

Pleasant Grove City Council Meeting Minutes
January 21, 2014
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mayor:

Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen
Cindy Boyd
Cyd LeMone
Jay Meacham
Ben Stanley

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Sheri Britsch, Arts and Culture Director
Libby Flegal, NAB Chairperson
Karen Bezzant, Treasurer
Barbara Johnson, Notary Republic

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, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley were present.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout, Truman Porter.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The Opening Remarks were given by Public Works Director, Lynn Walker.

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

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, stated that item "e" would be continued until the February 18 meeting. Reagan Outdoor Signs requested a delay to a later date because they recently acquired new counsel. Community Development Director, Ken Young, stated that there is an error in item "f." The item pertains to Manila Heights Plat D, not Plat A. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, stated that the item would need to be renoticed.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to approve the agenda with the changes of item "e" and "f" being continued to a later date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- a) **City Council and Work Session Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the January 7, 2013 meeting.**
- b) **To Consider for Approval Change Order No. 1 Requested by B. Jackson Construction for the 1300 West and PG Blvd. Intersection Traffic Signal and ATMS Fiber Optic System.**
- c) **To Consider for Approval Paid Vouchers for (January 9, 2014).**

Council Member Meacham asked if the City still has a general fund for Leisure Services. Finance Director, Dean Lundell, said there is a department in the General Fund that still goes by Leisure Services but the name could be changed. He offered to talk to Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, about possibly changing the name. Council Member Meacham asked what pool work had been done recently. Director Giles said they have begun work on the liner and will be making payments as pieces of the project are completed. It will be completed before the pool opens in the spring.

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

6) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Daniels opened the public session.

Douglas Gordon asked about advertising signs for seasonal businesses and stated that he has been an entrepreneur for 35 years. Last year Mr. Gordon sold custom fireworks for the first time and inadvertently placed illegal signs in the City. After learning more about the City Code he adjusted

the signs for New Years but again had problems. Mr. Gordon was preparing for Chinese New Year and would like to advertise without issues. He was proposing to the City that seasonal businesses pay the standard \$500 cash bond and be allowed signage. At the end of the firework season the owners collect their signs and clean up their stores and the City refunds them \$300 and keeps \$200. This will allow the City to make some money off of the seasonal companies. Mr. Gordon said because he had to move his signs out of the City over New Years he had a lot of business from residents in other cities where his signs were placed, but not a lot from Pleasant Grove.

Mayor Daniels thought Mr. Gordon brought up excellent ideas and suggested he speak to Director Young. Administrator Darrington said staff has spoken with Mr. Gordon several times and has not made a lot of progress, which is likely why he is coming before the Council. Mr. Gordon explained that he is not requesting a change for Chinese New Year, but hoped that by summer something could be worked out. Attorney Petersen suggested Mr. Gordon speak with her and Director Young. Administrator Darrington said Mr. Gordon was likely requesting a change to the City Code, which will require an action item on an agenda in the future.

Director Young presented a plaque of appreciation to the former members of different commissions. One plaque was given to Mr. Steven Phelon for his five years of service on the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Jeff Cardon was also awarded a plaque for his more than four years of service on the Planning Commission.

Mayor Daniels closed the public session.

7) **BUSINESS**

A) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL THE APPOINTMENT OF THE CITY TREASURER AND THE CITY RECORDER.

Mayor Daniels read this item and indicated that Council will be voting on re-appointing Karen Bezzant as the City Treasurer and Kathy Kresser as the City Recorder.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve Kathy Kresser as City Recorder and Karen Bezzant as City Treasurer. Council Member Meacham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Notary Republic Barbara Johnson swore in City Recorder, Kathy Kresser, and City Treasurer Karen Bezzant.

B) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2014-1) AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 14, SECTION 24, SUBSECTION 3C-2, THE GROVE INTERCHANGE SUBDISTRICT PERMITTED USES, AMENDING PROVISIONS REGARDING LIMITING PROFESSIONAL OFFICE USES IN THE GROVE INTERCHANGE SUBDISTRICT TO LESS THAN 50% OF EACH INDIVIDUAL PROJECT AREA WHICH IS BOUND BY EXISTING OR PLANNED PUBLIC STREETS, OR LESS THAN 50% OF A COMBINATION OF SUCH PROJECT AREAS, AS APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL, ETC. (CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 7, 2014 MEETING) PRESENTER: DIRECTOR YOUNG.

