



**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS  
Tuesday, August 7, 2018 7:00 p.m.**

Notice is hereby given that the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, will hold a **City Council Meeting on Tuesday, August 7, 2018, beginning at 7:00 p.m.** at the Community Recreation Center, 10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah. This is a public meeting and anyone is invited to attend.

**COUNCIL MEETING**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge led by C. Andersen and Invocation given by Mayor Rees
3. Approval of Meeting's Agenda
4. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns and comments (comments limited to 3 minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item)

**CONSENT AGENDA** (Consent items are only those which require no further discussion or are routine in nature. All items on the Consent Agenda are adopted by a single motion)

5. Minutes from the July 17, 2018 Work Session & City Council Meeting

**CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS**

6. City Manager
7. Mayor and Council

**SCHEDULED ITEMS & PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8. Review/Action and Public Hearing on Final Plan Approval for the Cedar Hills Gateway Commercial Subdivision
9. Review/Action and Public Hearing on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 3, Chapter 3 regarding re-zoning a portion of Lot 26 Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I from the PF Public Facility Zone to the R-1 11,000 Residential Zone, and vacating the open space provision of a portion of Lot 26 Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I, and to amend the Official Zone Map to reflect these zone changes

**ADJOURNMENT**

10. Adjourn

Posted this 3rd day of August, 2018

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder

- Supporting documentation for this agenda is posted on the city's website at [www.cedarhills.org](http://www.cedarhills.org).
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Cedar Hills will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at 801-785-9668 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.
- An Executive Session may be called to order pursuant to Utah State Code 54-4-204 & 54-4-205.
- The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the City Council, the staff, and the public.
- This meeting may be held electronically via telephone to permit one or more of the council members to participate.



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	8/07/2018

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Review/Action on a Final Approval for the Cedar Hills Gateway Commercial Subdivision
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	Charlie Openshaw; Mark Greenwood, Project Engineer
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Chandler Goodwin, City Manager

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

The proposed development lays down the ground work for future commercial development in the SC-1 zone. The final proposal sections off the property into lots that can then be developed within the guidelines of City Code §10-6A. The subdivision contains eight parcels of varying size that will be developed as commercial properties. The final plans only show the public improvements, not any commercial development. As each commercial development proposal comes to the City, each one will have to go through the process of concept, preliminary, and final approvals in order to obtain building permits. This subdivision outlines areas for development and allows the developers to seek tenants for each space and thereby build each building according to the needs of the tenant. Planning Commission made recommendation by a 4-0 vote. From the preliminary plans to the final plans, the following changes have been made:

- Streets have been assigned address designations
- 9930 N has been widened at the intersection to allow for three lines of travel
- Southern egress onto 9900 N shows a full access
- Walkability has been increased by adding additional sidewalks (additional walkways will be implemented as each project gets approved.
- The intersection of 4700 W 9930 N will change from a tabletop configuration to a four-way stop

All approvals should be subject to final engineering review and adoption of redlines according to Cedar Hills development standards.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

Planning Commission gave final approval on July 31, 2018

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

Cedar Gateway Subdivision Plans

**RECOMMENDATION:**

To approve the plans, subject to the incorporation of engineers redlines.

**MOTION:**

To approve/not approve the final plans of the Cedar Hills Gateway subdivision, subject to the following conditions, {LIST ALL APPLICABLE CONDITIONS}.



**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**  
Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning  
2230 North University Parkway, Building 50, Provo, Utah 84604 pnt1371-373-2562

**Cedar Hills Gateway**  
Opentown Properties

**C1.1**  
PLAT  
No. Revision Date

**VICINITY MAP**

**SITE INFORMATION:**  
Parcel Number: 14-003-0177  
Section: 6  
Township: 3 S  
Range: 12 E  
City: Cedar Hills, Utah

**OWNER:**  
City of Cedar Hills


**DEVELOPER:**  
Opentown Properties  
Walter "Chad" Opentown  
2230 North University Parkway, Suite 50  
Provo, UT 84604  
801-387-1444  
Opentown@opentown.com

**SURVEYOR/ENGINEER/PLANNER:**  
A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.  
2230 North University Parkway, Suite 50  
Provo, UT 84604  
801-387-1444  
ALM@alm.com

**ZONING INFORMATION:**  
Zone: SC-1 Commercial

**SITE TABULATION:**  
Total Area: 370,642.12 S.F. / 8.51 AC  
Lot Area: 1,493,225 S.F. / 34.12 AC  
Net Area: 314,499 S.F. / 7.22 AC

**LOT TABULATION:**  
Lot 1: 22,460.53 S.F. / 0.52 AC  
Lot 2: 20,155.71 S.F. / 0.67 AC  
Lot 3: 25,820.60 S.F. / 0.59 AC  
Lot 4: 17,590.13 S.F. / 0.40 AC  
Lot 5: 36,277.48 S.F. / 0.83 AC  
Lot 6: 39,057.09 S.F. / 0.90 AC  
Lot 7: 61,799.50 S.F. / 1.42 AC  
Lot 8: 80,990.60 S.F. / 1.86 AC




**SYMBOL LEGEND**

- SECTION LINE
- BOUNDARY LINE
- ADJACENT PROPERTY
- PROPERTY LINE
- P.U.L.
- CENTERLINE

**Curve Table**

Curve	Radius	Length	Chord	Chord Distance	Offset
C1	241.00	48.87	519.11	110.00	48.31
C2	241.00	71.97	541.57	125.00	70.63
C3	241.00	71.97	541.57	125.00	70.63
C4	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C5	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C6	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C7	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C8	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C9	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C10	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C11	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C12	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C13	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C14	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C15	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C16	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C17	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C18	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C19	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94
C20	241.00	143.94	572.14	143.94	143.94



5541

A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.  
 Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning




Cedar Hills Gateway  
 Opanshaw Properties  
 UTILITY PLAN

No.	Revised	Date

C20  
 OF  
 20

Page 509 - 10/17

11/22/2017 10:27:00 AM C:\Users\j\Documents\Projects\1717\1717.dwg Plot on 11/22/2017 10:27:00 AM



