-term best interest of the City. Council Member Bullock expressed that it was unfortunate timing for this applicant, but he did not act timely.

The discussion then turned back to the Downtown Zone and the presentation by Director Cardenas. He advised the Council that staff has been working on a series of changes to Downtown Village as requested by the Council. He explained that there are two Sub-districts in Downtown Village. After receiving direction from the Council, they recommend reducing the Transitional Sub-district

to bring in more single-family homes. Referencing the map presented to the Council, Director Cardenas explained that 200 East would be the cutoff point. He explained that they are not reducing the Transitional Sub-district in certain areas because they had already had received an application for development in those areas.

Director Cardenas explained that they are also recommending retaining the different residential uses with the exception of triplexes. Duplexes will still be allowed and instead of three units comprising 7,500, they propose allowing two units in 5,000, which reduces the density. They also propose eliminating all commercial uses in the newly created Transitional Sub-district. Currently, in addition to the commercial uses in the Commercial Sub-district, they also have some commercial uses in the Transitional Sub-district. This meets the City Council's condition to have this sub-district serve as a residential buffer.

Director Cardenas reported that the fourth change they are recommending is to eliminate the Downtown Design Standards and Guidelines. They are proposing to keep those design standards and guidelines for what will be called the Strawberry District. The changes will be incorporated in the proposed Code amendment that will be presented to the Council for consideration.

Council Member Williams asked about the type of activities allowed within a commercial use zone. Director Cardenas stated that there are different levels of commercial zones throughout the City. For the downtown Strawberry District, there is a list of approved commercial uses, including restaurants, office buildings, and retail. Director Cardenas clarified that although they changed the name, the commercial uses remain the same.

Council Member Williams stated that he does not want to see a lot of office buildings along Main Street. Director Cardenas noted that there are ways that they can restrict the office uses and provided an example of conditioning the approval of office space with the provision of retail space. Council Member Williams would like to incentivize commercial uses that attract people to the area for retail or dining. He remarked that because of the current price per square foot on Main Street it would be a shame to allow just office space to be developed, as that would ruin the downtown feel.

It was confirmed that the Council wants to see a plan that significantly limits office use on the ground floor along Main Street. Council Member Bullock warned about the temptation to develop the empty lots along the west side of Main Street. Instead, they need to create a place where people want to go. Director Cardenas noted that they recently created a significant incentive by switching the parking requirements for retail with those for office use. Council Member Williams commented that he would like to see the west side of Main Street developed with restaurants, retail, and upper floor office space that would allow corporate citizens to have options. Administrator Darrington confirmed that they would come back with further discussion points. Once the Council is comfortable then they would begin engaging property owners along Main Street before they change any zoning in the area.

Council Member Andersen requested clarification about allowing commercial in the smaller Transition Zone. Director Cardenas confirmed that no commercial uses would be allowed in the

newly drawn Transition Zone. It was also clarified that the zone requires retail on the street level if there is residential on the upper floors. This requirement currently does not apply to office uses. The new zoning requirements would only apply to future developments as they cannot impose requirements on existing uses. However, if an existing user leaves and the new user wants to change the existing use, they would then be subject to the new requirements. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, commented that they want to create a synergy between office space, retail, and restaurants, as the downtown office workers will support the retail and restaurants.

Mayor Fugal reported that he recently visited one of his sisters in Red Bluff, California and he stayed in Redding during the visit. He stated that Redding has two blocks of the downtown area that was recently developed as mixed-use, with shops, restaurants, and offices. He noted that they were also building a new parking garage two blocks away. He commented that this area is what Pleasant Grove's Main Street used to look like. He offered to talk to the owner of the property along the west side of Main Street to see if his vision is consistent with what they have been discussing tonight. Council Member Williams added that now is the time to revitalize that part of downtown. Council Member LeMone stated that during discussions in December, the property owner envisioned office space on the west side of Main Street. It was recalled by some that the stated vision included retail on the street level. The current owner of that property is looking to build on the property.

4) **Adjournment.**

MOTION: Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the Work Session at 5:33 p.m. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Bullock, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting "Aye".

The Work Session adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

The City Council Work Session minutes of June 1, 2021, were approved by the City Council on June 22, 2021.



Kathy T. Kresser, MMC
City Recorder

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