Director Young reported that last spring the City Council passed a moratorium on development in the Interchange Subdistrict in order to look at options allowing the City to better steer development in that area. The development focus for many years had been the highest quality of economic development including the highest retail options. When the Council learned of a potential development that would comprise all office space they asked staff to look into ways to amend the ordinance.

The language suggested would be added to the permitted uses list as a category of professional offices. The verbiage read “limited to less than 50% of each individual project area which is bound by existing or planned public streets, or less than 50% of a combination of such project areas.” This verbiage would allow some flexibility to the Council as they approve developments.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing.

Sandy Carter, 2708 North 450 West, thought it was a great idea to have a combination of retail and office development. She stated that it is important for the City to have strong development in such a good location. She thought this change would make Pleasant Grove an even better place to live.

Jane Robinson reported that she owns the Bungalow just off Main Street and the railroad tracks. She wanted to be sure that the Council remains cognizant of Old Town and thought it should remain the way it is now.

Jeff Cardon was concerned when the item limiting professional offices to the 50% was presented to the Planning Commission. He felt the change would make the Interchange Subdistrict primarily retail and sales oriented. He thought it would be a missed opportunity for the City to limit office space so dramatically in this area. The Grove is a great place to develop a tax and sales tax base for the City. The Interchange area provides a perfect opportunity to attract professional workers from other cities and sell to them from the stores directly across the street. He did not feel the commercial sales zones were likely to attract residents from other cities to Pleasant Grove.

Director Young noted that the Planning Commission as a body recommended the change.

Mayor Daniels closed the public hearing.

Council Member Stanley confirmed that the staff and Planning Commission recommendations are in alignment with each other. He asked if the property owner, Dennis Baker, was present at the meeting.

Administrator Darrington reported that Mr. Baker was not present. When they discussed the matter this last summer there was a group that wanted to purchase all 37 acres and develop it all as office space. The City’s long-term plan had always been for the area to be retail space in conjunction with the hotel space. As staff presented the issue to the Council, they originally suggested only changing the 37-acre area in question. The Council then requested that the entire Interchange Zone be reviewed. Retail sales tax generates more money to the City than property tax and to have all of the Interchange Zone full of businesses only creates a problem financially for the City. Staff felt it was important to protect the retail viability of the area so that in the long term the future finances of the

community are also protected. The potential sales tax dollars are not ear marked for anything, but provide general services, public safety, and other important items.

Council Member Boyd remarked that she does not associate commercial retail centers with office space. She realized, however, that retail centers are extremely important to the financial viability of the City.

Council Member Stanley felt it was clear that everyone shares the goal of having as much commercial retail and destination commercial as possible. He wanted to know if there is a less restrictive way to provide the same protection. He thought the City may need to take more time to consider all options and asked what other options were presented other than the 50%.

Director Young said that this is the only proposal that has been brought forward based on the request of the City Council. The City Council recommended they look at 50%. Council Member Andersen asked Director Lundell about the business plan given to the City for this area. She asked if the total retail tax base was estimated to come to \$6 million. Director Lundell responded that the numbers were created based on looking at other areas that were similar to the Interchange Zone. There is still the potential of hitting a \$6 million retail tax base with retail and office mix. Council Member Andersen was concerned about limiting what a property owner can do with their land.

Administrator Darrington remarked that property owners control the property and who they sell to. The City can only control the zoning to specify uses and cannot specify what retailer or company they want in a space. In the past the Council felt it was worth being patient to develop the area in order to get the type of retail/office mix they felt would be best for the City.

Council Member LeMone remarked that they are still being developer friendly with the 50/50 split. This will still allow for some office space mixed with retail. To leave the future of the City up to one property owner gives that one person a lot of power. She stated that the residents that have spoken with her do not want any more high density housing or office space. They want places to shop and eat. Council Member LeMone was on board with moving forward with the plan and felt that the impact of bringing more sales tax to the City is extremely important.

Administrator Darrington asked if they noticed or were required to notice the property owner. Attorney Petersen responded that they are not required to because this is not a rezone but an amendment to the zoning text of permitted uses. Administrator Darrington said the property owner sent a letter to the Planning Commission expressing opposition to the moratorium the City put in place. The City has spoken with the property owner in the past about potential projects. Council Member Boyd said the Council has spoken with the property owner about a project that would fit in the new ordinance.