230 North University Parkway, Building 9D, Provo, Utah 84604 (801) 374-6262

Engineering • Surveying • Development • Planning

**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**

**Grading and Drainage Plan**

Openshaw Properties

Cedar Hills Gateway

No.	Revision	Date

**C3.0**


Sheet 53 of 107

1121 1122 1123 1124 1125 1126 1127 1128 1129 1130 1131 1132 1133 1134 1135 1136 1137 1138 1139 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1150 1151 1152 1153 1154 1155 1156 1157 1158 1159 1160 1161 1162 1163 1164 1165 1166 1167 1168 1169 1170 1171 1172 1173 1174 1175 1176 1177 1178 1179 1180 1181 1182 1183 1184 1185 1186 1187 1188 1189 1190 1191 1192 1193 1194 1195 1196 1197 1198 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213 1214 1215 1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229 1230 1231 1232 1233 1234 1235 1236 1237 1238 1239 1240 1241 1242 1243 1244 1245 1246 1247 1248 1249 1250 1251 1252 1253 1254 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260 1261 1262 1263 1264 1265 1266 1267 1268 1269 1270 1271 1272 1273 1274 1275 1276 1277 1278 1279 1280 1281 1282 1283 1284 1285 1286 1287 1288 1289 1290 1291 1292 1293 1294 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1300 1301 1302 1303 1304 1305 1306 1307 1308 1309 1310 1311 1312 1313 1314 1315 1316 1317 1318 1319 1320 1321 1322 1323 1324 1325 1326 1327 1328 1329 1330 1331 1332 1333 1334 1335 1336 1337 1338 1339 1340 1341 1342 1343 1344 1345 1346 1347 1348 1349 1350 1351 1352 1353 1354 1355 1356 1357 1358 1359 1360 1361 1362 1363 1364 1365 1366 1367 1368 1369 1370 1371 1372 1373 1374 1375 1376 1377 1378 1379 1380 1381 1382 1383 1384 1385 1386 1387 1388 1389 1390 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1399 1400 1401 1402 1403 1404 1405 1406 1407 1408 1409 1410 1411 1412 1413 1414 1415 1416 1417 1418 1419 1420 1421 1422 1423 1424 1425 1426 1427 1428 1429 1430 1431 1432 1433 1434 1435 1436 1437 1438 1439 1440 1441 1442 1443 1444 1445 1446 1447 1448 1449 1450 1451 1452 1453 1454 1455 1456 1457 1458 1459 1460 1461 1462 1463 1464 1465 1466 1467 1468 1469 1470 1471 1472 1473 1474 1475 1476 1477 1478 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1490 1491 1492 1493 1494 1495 1496 1497 1498 1499 1500 1501 1502 1503 1504 1505 1506 1507 1508 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1516 1517 1518 1519 1520 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1527 1528 1529 1530 1531 1532 1533 1534 1535 1536 1537 1538 1539 1540 1541 1542 1543 1544 1545 1546 1547 1548 1549 1550 1551 1552 1553 1554 1555 1556 1557 1558 1559 1560 1561 1562 1563 1564 1565 1566 1567 1568 1569 1570 1571 1572 1573 1574 1575 1576 1577 1578 1579 1580 1581 1582 1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1589 1590 1591 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1599 1600 1601 1602 1603 1604 1605 1606 1607 1608 1609 1610 1611 1612 1613 1614 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1620 1621 1622 1623 1624 1625 1626 1627 1628 1629 1630 1631 1632 1633 1634 1635 1636 1637 1638 1639 1640 1641 1642 1643 1644 1645 1646 1647 1648 1649 1650 1651 1652 1653 1654 1655 1656 1657 1658 1659 1660 1661 1662 1663 1664 1665 1666 1667 1668 1669 1670 1671 1672 1673 1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1730 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1740 1741 1742 1743 1744 1745 1746 1747 1748 1749 1750 1751 1752 1753 1754 1755 1756 1757 1758 1759 1760 1761 1762 1763 1764 1765 1766 1767 1768 1769 1770 1771 1772 1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1778 1779 1780 1781 1782 1783 1784 1785 1786 1787 1788 1789 1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795 1796 1797 1798 1799 1800 1801 1802 1803 1804 1805 1806 1807 1808 1809 1810 1811 1812 1813 1814 1815 1816 1817 1818 1819 1820 1821 1822 1823 1824 1825 1826 1827 1828 1829 1830 1831 1832 1833 1834 1835 1836 1837 1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1847 1848 1849 1850 1851 1852 1853 1854 1855 1856 1857 1858 1859 1860 1861 1862 1863 1864 1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875 1876 1877 1878 1879 1880 1881 1882 1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1890 1891 1892 1893 1894 1895 1896 1897 1898 1899 1900 1901 1902 1903 1904 1905 1906 1907 1908 1909 1910 1911 1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 1925 1926 1927 1928 1929 1930 1931 1932 1933 1934 1935 1936 1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1943 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000









SEAL

**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**  
 Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning  
 2230 North University Parkway, Building 60, Provo, Utah 84604 PHT 8011374-8262




Cedar Hills Gateway  
 Openshaw Properties  
 PLAN & PROFILE - 9900 N (4+00 - 8+00)

C4.1	
DATE	2/21/15
PROJECT	9900 N (4+00 - 8+00)
NO.	2/21/15
BY	
CHECKED	
DATE	

GRAPHIC SCALE  
 1 inch = 50 feet

9900 NORTH CEDAR HILLS  
 STA = 0+400.00 TO 8+20.75

15:27:00 (M:\Projects\9900 North Cedar Hills\9900 North Cedar Hills.dwg) (PLOT) (SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0") (DATE: 2/21/15) (TIME: 15:27:00) (USER: jay)



**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**  
 Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning  
 2230 North University Parkway, Building 5D, Plover, Wisconsin 54457  
 Phone: (801) 374-6292


**Cedar Hills Gateway**  
 Openshaw Properties  
 PLAN & PROFILE - 9930 N (0+00-4+60)

No.	Revision	Date

**C4.2**  
 DRAWING  
 Project: 9930-1937


PROPOSED 9930 NORTH STREET CROSS SECTION - 38' RIGHT OF WAY (LOOKING EAST)

PROPOSED 9930 NORTH STREET CROSS SECTION - 46' RIGHT OF WAY ENTRY/EXIT (LOOKING EAST)



9930 NORTH  
 3.1 VERT  
 STA. = 0+00.00 TO 4+55.34

0: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 1: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 2: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 3: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 4: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 5: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 6: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 7: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 8: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 9: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 10: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 11: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 12: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 13: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 14: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 15: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 16: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 17: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 18: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 19: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 20: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 21: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 22: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 23: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 24: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 25: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 26: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 27: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 28: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 29: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 30: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 31: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 32: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 33: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 34: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 35: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 36: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 37: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 38: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 39: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 40: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 41: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 42: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 43: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 44: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 45: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 46: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 47: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 48: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 49: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 50: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 51: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 52: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 53: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 54: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 55: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 56: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 57: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 58: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 59: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 60: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 61: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 62: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 63: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 64: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 65: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 66: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 67: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 68: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 69: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 70: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 71: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 72: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 73: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 74: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 75: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 76: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 77: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 78: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 79: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 80: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 81: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 82: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 83: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 84: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 85: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 86: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 87: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 88: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 89: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 90: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 91: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 92: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 93: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 94: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 95: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 96: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 97: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 98: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 99: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM  
 100: 2024/08/01 10:00 AM








**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**  
 Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning  
 2230 North University Parkway, Building 60, Provo, Utah 84604 (P) 801.374-8282

Cedar Hills Gateway  
 Opanshaw Properties  
 PLAN & PROFILE - 9980 N (0+00-4+60)

NO.	REVISION	DATE


**C4.3**  
 OF 501-1037




9980 NORTH  
 5.1 VEERT  
 STA = 0+00.00 TO 4+56.46

Produced by A.L.M. & Associates, Inc. under contract to Opanshaw Properties. All rights reserved. No part of this drawing may be reproduced without the written consent of A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.






PROPOSED 4700 WEST STREET CROSS SECTION - 40' RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH PROJECT (LOOKING NORTH)



4880



GRAPHIC SCALE



4700 WEST  
S.L. VERRI  
SIA = 3+00.00 TO 10+88.74



**A.L.M. & Associates, Inc.**  
Engineering · Surveying · Development · Planning

2230 North University Parkway, Building 6D, Provo, Utah 84604 (401) 374-5222

**PLAN & PROFILE - 4700 W (8+4-10+90)**

Cedar Hills Gateway  
Openshaw Properties

Rev. Revision Date

**C4.5**

DR 9/1/11  
REV 09/10/11



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	8/07/2017

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Review/Action on Amendments on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 10, Chapter 3 regarding re-zoning a portion of Lot 26 Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I from the PF Public Facility Zone to the R-1 11,000 Residential Zone, and vacating the open space provision of a portion of Lot 26 Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I, and to amend the Official Zone Map to reflect these changes.
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	Rance Jones
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Chandler Goodwin, City Manager/City Planner

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

Applicant and land owner, Alan Parsons, has applied for a zone change for his parcel, Lot 26 of Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I. The parcel in question has been recorded as open space from the time that Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I was recorded in 1976. The subdivision was built by the Associated Industrial Developers, who owned the parcel in question from the time the plat was recorded. In 1983 the property changed hands through a tax deed, and Alan Parsons received the property by quitclaim deed.

From Utah State Code §10-9a-102, "municipalities may enact all ordinances, resolutions, and rules and may enter into other forms of land use controls and development agreements that they consider necessary or appropriate for the use and development of land within the municipality, including ordinances, resolutions, rules, restrictive covenants, easements, and development agreements governing uses, density, open spaces, structures, buildings, energy efficiency, light and air, air quality, transportation and public or alternative transportation, infrastructure, street and building orientation and width requirements, public facilities, fundamental fairness in land use regulation, considerations of surrounding land uses and the balance of the foregoing purposes with a landowner's private property interests, height and location of vegetation, trees, and landscaping, unless expressly prohibited by law.

Further, §10-9a-505 states, "The legislative body may divide the territory over which it has jurisdiction into zoning districts of a number, shape, and area that it considers appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

Authority is granted to the municipality to regulate zoning, open space and density within the municipal boundaries. The current piece is identified as "open space" on the plat, and is zoned as public facility. In order to put density onto the property, the legislative body of Cedar Hills would need to rezone the parcel into the R-1, 11,000 zone, vacate the plat identifying Lot 26 as open space, and re-plat Plat I as Plat I Amended. The owner of Lot 26, or the developer would be responsible for surveying and re-plating Plat I

Planning Commission voted on July 31, 2018 to recommend the proposed rezoning to the council by a vote of 3-1. The current proposal asks to rezone a portion of Lot 26 (.48 acres) while the remainder of the lot (1.22 acres) would remain as PF open space. Additionally, the proposal allows for a 15' wide trail easement to be located adjacent to the proposed lot. At issue in this decision is the preservation of open space and private property interests. In multiple instances, neighboring lots have built past property lines into the land designated as open space. A common theme throughout each discussion on this issue has been the need to preserve open space, not only on Oak Road, but throughout the community.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

Planning Commission voted 3-1 to recommend rezoning a portion of Lot 26, Cedar Hills Subdivision Plat I from the Public Facility Zone to the R-1 11,000 Zone.


**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

# City of Cedar Hills

June 2018

10320 N



## LEGEND

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  RR-1 20,000 Residential |  PR 2.2 Residential       |
|  R-1 15,000 Residential  |  PR 3.4 Residential       |
|  R-1 11,000 Residential  |  H-1 Hillside Residential |
|  Townsite Residential    |  SC-1 Commercial          |
|  Planned Development - 1 |  Public Facility          |

TOWN OF CEDAR HILLS

Regular Town Council Meeting  
Wednesday, May 12, 1993 7:00 p.m.  
Manila Elementary Media Center

NOTICE is hereby given that the Regular Town Council Meeting of the Town of Cedar Hills, Utah, will be held Wednesday, May 12, 1993, at the Manila Elementary Media Center at 7:00 p.m.

COUNCIL MEETING

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Minutes and Agenda
3. Finances
4. Department Reports
5. Attorney Reports - Tony Schofield & Craig Carlile
  - A. Northstar Cablevision Status Report
  - B. Pretreatment of Industrial Waste Ordinance Amendment
  - C. Herrera Status Report
  - D. Other Issues
6. Adjourn to Executive Session
4. East Cove
8. Cedar Cove - Reestablishment of Performance Guarantee
9. Park Maintenance Sealed Bids
3. Hullinger Annexation
10. Hullinger Annexation
- ~~11.~~ Street Between Prestwich & Olson (Cedar Hills Dr & 4280 West)
- ~~12.~~ Extend Meter Reading Period *184 billed 120 credits*
- ~~13.~~ Fine for Contractors for Taking Out or Bypassing Meters
4. **14. Lots 26 and 19. (Greenbelt) - Mr. Parsons**
15. Other Business
16. Adjournment

MOTION: C. Johnson - That we will agree to meet with Carl Warnick in one last effort in two weeks to see site proposals and a cost breakdown of moving the reception station and that Carl, the attorneys and two Council members will be present and that we will then discuss the outcome at the next Council meeting. Seconded by C. Peaslee and unanimously approved.

14. Lots 26 and 19 (Greenbelt) - Mr. Parsons (9:00 p.m.)

Mayor Memmott - Written letter that the open space be removed from plats I and D.  
Allen Parsons - I would like to build on the North end and would need the open space designation removed.

Jeff Lindstrom - I bought a lot that states that it is not a buildable lot.

Allen Parsons - Mine does not say this.

Rodney Despain - Lot numbers were given to convey the property but the Town did not claim the property and let it go to tax sale. The position is that this is privately held but not buildable because of the open space on it. We must amend the plat and remove the open space. Petition before the Town Council and a plat made. There is no guarantee that it will be further divided. My comments to Mr. Parson is that you keep it as a single lot or sell portions to adjoining lots.

Cindy Huntbach - I check plats when I buy them and if someone bought it then that is how it is.

Tony Schofield - I believe that open space means that it is not buildable but that is my opinion.

Steve Kesler - Could we put this in writing to the Council. Mr. Hansen does not plan to divide Lot 19 at the present time but may in the future.

Tony Schofield - We may sue. He does have legal council advising as well.

R.L. Peay - You have the ability to tell me what fence I can put in, etc. I talked to Mr. Hansen and he will put 9 lots in Lot 19 if he is to sue the Town.

C. Peaslee - If the Town keeps this as open space then the Town ~~has~~ <sup>should</sup> buy it. This information comes from Utah League of Cities and Towns one year ago.

Tony Schofield - It comes down to what open space means on the plat. Ordinances are upheld.

Rodney Despain - Any property that is divided two or more times, they become a subdivider and must go through process of plat amendment. Lot 26 meets frontage and area requirements but the lot is open space. Our ordinance states that it is then not buildable.

Paul Massicotte - We won't address that this area is causing flooding? A home could cause more problems.

MOTION: C. Peaslee - That we firm up the term "open space" and what we require that it be and address this issue at our next meeting. No second, motion dies.

Rodney Despain - If you say that it is not buildable then Mr. Parsons will try to get a judge to change that definition. The Town in the past has said that it appears that the portion fronting Oak Road W could be built upon. I believe that Mr. Parsons has a strong right to a building permit but not without limitations. We have some strong feelings to just say "no".

Mayor Memmott - If this is the way we want to go, do we keep it that way or do we give it up.

Citizens - NO!

(Kim Holindrake excused at 10:45 p.m. and remaining minutes taken by Rodney Despain)

MOTION: C. Snively - Table Consideration to get an opinion as to the meaning of open space and put on next agenda. Seconded by C. Peaslee and unanimously approved.

MOTION: C. Peaslee - Extend meeting for 25 minutes. Seconded by C. Howard and unanimously approved.

7. East Cove (10:16 p.m.)

Verl Hebertson inquired as whether the Town wanted all of the property or just the portion previously negotiated. The Mayor indicated that he discussed this with other Council members and the Town was interested in at least part of the property. Two alternatives were discussed.

1. \$30,000 plus a tax credit letter for the drainage basin and properties fronting the Canyon Road.

2. Entire parcel at a cost of approximately \$125,000 plus the tax credit letter on the 4 lots facing Canyon Road.

TOWN OF CEDAR HILLS

Public Hearing and Regular Town Council Meeting  
Wednesday, June 9, 1993 7:00 p.m.  
Manila Elementary Media Center

NOTICE is hereby given that a Public Hearing will be held on the 1993-94 Tentative Budget followed by the Regular Town Council Meeting of the Town of Cedar Hills, Utah, beginning at 7:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Call to Order
2. 1993-94 Tentative Budget
3. Adjournment

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance
  2. Approval of Minutes and Agenda
  3. Finances
  4. 1993-94 Budget Adoption
  5. Department Reports
  6. Street Between Prestwich & Olson (Cedar Hills Dr & 4280 W)
  7. Extend Meter Reading Period
  - ~~8.~~ Fine Contractors for Taking Out or Bypassing Meters
  9. Lot 26 (Open Space)
  10. Park Maintenance Bids
  11. Park Street Light
  12. High Meadows Streets - Tom Harward
  13. Other Business
  14. Adjournment
-

up rocks on the ball field. Steve Kesler donated some redwood for picnic tables. I may chain them down. If I catch kids doing vandalism, they do work in the park for free. The Town celebration is July 30 and 31. BBQ and dance on 30th and rest on the 31st.