Council Member Meacham said the perspective of the City has not changed over the past several years. This amendment only defines the vision in more detail to make it easier to understand. Council Member Stanley asked what the vote in the Planning Commission was. Director Young responded that it was four to two.

Council Member LeMone remarked that it can be changed in the future if necessary. The amendment protects the best interest of the City. Council Member Stanley commented that

everyone would like to see commercial retail there, but he was concerned that even with the power to grant a variance the Council would never receive a variance application because of the way the ordinance will be worded. He was torn and saw the compelling arguments of both sides.

Council Member LeMone remarked that when a business comes to Director Young staff reviews the ordinances and has the ability to appeal if desired. She saw no reason to wait to conduct more research when they already know how important sales tax is to the City.

Director Young said there may be some risk that the City would lose an applicant based on the way the ordinance is worded. There is a chance that the potential applicant may not even talk to him at all because they assume they will be denied. The larger risk was leaving the ordinance as it is because he cannot deny an applicant if they meet the ordinance requirements, which currently allows 100% office space.

Council Member Stanley agreed that a change is needed but wondered if there is a less restrictive option that protects the interests of the City and the property owners. Council Member Andersen originally felt that the ordinance change was going to be very restrictive, but now feels it will inform the developers about the desires of the City. She commented that developers will come into a project regardless of the numbers if they want the project enough. Council Member Boyd added that any developer who takes on this size of a project will be large and well established and they will be given solid guidelines.

Mayor Daniels clarified that the change would put in place the ability to deny something they do not want. He asked if the City is looking to create something that states exactly what they want to help simplify and clarify questions developers may have. Director Young responded that they could add a vision statement to the ordinance if the Council preferred.

Mayor Daniels suggested the possibility of eliminating office space from the ordinance all together. Attorney Petersen responded that because it is a permitted use, a developer could construct 37 acres of office space. The area was always intended to be mixed use which is why both retail and office spaces are listed in the permitted uses. She said they could potentially change the office to a conditional use but the City has been trying to move away from that.

Council Member Stanley questioned why the City is moving away from conditional uses. Attorney Petersen explained that the legislature has requested that cities trim down their conditional uses and determine if something is allowed or not.

ACTION: Council Member Boyd moved to approve Ordinance 2012-1 amending Title 10, Chapter 14, Section 24, Subsection 3C-2, the Grove Interchange Subdistrict Permitted Uses, amending provisions regarding limiting professional office uses in the Grove Interchange Subdistrict to less than 50% of each individual project area, which is bound by existing or planned public streets, or less than 50% of a combination of such project areas, as approved by the City Council. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley voting “Aye.”

C) PUBLIC HEARING CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION TWO ORDINANCES (2014-4 AND 2014-5) REZONING VARIOUS PROPERTIES BETWEEN APPROXIMATELY 505 WEST TO 125 WEST ON THE NORTH SIDE OF STATE STREET FROM DOWNTOWN VILLAGE TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL (C-G) AND COMMERCIAL SALES (C-S). (OLD FORT AND SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOODS) PRESENTER: DIRECTOR YOUNG.

Council Member Boyd informed the Council as a matter of record that she has a family member that owns a business in the area but would be voting on the issue.

Director Young reported that the matter was coming to the City Council in response to direction by the City Council to staff. The concern was that there are businesses or potential businesses that would prefer to not be regulated by the stricter guidelines of the Downtown Village Zone in that they interface with and have great interaction with the business corridor of State Street rather than downtown Pleasant Grove.

Staff created two areas, dividing at the railroad tracks, and there is a slight difference in those properties depending on which side of the tracks they fall on. To the north, south, and west of Area One is the CG Zone which is general commercial and the most open and flexible commercial zoning that the City has. The properties within Area One relate more to the CG Zone properties. The zoning in this area was initially modified to include it in the Downtown Village Zone because the City felt that 200 South at State Street would make a good “entryway” into downtown. The City is not convinced that that specific location is the best entrance into downtown and that perhaps the true entrance would be at the railroad tracks. If and when the properties redevelop in Area One it would make more sense to redevelop on the State Street corridor rather than as part of downtown Pleasant Grove.