C. Snively - Mr. Haily is going to paint the street lines.

C. Peaslee - Also the water company has done a good job keeping the weeds down on their pump station.

6. Street Between Prestwich and Olson (Cedar Hills Dr & 4280 W) (8:07 p.m.)

Mayor Memmott - I propose that we make an offer to the owners to buy the piece.

Rodney Despain - Property owners to amend the plat. Then set terms of dividing. The Town could vacate interest but you then don't have a say in requiring improvements.

Mayor Memmott - Should the Town improve this or give it up? If the beautification offsets giving it to the citizens then that's what we should do.

C. Howard - First step is to find out if the property owners want it and then go from there.

Rodney Despain - You don't have much alternative uses.

C. Peaslee - I will talk to the property owners.

7. Extend Meter Reading Period (8:20 p.m.)

C. Peaslee - I get a lot of calls every Spring about big bills.

C. Snively - There were no big water checks. This was talked about before and people pay extra if they feel they need to.

Kim Holindrake - I billed 184 people for water last month and 120 of them received a credit for their winter use.

MOTION: C. Peaslee - That we read the meters at the end of April instead of the end of May. (Resolution to be changed) Seconded by C. Howard.

Aye	C. Howard
	C. Peaslee
Nay	Mayor Memmott
	C. Snively

Motion dies.

9. Lot 26 (Open Space) (8:29 p.m.)

Allen Parsons - I talked to Hansen and he agreed to sell to the adjoining lot owners. The upper lots feel it is too low and the others are giving me a counter offer. R.L. Peay is interested in the lower 1/3.

Mayor Memmott - First item of business is to remove the open space.

Rodney Despain - Discussed open space with the attorney. Best definition is from the dictionary. The Town has maintained that this was not to be built upon. A judge may say differently but this has been the Town's intent. The shape of the lot and statement of open space was the intent not to be buildable.

R.L. Peay - Has any one looked at this to see if it meets the criteria to be built upon?

Rodney Despain - Western edge of Oak Road gives area for a building to be built.

There must be a petition to amend the plat to remove the designation of open space. The citizens have a strong feeling to not let that occur. Mr. Parsons wants a building permit but needs to comply with the plat standards. The Town needs the name and address of everyone in the plat.

Allen Parsons - The above owners are not against it.

Dawn Cattermole - That's not true.

Rodney Despain - You need the signature of each owner. This would be all in Plat I. If all consent, then there is no need for a hearing. All owners are notified and a public hearing held. We need a plat to remove the open space and a list of the adjoining owners. This gives the right to move forward. Then the Town Council decides to go forward or not. Then you have a replacement plat. If you do remain with one lot then I suggest that the eastern 2/3 still be labeled as open space so that it remains unbuildable.

TOWN OF CEDAR HILLS

Regular Planning Commission Meeting  
Wednesday, July 27, 1994 6:30 p.m.  
Alpine City Council Building  
20 North Main, Alpine, Utah

NOTICE is hereby given that the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of the Town of Cedar Hills, Utah, will be held Wednesday, July 27, 1994, at the Alpine City Council Building at 6:30 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

- |        |    |   |
|--------|----|---|
| 2 min  | 1. | Call to Order   |
| 2 min  | 2. | Swearing in of new Planning Commission Member -<br>Jim Howe   |
| 2 min  | 3. | Approval of Minutes - July 25, 1994, Regular<br>Meeting       |
| 30 min | 4. | Preliminary Plan Review of 16 Acres - Vilmar<br>Gaertner      |
| 30 min | 5. | Review of Lot 26 (Open Space) - Allen Parsons                 |
| 15 min | 6. | Impact Fees   |
| 15 min | 7. | Zoning Ordinance Amendments<br>A. Commercial Zone<br>B. Other |
|        | 8. | Adjournment   |

TOWN OF CEDAR HILLS

Regular Planning Commission Meeting  
Wednesday, July 27, 1994 6:30 p.m.  
Alpine City Council Building  
20 North Main, Alpine, Utah

NOTICE of this meeting was properly posted throughout the Town and the press notified.

Present: Chairperson Meredith Simpson  
Planning Commissioners Priscilla Leek, Dolores Gardiner, Lori Martin,  
Jim Howe, Doug LeDoux  
Councilmembers Elizabeth Johnson and Mike Robertson  
Kim Holindrake, Town Clerk  
Rodney Despain, Town Planner  
Citizens: Alan Parsons

This meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Meredith Simpson at 6:42 p.m.

2. Swearing in of New Planning Commission Member - Jim Howe

Jim Howe was sworn in as a member of the Planning Commission by Kim Holindrake, Town Clerk, with a term through December, 1996.

3. Approval of Minutes - July 25, 1994, Regular Meeting

MOTION: C. Gardiner - To accept the minutes from May 25, 1994, with changes on page 2. Seconded by C. Leek and unanimously approved.

4. Preliminary Plan Review of 16 Acres - Vilmar Gaertner (6:45 p.m.)

C. Simpson - I received a call and apparently Mr. Scow has taken a second offer on the property and Vilmar Gaertner and Robert Mount are going to take him to court. Apparently they had a meeting with Mr. Scow Monday. He is planning to sell it for one home. He does not have frontage and he needs this in order to build.

Rodney Despain - Lot 1 does not conform to our ordinance. That could move a couple of property lines to have it conform. Part of the discussion last time was do we need a collector class road going through. A road with a sewer under would probably not have enough slope to run. So we may shift up to 9600 North for the collector class road and then to the west where the LDS Church is planning a building. I have talked to them about a collector class road there.

C. Simpson - What will happen to this piece with the sewer?

Rodney Despain - They were planning to run a line to 4000 West and then pick it up when the sewer came down that road. The Mayor and I have talked with Pleasant Grove about putting the sewer down at their line but she said that meeting did not go well. Much of it is uncertain at this time.

---

5. Review of Lot 26 (Open Space) - Allen Parsons (6:51 p.m.)

Alan Parsons - \*\*See map handout\*\* Scott Oldroyd has bought the property. We have been negotiating with the neighbors to buy 2/3 of the property.

C. Howe - My position and others is that we do not want to buy anything. If it is broken up then we might consider it.

Alan Parsons - Then maybe I should sell the whole thing to Scott Oldroyd. Mr. Swenson's house was open space and now has a house.

Rodney Despain - Lot 26 is an open space lot and the question of erasing

and making it a building lot has been the issue for some time. There is nothing that says he can't sell the property. It was acquired with that indication on it. The Town has continued that this be required to go through the plat amendment process to get rid of the open space designation. This is a determination of the Council. The Planning Commission is responsible for recommending to the Council what the replacement plat would be. Question, is this a suitable alignment of the property for those who have expressed interest. For the sake of discussion, let's say the Council will approve the plat vacation and the removal of the open space. I believe that the property that Scott Oldroyd wants could accommodate a lot. The question comes, what happens to the rest of the property. He has discussed it with many property owners. Ray Layne, Jim Howe, Mark Grant, R.L. Peay, A.J. Michaels and Paul Massicotte would all have a portion. We need a subdivision plat that includes all those lots with the portion of their lot. All these people would become co-subdividers. The question really before us is assuming that this alignment would be acceptable.

C. LeDoux - How does this affect those people who bought lots to be along open space. Can we do that?

Rodney Despain - The Planning Commission does not make that call. The Council will make the determination after a public hearing. The public or any individual can not be harmed. The Planning Commission recommends to the Council. We are trying to flush out the issues that are here. Everyone will sign this plat, if they are in it. All the citizens will have an opportunity to express their issue about if this will affect them. The issues are do we feel strongly about the open space. There are a lot of political issues. It will be and always be a weed patch.

Michael Robertson - Do we not have a weed ordinance?

Alan Parsons - I don't know that you want to cut what is holding that side up.

C. Howe - Some owners have said that they would like it to be open space. A.J. Michaels said she was concerned about the fire problem and the weeds.

Rodney Despain - If the amendment process takes the open space off and you want it on then you would put it back on at that time of the new plat.

C. Leek - Have you entertained an offer from one person to buy it?

Alan Parsons - Scott Oldroyd is interested in buying the whole thing. Open space has only been applied to public property and not private property.

C. LeDoux - What are we deciding here? This will set a precedence for the other lot.

Rodney Despain - 1. That the Scott Oldroyd piece is buildable. 2. Other parcels would be divided off and title given. These people would know that it would be open space.

C. LeDoux - Is there a building envelope there?

Rodney Despain - Yes. I believe a building could be placed in that piece.

C. Howe - You have a frontage between Laynes and Howes. If we allow one for Scott Oldroyd, could others come and put houses there?

Rodney Despain - Yes, but Laynes will put the property to his lot. There is no guarantee that people won't ask but will they receive this?

C. Martin - What are we here to decide without the proper presentation?

C. Leek - You have talked to these people but we don't have anything before us from these people that they want the property.

---

Rodney Despain - It has been represented to me that these people do want this. This is a concept review. Everything will have to be resolved.

Elizabeth Johnson - What if the one building lot is given and the rest turned to the Town as it was in the past?

C. Martin - Mr. Sears called me and he says that this will affect his building lot value.

Elizabeth Johnson - Mr. Sears and Mr. Layne will not be happy with a building lot there.

C. LeDoux - Our leverage is if we give one lot then others will want the same.

Rodney Despain - In some way we need a distribution of the property and Mr. Parsons wants a building lot out of this. Until Lot 26 is owned by someone adjacent to it then it will always be a fire hazard. It is a possibility that the Town gets it but they may not be financially set to maintain it. Is the lot between Laynes and Howes buildable?

C. Howe - It is not as steep as some areas on Lot 19. In Salt Lake on the east bench, there are homes built like this.

Rodney Despain - You put the open space back on this area and then the Town has control.

C. Martin - Do the people intend to keep it open space or do they plan to use it how they want to? We need to determine what they plan to do. One gentleman intends to put his heavy equipment on it.

Rodney Despain - You can be more definitive and restrictive. The property owners need to be involved early on. To some degree, if Gardners get it, do they want to remove their fence. I don't think so. Most would want to enlarge their own lot if they got the property.

C. Howe - A number of us would prefer that it remains as it is; but if it is parceled, then we would be forced to buy this.

C. LeDoux - It is not the concept that is our concern. It is other issues.

Rodney Despain - Nothing vests at a concept. You have to go through preliminary approval. You have to go through the process.

Alan Parsons - My original intent was to sell the whole thing to Mr. Oldroyd. We do not want to build a home that would antagonize the neighbors. The people there wanted to have it pieced or sold in whole. The other 2/3 is worth \$65,000.

Rodney Despain - The question I raise again is if all came to pass would the Planning Commission be willing to approve a plat?

C. Simpson - We are looking to have a lot for Mr. Oldroyd and the rest being open space.

**\*\*Discussion of Open Space designation\*\***

Rodney Despain - I discussed the open space with legal council and one argument is that it is there and you treat this as a request. I don't know what a judge would do because this one area meets building requirements. The Town has addressed the issue of allowing a building lot.

C. Simpson - We could then put restrictions on the rest so this does not happen again.

Rodney Despain - I believe that Lot 19 will come with a similar request. Mr. Hansen has said in the past that it is good for 8 lots, but it is one lot and was bought as onelot. The owners think differently. The Council will make the call.

Michael Robertson - If the Planning Commission gives concept then it goes to the Council for public hearing and a decision?

Rodney Despain - The Council decides if it burdens others after the public hearing is held. The history is clear. It was intended to be dedicated to the Town. For whatever reason, it did not happen and was sold for taxes. I suggest that you express your point of view and not have a motion.

Elizabeth Johnson - 1. Leave as open space. 2. Make one lot and allow a building permit on the west side. 3. Allow one lot and divide remaining to neighbors. 4. Have a building lot and negotiate with the Town to take the remainder. You need to decide and let the Council know.

Rodney Despain - If this is done, these people will have to come and be a definite part of the process.

Alan Parsons - If I sold it to one neighbor and Mr. Oldroyd?

C. Simpson - They have to be here.

C. Howe - Some of the neighbors would want to know what the plans are.

Alan Parsons - Can I ask for the open space to be erased?

Rodney Despain - You are asking this now. You did that in the past. If you want to do this it is the same process. It has a high probability of denial.

C. Martin - If Mr. Oldroyd gets his permit, then there is no access for a brush truck.

**\*\*Priscilla Leek excused at 7:50 p.m.\*\***

Elizabeth Johnson - The point we are getting hung up on is that these other people are co-developers and need to be here.

Alan Parsons - To simplify this then I will sell the entire thing to Mr. Oldroyd.

C. Simpson - There is no conclusion.

6. Impact Fees (7:55 p.m.)

C. Simpson - Roger Zundel did a study of other towns.

Elizabeth Johnson - He came up with just throwing in a number. That is not the process that holds up in the courts. We have to have a specific study of our Town.

C. Simpson - The Council is addressing this issue.

7. Zoning Ordinance Amendments (7:58 p.m.)

Elizabeth Johnson - Issues we had. Change from a shopping zone to a professional zone. Part of the deal was Lyle Smart giving the property for the road and making it a SC-1 Zone. We need to make sure that he agrees with this. I have been told that it is a very staff intensive ordinance and we don't have any staff. I feel we need to go back and look at our goals for this area. List the businesses we want and don't want and then go from there.

C. Howe - I think a shopping center is a horrible idea. People raised \$75,000 to fight a shopping center.

**\*\*Discussion of road property being given to Town for zoning property to SC-1\*\***

C. Gardiner - We do need revenue.

Elizabeth Johnson - We might want a professional area, medium retail and then Walkers would be on the corner. Get the lowest impact to the residential and the highest at the Training School Road.

C. Simpson - The State has set the plans for the Training School Road.

Elizabeth Johnson - We need a feel of what we want before we talk to Lyle Smart. We need to plan carefully. We could say that we will allow only one convenience store. Do you like the idea of a progressive commercial area? The area is 41 acres.

C. LeDoux - I would like to see it as small as we can.

C. Simpson - We need to find out the specifics from the road property and Lyle Smart's deal.

Elizabeth Johnson - I want to know how you want it to look. Do you want a strip mall or small house type businesses?

C. Howe - I would like a "James Town Square" type look with trees, bike trails and such. I will see if I can get a copy of their requirements.


Elizabeth Johnson - We could say that we are predominantly residential and we want our commercial zone to fit in.

**\*\*Discussion of building types and SC-1 Zone Ordinance\*\***

---

8. Adjournment


This meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m. on a motion by C. Gardiner and seconded by C. LeDoux.