Area Two falls on the west side of the railroad tracks and includes Ace Hardware down to Daylight Donuts. Those businesses have interaction with State Street and property owners of some of these companies have requested that they have the flexibility offered to other State Street businesses. The area to the south and southeast is the CS Zone, which is similar to the CG Zone and slightly more limited but focused on retail business. The General Commercial Zone to the west allows for things such as auto repair.

After review staff recommended the City create the two separate areas and do two separate zone changes. The request came to the Planning Commission at the January 9 meeting. The Planning Commission recognized that the businesses on the State Street corridor should possibly be allowed more flexibility but they felt that changing the zone was not necessarily the best way to do that. It was mentioned that the area was included into the Downtown Village Zone intentionally to provide an entrance into that zone and it may not be wise to change it. Another option would be to amend the ordinance for the Downtown Village to allow those properties that face onto State Street or within a certain proximity of State Street to have the same permitted uses as the CS Zone, but that all other requirements such as signage, architecture and landscaping that are required of businesses in the Downtown Village Zone remain. This would grandfather in any existing properties and when the properties redevelop they would be required to develop as per the Downtown Village requirements.

Planning Commission's final recommendation was that Area One be changed to CG but Area Two remain in the Downtown Village Zone. They also recommend that staff come forward with a separate motion in amending the code text of the Downtown Village Zone to allow the businesses that front State Street to have greater flexibility such as those in the CS Zone.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing.

Jane Robinson remarked that there are very few people who still have residential property close to Main Street. Those property owners are planning to keep the property in their families and she hopes that they will be grandfathered in. She asked if residential commercial is included in the current zone. Director Young said it was included in the mixed use area along with any other use permitted in the downtown area. Ms. Robinson asked what some of the restrictions might be that the residents would have to be concerned about within the current zoning. Director Young said he would be happy to meet with Ms. Robinson and review the zoning requirements and answer any specific questions she might have. She hoped the City will never make a change that will harm the historical residential homes in that area.

Dennis Thayne reported that he owns a business at 385 South Main Street that faces State Street. To the right of his office there used to be a large metal fence and a lot of junk. He has since taken down the fence and cleaned up the yard. He would like to take the front of that property and turn it into a small car lot. According to State requirements he has enough space to develop this kind of business. He would not like to take the property out of the downtown area, but he would like a conditional use. The ordinance change would be better for him, but if the change does not happen he will ask for a conditional use.

Chris Brightenberg, 1399 West 1400 North, in Lehi, reported that he is a major property owner in the area in question. He has been actively involved in the Chamber of Commerce and other committees in Pleasant Grove for over 10 years. He would prefer not to change Area Two to the CS Zone but to maintain the current zone as it exists. He said it is important to have a recognizable entrance into the downtown area. As development takes place he would like to see an entrance into something bigger and better that shows the look and feel of old downtown. He wants to see the downtown area thrive and grow and changing to a CS Zone will remove the design standards that are important to the City's vision for the area.

Council Member Boyd asked if the City allows for new uses but keeps the same restrictive architectural design and other elements if Mr. Brightenberg would find that a win/win. He hoped other property owners have the same desire to maintain the standard of what Pleasant Grove is and try to maintain the vision of its forefathers.

Kira Harris, an Alpine Drive resident, wanted to see the area developed and made more attractive. Her home has a view of the area and it is not very appealing. She is not attached to a certain vision but just wants it to look fresher. If the downtown village ordinances are preventing the area from being upgraded she would prefer to change it. If changing will not help beautify the area, it might as well be left as is. Mayor Daniels remarked that if someone comes in under an ordinance and wants to make a change they are required to build it according to the ordinance in place at the time. It places no burden on current business or property owners from making any changes to what is

there. If they want to make a change to their business then they are required to comply with the new ordinance standards.

Director Young said the intent of the Downtown Village Zone was to add a layer of quality requirements and an entrance to the area in a good location. By changing the zoning the City is stripping away the layer of quality requirements and allowing for more uses. He agreed that the Planning Commission's recommendation may be the best way to keep the quality standards while still allowing for more uses.

Director Young said the action plan is a long-range vision of what the City wants the downtown to become. It will take years before enough redevelopment will occur and improve everything in the way the City envisions. The Council needs to decide what they want it to look like now so that if someone buys a large piece of property in the future they will be required to meet design standards.