  
Kim E. Holindrake, Town Clerk

LOT 26 APPLICATION - ALVIN PARSON

1977 NOV 11 AM 8:44  
NINA B. REIS  
NAN CO. SURVEYOR  
DATE: 11/11/77

259 7016  
724 S 300 E.  
S.L.C. 6711, 6711



**LEGEND**

- Indicates Subdivision Boundary
- Indicates Lot Boundary
- Indicates Centerline of street
- Monument Brass cap set in concrete, unless otherwise noted
- 1/2" Iron pin unless otherwise noted
- Indicates 66' & 1/2' Utility Easement (P.U.E.) - 7.00 where lots are back to back 5.00 where lots are not back to back
- (R) Indicates bearing is a radial line to a curve
- P.U.E. Indicates Public Utility and Drainage Easement



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
Thursday, August 31, 2017 7:00 p.m.  
Community Recreation Center  
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: David Driggs, Presiding  
Commissioners: Jared Anderson, John Dredge, Brian Miller, LoriAnne Spear, Steve Thomas  
Absent/Excused: Craig Clement, Jeff Dodge  
Chandler Goodwin, City Manager/City Planner  
Denise Andersen, City Council Representative  
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder  
Others: Jenney Rees, Gary Gygi

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills having been properly noticed was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by C. Driggs. The voting members of the Planning Commission were recognized.

2. Public Comment:

Tyler Gardner of 10218 North Oak Court started his comments by saying he was born and raised in Cedar Hills. He spoke regarding the open space near his home of which there had been a continuous battle to have it rezoned. He and a number of other members of the community had a number of items they would like to take place: (1) denial of the zone amendment, (2) immediate enforcement of the maintenance of the property, (3) purchase of the land by the City that would develop and maintain the open space.

Ray Layne of 4279 West Oak Road North also commented on the aforementioned open space. After thirty eight years of living where did, the open space continued to be an issue. He discussed conflicting language from the City as to whether or not it was still considered open space, or if the City was trying to sell the property. He went into detail of the negative impact that the changing of the area from open space to another residential space would have on current residential homes.

Dave Free of 4309 West Oak Road North also discussed the open space in question. He spoke on the views that owners bought when purchasing homes. Residents didn't buy the view of the side of a house, rather, a park-like space. He cited this being no different than those who had purchased homes overlooking the golf course and how their property values would go down if the golf course were to be sold for the purpose of building new homes. He requested the voting of the Commission be in opposition to the proposal.

Cherie Condie of 4221 West Oak Road North thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. She wanted to speak with the Commission regarding rezoning open space. She stated that would be great mistake and urged the denial of the petitioner's request. She also implored of the Commission to not recommend for rezone to the City Council.

Steve Brantley explained that the owner of the lot that had been spoken of by those who preceded him was not looking to put more than one lot in the aforementioned space. Also, the owner was not looking to build a home anywhere outside of City building regulations. C. Driggs asked if Steve Brantley represented the owner of the lot. Steve Brantley stated that he represented Allen Parsons through Pettey and Associates. C. Driggs cited Steve Brantley having said there was a desire to build on part of the zone, and he inquired as to what part. Steve Brantley responded that he was willing to work with the City to determine the best section to build.

Mark Grant of 10196 North Oak Court stated he had lived in Cedar Hills for approximately thirty years. He stated that Allen Parsons had bullied him and his family and made unspecified threats. He continued that the land in question was nothing but weeds. He requested that City officials take action.

Mike Taylor of 10099 North Sage Road East stated that a decided factor of purchasing his home when he did was that the land in question was designated open space. He was against the development of even a section of the land. He, among others, believed that the space was not ugly, but beautiful and enjoyed the beauty of unmanicured, natural lands.

Ken Hazelbaker of 10253 North Oak Road West discussed the definition of “integrity”. He asked the City to not compromise its integrity for the sake of one individual, while seventy five others opposed the will of that individual. This was regarding the possible residential development of the land aforementioned.

Jean Peaslee of 10147 North Oak Road West discussed what the open space meant for children living in the area. She was concerned that building on the ground could destabilize the land, thereby putting nearby homes in jeopardy.

Markus Memmott of 10137 North Maple Court wished to bring a historical perspective into the conversation, believing such a view to be of value. He shared that he had been one of the individuals that signed the petition of the County to grant Cedar Hills the status of being an independent town to become a city. A part of that petition included plats that illustrated the open spaces requested. The County accepted the statement as what the residents of now Cedar Hills wanted at that time. Markus Memmott continued that many residents had bought land near the space with the intent that the open space would continue, of which they would benefit. He would like to see the land remain as was into the future.

Troy Flickinger of 10130 North Maple Court explained that he had previously lived in an area where he was fish-bowled in. He had bought land having not been surrounded by other homes, but that quickly became the case. He didn't enjoy feeling he had no privacy, and for this purpose he moved to Cedar Hills as he was told the aforementioned area was open space and he wouldn't have to worry about privacy. He expressed concerns with the land shifting, possible flooding, density and difficulty of travel, and privacy. He asked that the Commission do what was best for the majority and not the minority in this case.

Eric Richardson of 4275 West Sandalwood Drive stated that he loved Cedar Hills having built two homes in the City, and would most likely be buried in the City cemetery if it was finished by that time. He stated there were no development rights on open space. He would like to see the property bought at a reasonable rate to preserve the owner's rights as a property owner and the rights of the citizens of Cedar Hills. He hoped the Commission would deny the request.

Judy Ball of 10116 North Sage Road East sought to clarify that Allen Parsons was not seeking to build on his lot, but hoped to sell it. She also shared her opposition of the request.

Joann Holmes of 196 South 850 West Lehi stated she was the residential real estate agent for the property. She made the recommendation that the City make a reasonable offer.

Brent Holbrook of 10217 North Oak Court asked if all those opposed could stand to show that even those that hadn't spoken were in opposition to the request. It was noted that the greater majority of audience stood up.

Mary Witty of 4222 West Cedar Hills Drive expressed concern of the geology of the property.

Diane Sorensen of 4078 West Oak Road North agreed with all the other residents. She had one question, that being what was the basis for the Staff's recommendation.

C. Driggs stated that the Planning Commission would recommend this item to City Council who would ultimately decide the outcome of the request. He spoke on the rights of the property owner to submit a request. He also wanted to make it clear that the Planning Commission is not made up of elected officials; rather they are appointed officials.

C. Driggs then closed the public comment segment of the meeting.

#### SCHEDULED ITEMS

##### 3. Approval of Minutes from the July 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

**MOTION: C. Miller—To approve the minutes from the July 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting.** Seconded by C. Spear.

Yes - C. Anderson  
C. Dredge  
C. Miller  
C. Spear  
C. Thomas Motion passes.

C. Driggs reviewed the agenda items. He also noted that items number five and six had been suggested to be discussed but not voted on as they were not properly publically noticed.

##### 4. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 3 Regarding the Re-zoning of Certain Portions of Area Currently in the PF Public Facilities Zone to the R-1-11,000 Residential Zone, and to Amend the Official Zone Map to Reflect these Zone Changes

Chandler Goodwin explained that land use issues required a public hearing and public notice. He wrote down some of the concerns of the public and hoped he could cover them in his presentation. He stated that property owners had the right to due process. He spoke on the history of the land parcel and explained the plat was signed in 1976 by Utah County, before Cedar Hills was incorporated. The land had not previously had a city to be dedicated to and had been held privately.

Chandler Goodwin then explained in detail the State's code concerning powers and duties of a city. One of the duties dealt with regulation of density and open space.

He then addressed Diane Sorensen's question regarding the Staff's recommendation. He read the official recommendation of Staff which stated either the landowner be allowed to build or leave the land as it was. He stated that rezoning would not grant developmental rights.

An unidentified audience member asked if it was a requirement of every resident to maintain the property. C. Driggs stated that the public comment section was over.

Chandler Goodwin said he didn't see how the issue at hand pertained to the violation of property rights.

C. Thomas cited the staff report, mentioning two other parcels that were privately owned. Chandler Goodwin made the correction that there was only one other parcel now, the second being the Harvey land which was acquired by the City.

C. Spear stated that last month Chandler Goodwin was going to seek legal advice on this matter, and asked Mr. Goodwin what he had learned. Mr. Goodwin expressed his concerns on taking the land. C. Spear stated that there had been attempts to purchase the land from Allen Parsons and wondered when the last attempt had been made. Eric Richardson replied that the most recent attempt was either 2010 or 2011. Chandler Goodwin stated he wasn't privy to those discussions.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the same open space provision was still intact on the property. That hadn't changed since the time the plat had been recorded. C. Miller stated that it seemed odd to have private property designated as a public facility. C. Driggs cited a section of City code which had to do with public land zoning.

Chandler Goodwin stated that the owner's rights had not changed, but the City did have the intent to someday acquire the land. C. Driggs asked if this was currently on the City's master plan for a park. He pointed out that according to nuisance section of City Code, weeds and general appearance only applied to commercial residential lots, not to public facilities which the land in question would be labeled. Chandler Goodwin stated there were park rules which would be considered nuisance, such as fireworks. C. Driggs stated that the plat currently was a fire hazard, but because the nuisance ordinance didn't apply to a public facilities zone the City didn't have any recourse to encourage the owner to maintain the land. Chandler Goodwin responded that if the area stayed in the public facilities zone, the City would need to reach an agreement with Allen Parsons regarding the needed maintenance. C. Driggs asked Chandler Goodwin what

he would suggest. Chandler Goodwin stated that the City did do weed abatement on private property and billed the owner, but that was on residential lots. C. Anderson inquired as to why the City would even want to interject on land maintenance. Chandler Goodwin stated the City typically did not do this.

C. Driggs stated that unless the plat went back to an R-1-11,000 zone, there would be no recourse for the owner to take care of the land. Chandler Goodwin stated that the space could be rezoned to R-1-11,000 and the Commission could forward a recommendation to the City Council as to whether or not the open space should be vacated.

C. Dredge asked about the timeline for acquiring the property and turning it into a park. Chandler Goodwin stated that for the last fifteen years the City had been trying to acquire the Harvey property. In those years, other parks had been developed. Now that the Harvey property had been acquired, that would take precedence over other park developments because of funding availability.

C. Driggs stated that he believed Allen Parsons had no legal right to revert the land from open space. He also spoke on how the property rights of the neighbors began and ended on their own property. Much of the conversation came back to what was in the best interest of the City, since neither party held legal claim to force the other to do what they wished. His opinion was that the best interest of the City was to keep the land as open space. He suggested the City put the land back in the R-1-11,000 zone so the owner would be responsible for addressing the maintenance needs of the property.

C. Dredge believed the Commission was not discussing whether to vacate the land from open space. It was stated that this was to be a part of the motion.

C. Spears stated that the property owner knew what the land was when he bought it. C. Miller didn't see any compelling reason to change the status of the property. He also didn't fault the property owner. Expectations were set with a hope of development which was not a right.

Chandler Goodwin interjected with a side note that he was willing to work with Steve Brantley to begin conversation regarding acquisition of the property.

C. Thomas asked where the trail would go if the property becomes a park. Chandler Goodwin responded that it would simply snake through the land beginning in the east. There was more discussion as to the overall layout possibilities.

There was some discussion as to what type of motion to make on this item.

**MOTION: C. Spear moved that the Commission recommend to the City Council to not rezone the certain portions of the area currently in the Public Facilities zone and not recommend the amendment of the official zone map to reflect those changes.**

C. Driggs asked if C. Spear wished to keep the land a Public Facilities zone and C. Spear answered affirmatively.

C. Dredge seconded the motion.

C. Driggs stated it would be hard for him to vote with the issue of nuisance and fire hazard that the land posed. C. Spear questioned that if the land was put back into R-1-11,000 zone that the owner would then be responsible. C. Driggs responded that was correct. C. Miller stated that the City code enforcer could issue citations.

**A vote was called for the motion. All were opposed.**

C. Driggs asked if it was the intent of the Planning Commission body to have the property owner subject to the nuisance ordinance. There was subsequent discussion concerning this question.

C. Miller asked if there was another option for amending City code.

Mr. Goodwin explained that R-1-11,000 was a residential designation and was what all homes were in. He stated the only other option was to make the space commercial. C. Miller believed that if the Commission was to put the land back into the R-1-11,000 zone, with the City being years away from acquiring the land, there would be time between now and the time of acquisition to make the necessary amendments to nuisance to public lands.

C. Driggs recognized a number of hands raised in the audience. He reminded the audience that public segment was closed.

**MOTION: C. Dredge moved to recommend amending the official zoning map of Cedar Hills to move Lot 26 Plat I of the Cedar Hills subdivision into the R-1-11,000 zone and to not vacate the open space provision associated with Lot 26 Plat I. The motion was seconded by C. Spear. Voting was unanimous in carrying the motion.**

*Note: The Commission took a break beginning at 8:28 pm. They reconvened at 8:40 pm.*

Chandler Goodwin noted on the previous decision that recommended rezoning only had to do with the Parson's piece.

5. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 5, Section 27: Landscaping, Relating to Artificial Turf

Chandler Goodwin stated once more that this item was for discussion only. There were two codes for landscaping; one in favor, one for denial. The code only addressed front and side yards.

C. Dredge was looking at the proposed code and believed wording needed to be changed in order to reflect artificial versus genuine blades of grass. There was deliberation as to what the wording should read and properties that had requested the City consider the usage of artificial turf on lawn space.

C. Driggs was opposed to artificial lawn space because it was not ozone friendly. C. Thomas didn't like artificial lawn space as it was not meant to last. C. Driggs stated there was a safety issue as well.

C. Spear asked if the Commission had discussed last month that these kinds of astro-turfs were different than those used for sporting events. Staff responded in the affirmative and explained that the hazards associated with athletic astro-turfs were not an issue with the artificial lawn spaces in question.

C. Driggs stated regardless that it was artificial turf. Cedar Hills was a natural city not an artificial city. C. Spear stated the City did use vinyl fences which were plastic and artificial.

C. Driggs asked for a straw poll on this item. C. Anderson and C. Dredge were in favor of allowing artificial turf. C. Driggs, C. Spear, C. Thomas, and C. Miller were in opposition to the allowance.

**MOTION: C. Thomas moved to table the agenda item on artificial turf code until a future Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by C. Miller. Voting was unanimous in favor of the motion.**

6. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code title 10, Chapter 5, Section 38, Relating to Ground Mounted Renewable Energy Systems

Chandler Goodwin stated that rather than disallow such renewable energy systems it was the desire to constrain residents from placing said systems above the property lines and twenty feet tall. He went into detail concerning the specifics of the amendments.

C. Dredge observed that those on smaller lots would not be able to take advantage of systems according to the specifications. Chandler Goodwin stated the amendment affected those smaller backyards. The amendment would limit the renewable energy system size based on square footage of the backyard in which it was placed. He continued that he would not want to have such a large system in his own backyard blocking his and the view of his neighbors. C. Thomas stated it was like having a billboard in the backyard.

Chandler Goodwin stated the amendment would be similar to the limitations on the City's large animal units; for each horse a resident must own 5,000 square feet of agricultural area. Not every property right was held by every property.

C. Driggs asked about the placement of solar panels and whether or not there was an allowance to place the panels on the front side of a home. Chandler Goodwin responded there were no restrictions on placement due to solar panel efficiency being constrained by where the sun was.

C. Driggs talked about trying to mitigate solar panel glare. Chandler Goodwin thought the Commission had addressed mitigation of solar panel glare. He read the code regarding said issue and upon reading the code stated that there wasn't prevention of panel placement, only mitigation.

C. Driggs asked for a motion to table this item.

**MOTION: C. Miller moved to table the item for proposed changed to Code 10-5-38 Renewable Energy Systems to City Council until future Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by C. Dredge. Voting was unanimous in favor of the motion.**

ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m. on a motion by C. Dredge, seconded by C. Thomas and unanimously approved.

Approved:  
September 26, 2017

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC  
City Recorder

Cedar Hills City Council  
via e-mail

August 2, 2018

Re: Amendment to rezone PF to Residential

Honorable Councilmembers:

I'm writing to request that you deny the petitioner's request to rezone and vacate part of the open space shown as the Hillside Parcel in the General Plan.