Clark Evans, 752 North Locust Ave in Lindon, identified himself as the owner of the Purple Turtle. He asked if he was to expand his business by purchasing additional property whether he would have to change the look of the existing business. Mayor Daniels responded that under the existing ordinance any time a structural change is made the entire business has to be brought to the current code standard. Mr. Evans stated that if the City is concerned about bringing businesses to Pleasant Grove they should not put tighter restrictions on business owners. He did not see a problem with changing the zone and thought it would invite more retail and business to the City and the downtown area.

Sandy Carter remarked that it seemed that the Council was trying to put a better face on the City and beautify it as much as possible, especially in specific areas. She stated that business owners should have a say in what changes occur that affect their businesses. One cannot stop growth from occurring and it is difficult to match reality and dreams. She was conflicted with the best way to move forward and could see the benefit of guiding new growth while still thinking of the current business owners.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public hearing.

Council Member Meacham suggested voting on item 2014-4 before discussing 2014-5.

ACTION: Council Member Meacham moved to approve Ordinance 2014-4 an amendment to the official zoning map of Pleasant Grove City rezoning approximately 5.4 acres located from approximately 505 West to the railroad tracks on State Street from Downtown Village to General Commercial. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley voting "Aye."

Council Member Boyd clarified that one option is to do as the Planning Commission suggested and not change the zone to CS but add permitted uses. Administrator Darrington remarked that the new permitted uses would only include the businesses that face State Street. Council Member Boyd indicated that that is what she would prefer.

Council Member Meacham suggested continuing the item and redefining the details. Director Young said if the Council decides they want to do what Council Member Boyd suggests, they would have to deny the zone change tonight.

Mayor Daniels indicated that if the ordinance goes through tonight as is, the vision of the old downtown look would no longer apply. If the ordinance is denied, the Council will direct staff to move in a different direction leaving things as they are for the time being. Administrator Darrington explained that a new proposal would have to go back to the Planning Commission and come back through the Council if the ordinance is denied tonight.

Council Member LeMone felt that having a permitted use within a restricted area while still maintaining the design standards would be the best of both worlds for the City. She preferred to deny the current ordinance.

Council Member Andersen clarified that the only time the building and design would have to be changed is if the structure of the building is being altered.

ACTION: Council Member Boyd moved to deny Ordinance 2014-5 and that Council and staff look into other options for the properties that front State Street. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed with Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone and Meacham voting “Aye,” and Council Member Stanley voting “Nay.”

D) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2014-6) ADOPTING THE PLEASANT GROVE CITY VICINITY MAP TO PROVIDE LONG RANGE PLANNING FOR LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS, PER CITY CODE SECTION 10-5-4. (CITY WIDE) PRESENTER: ENGINEER LEWIS.

City Engineer, Degen Lewis, stated that City Code requires Pleasant Grove have a vicinity map for long-range planning for local streets. Staff created the map to bring the City into compliance with the Code. They looked at undeveloped properties in the City and based on the zoning, lot layout options, restrictions on roads, and other data and created the vicinity map. He said there are other potential options on how the roads could be laid out because they had to make assumptions on how things would develop. This map was meant to be a guideline.

Engineer Lewis focused on which roads need to connect. There were some areas that were clear and some that were less obvious. Engineer Lewis’s primary focus was to ensure that they provide interconnectivity in the community with as many alternatives as possible.

Mayor Daniels said the options are to comply with City Code by adopting the vicinity map. The other option was for the Council to request that staff conduct additional research and change the verbiage on the ordinance that requires the map. The main issue discussed previously was whether developers are required to follow the plan or if it simply a suggestion. Administrator Darrington stated that the plan is not intended to define specific alignments and is only a suggestion.

Council Member Boyd asked if the map can be more general in covering the streets and trails rather than list the details of all of the lot lines. Engineer Lewis stated that the lot lines are shown in order to determine where the next street needs to start. He also needs to ensure that they provide enough

space for lot depth and lot area to be met. The lot lines can be removed if that helps imply that it is more generalized.

Council Member LeMone asked what happens if a developer provides a plan that differs from the one drawn out by the City. Engineer Lewis said a developer is required to provide the same opportunity they received. The goal is to not have land locked parcels or any flag lots that cannot be properly developed. If the developer's street plan meets the City's ordinances and provides access to the neighboring lots the City has no problem approving the developer's proposal. The vicinity map will allow the City to make the developers account for their neighboring property owners. If developers only cul-de-sac their own developments there would be no street continuity.

Attorney Petersen commented that the idea of the vicinity map is to fill the gap between what is on the Street Master Plan and what the City has not planned. Council Member Boyd was pleased that the map defines streets and trails but preferred not each building lot not be shown. Administrator Darrington stated that it is easy to delete the lot boundaries and leave the street boundaries.

Mayor Daniels suggested reading the actual 10-5-4 code. Council Member Stanley was comfortable leaving the lot lines and moving forward with approval as is. Council Member Andersen stated that the map will limit the need for the Planning Commission to continue creating overlays and rezoning based on needs of developers.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Baptista, 32 North 1300 East, stated that her only concern with the map pertained to the master plan and the regulations associated with it. She confirmed that the map is not another step to the master plan.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public hearing.

Council Member Stanley clarified that the master plan is a binding document that the Council and City are required to follow, whereas this vicinity map is not. Attorney Petersen confirmed his statement.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve Ordinance 2014-6 adopting the Pleasant Grove City vicinity map to provide long-range planning for the local neighborhood streets per City Code section 10-5-4. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley voting "Aye," and Council Member Boyd voting "Nay."

Administrator Darrington remarked that one of the unintended consequences of creating the map was helping the City further clarify what the build out population is. It was a useful to have the general lot sizes to help calculate that number.

- E) TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL BY REAGAN OUTDOOR SIGNS FROM A DECISION OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR DENYING THEIR REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT A NEW BILLBOARD SIGN ON STATE STREET AT APPROXIMATELY 500 WEST STATE. PRESENTER: DIRECTOR YOUNG.**

The above item was continued.

F) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A FINAL PLAT CALLED MANILA HEIGHTS PLAT "A" AMENDED FOR THE LINCOLN ACADEMY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1582 WEST 3300 NORTH IN THE RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. (MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD) PRESENTER: DIRECTOR YOUNG.

The above item was continued.

8) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

NAB Chairperson, Libby Flegal, requested that Director Giles look into having the water marks removed on the plaques at the Memorial Garden.

Engineer Lewis reported that work is proceeding on the traffic signal at 1300 West and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

Director Young reported that there is an opening on both the Board of Adjustments and the Planning Commission. Council Members were invited to submit names of individuals to be nominated. Mayor Daniels asked staff to determine the start and end dates of committee members and when their terms end. Once that information has been provided, the Council can make nominations.

Assistant to the City Administrator, David Larson, stated that nominations for Team Member of the Year are due by the 14th. They are working on upgrading the City's website and are on track for February 1. The Recreation Center portion of the website is being upgraded tonight. The weekend of February 1, they will make the rest of the changes and the following week there will be training on the new site. Most of the changes will not be visual but will enhance performance.

Public Works Director, Lynn Walker, said the sewer lining project is underway and will be done in the next few weeks.

Police Chief, Mike Smith, reported that he received a letter from the Office for Victims of Crime. A large portion of the City's victim advocate position is funded through grants. This year the City is being awarded \$21,002. Chief Smith also received a thank you note regarding Kaden Hardman for saving and changing a community members' life nearly two years ago.

Administrator Darrington remarked that the draft agenda for the retreat will be provided to the Council by the end of the week. The retreat will begin at noon rather than the usual 4:00 p.m. start time. It will be held at the Fox Hollow Club House.

Attorney Petersen reported that February 11 was confirmed for Dave Church from the Utah League of Cities and Towns to make a presentation to the Council. She requested a very brief executive session to discuss pending litigation following the meeting.

9) SIGNED PLATS

No plats were signed.

Mayor Daniels called for a motion to go into executive session.

ACTION: At 8:30 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to adjourn to executive session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Boyd seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

10) **EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. (UCA 52-4-205 1 (c))**

PRESENT:

Mayor:

Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen

Cindy Boyd

Cyd LeMone

Jay Meacham

Ben Stanley

Staff:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator

Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Kathy Kresser, City Recorder

ACTION: At 8:40 p.m. Council Member Meacham moved to come out of executive session. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

11) **ADJOURN**

ACTION: At 8:41 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

This certifies that the City Council Minutes of January 21, 2014 are a true, -full and correct copy as approved by the City Council on February 18, 2014.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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