The National Recreation and Park Association released the metrics of their 2018 survey for parks based on population. The typical city agency offers 10.1 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. That's quite a jump from when Cedar Hills did their General Plan, which then was at 6.1 acres per 1,000 residents. In spite of being underserved recreationally I'm glad that our leaders and staff recognize the importance of open space to our citizens, as demonstrated in the Mayor's recent Facebook poll about this issue. Mr. Goodwin printed out 7 pages of comments - the majority of which were opposed to a rezone into residential. A petition circulated among the homeowners in the Oak Road neighborhood resulted in 150 signatures against a rezone.

I see that the value our city places on parkland is evident in the 2018 Budget Document. Not counting the private-use golf course, 82% of our Capital Project fund expenditures are going to public park projects. The future Harvey Park will take up to \$2,850,000 in the annual budget. I believe 94% of the 2018 Capital Project Revenues are from sale of city land - that is a big one-time source of funding and will not likely be repeated. So I can understand the temptation to jump at the petitioner's offer. But on the other hand, we're faced with dwindling open land for future recreational use.

The recent Planning Commission hearing on the rezone brought out many issues among the Commission and attendees: losing patience with repeated rezoning requests; buying some land at a PF rate at the cost of losing nearly 30% of the lot; the weed/nuisance notice sent to a property owner not being followed up; the lack of universal understanding that public land and trails are an amenity to neighborhoods. It seems like an intricate situation and was described as a "hornet's nest" and "ticking time bomb." But is it really that complicated? Once a half/acre of open space is gone, it's gone. Period. That's why it should be saved.

The Popular Science website recently did an article which mentioned how parks and natural areas, especially trees and vegetation, can reduce what is called the urban heat island effect. This effect is caused because built up areas are hotter than rural surfaces due to human activities such as development. In the summertime it results in higher peak energy demands. Also, the heat island effect impairs water quality. The high pavement temperatures heat up the stormwater runoff that drains into Utah Lake. I don't think I need to go into the water quality problems of that neglected landmark. Even a half/acre of undeveloped land can contribute a little to lower power usage and better care of one of our valley's most visible features.

Please do not rezone or vacate the open space.

Sincerely,

Cheri Condie  
4221 W. Oak Road North

Cedar Hills Planning Commission, City Council, Mayor Rees  
via: e-mail

Re: Rezone of Lot 26 from Public Facilities to Residential

Honorable Commissioners, Councilmembers, and Mayor Rees:

Please find attached a petition containing 150 Cedar Hills signatures opposing the rezone of any portion of the lot in question.

It might be tempting to jump at the generous offer of Mr. Jones, but there are several reasons to keep the land as open space, some of which are:

There is no compelling reason to rezone at this time. The future Hillside Parcel passive parkland, of which Lot 26 is part of, is on the Capital Improvements schedule for the year 2025.

It's not reasonable to lose 30% of the zoned open space when the city is underserved according to National Parks & Recreation standards.

To provide services to residential use is more expensive for cities than to provide services for parkland. (Erica Gies study, Trust for Public Land) I would think services for a nature park would be quite minimal.

The owner acquired the land as unbuildable. He's not losing any private property rights.

I know repeated requests for a rezone are inconvenient, time consuming and a pain, but I'm putting it on my annual calendar, just like I do to pay my insurance premium, to come to you again and again to ask for patience and restraint. My values of the importance of sufficient recreational space for a city, are being harmed.

Please deny the request for a rezone.

Sincerely,

Cheri Condie  
4221 W.Oak Road North

COPIES OF  
THIS BATCH SUBMITTED TO  
THE CEDAR HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
7/25/17 etc.

## Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property

**Petition summary and background**  
We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026

**Action petitioned for**  
We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
BEN SMIT	<i>[Signature]</i>	10233 N. Oak Rd West		7/24/17
Jennifer Wall	<i>[Signature]</i>	10253 N. Oak Rd. W.	We want a PARK!	7/24/17
B. Shapiro	<i>[Signature]</i>	10219 Oak Rd W.		7/24/17
Rachael Hassard, Sherwood Hassard, Myra Hassard	<i>[Signature]</i>	10219 N. Oak Rd. W.	PARK! No more homes!!	07/24/17
Ben Garbille	<i>[Signature]</i>	10219 N. Oak Rd. W.	Leave it a PARK!	07/24/17
Bin Anderson	<i>[Signature]</i>	10191 Oak Rd W.	Let's Build the Park	7-24-17
Justin Remick	<i>[Signature]</i>	10175 North Oak Road West	Park	7-24-17
Dave Free	<i>[Signature]</i>	10131 N. Oak Rd.	open space	7/24/17
ANGELA FREE	<i>[Signature]</i>	4309 W. OAK RD	leave it!	7/24/17
Bernice Hazelbaker	<i>[Signature]</i>	"	"	" "
KEN HAZELBAKER	<i>[Signature]</i>	10253 N. Oak Rd W	Please build the park for the kids!	7-24-17
		10253 NOAK Rd W	MAINTAIN STATUS QUO OF 35YRS!	7/24/17

# Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property


**Petition summary and background**  
We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026

**Action petitioned for**  
We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Karen Holbrook	Karen Holbrook	10217 N. Oak Court <sup>CH</sup>		7/24/17
Greg Holbrooks	<i>[Signature]</i>	"		7/24/17
Justin Bergon	<i>[Signature]</i>	10172 N. Oak Court	H NO!	7/24/17
Tracy Rice	<i>[Signature]</i>	10172 N. Oak Court	NOPE!	7/24/17
Himm Rees	Himm L. Rees	10182 N. Oak Ct	NO	7/24/17
<del>Beverly Bench</del>	<del>Beverly Bench</del>	<del>10182 N. Oak Ct</del>	<del>Absolutely not!!</del>	<del>7/24/17</del>
Lindsey Rice	<i>[Signature]</i>	10172 N. Oak Ct	NO!	7/24/17
Emily Anderson	<i>[Signature]</i>	4236 Cedar Hills Dr.		7-24-17
Dawn Cattermole	<i>[Signature]</i>	10208 Oak Ct.		7-25-17
<i>[Signature]</i>	Brad Cattermole	"		7-25-17
Mack Grant	<i>[Signature]</i>	10708 Oak Ct	NO	7/25/17

# Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property

<b>Petition summary and background</b>	We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026
<b>Action petitioned for</b>	We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
1 Austin Christine				7/24/2017
2 Kirk Hammond		10094 N. Oak Rd. v.	Keep it a Park.	7/24/2017
3 Curtis Hall		4292 Cedar Hills Dr	'	
4 TORT SANGRE		10061 poplar CRT		
5 Wanda MacPherson		4221 Cedar Hills DR	Keep Zoning as Recreation...	7/24/2017
6 Curtis MacPherson		4221 W. CEDAR HILLS DR.	YOU ZONED IT NOW KEEP IT!	7/24/2017
7 William White		4222 W-Cedar Hills Dr		
8 Mary White		4222 W. Cedar Hills Dr.		
9 Kathleen Lund		4267 W. Cedar Hills Dr	Keep as previously zoned	7/24/2017
10 Marinann Costillo		4299 W. Cedar Hills Dr.		7/24/17
11 <del>Rosa</del> Castillo		4299 W. Cedar Hills Dr.		7/24/17

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
12 JOHN F. UTYKAWSKI JR.		10045 N. SAGE RD WEST CEDAR HILLS UT	NO!	7/24/17
13 RICK HALL		10077 N. SAGE RD WEST CEDAR HILLS UT		7/24/17
14 JARED SOROG		4202 W. CEDAR HILLS DR.		7-24-17
15 NICOLE UTYKAWSKI		10045 N. SAGE RD W. CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO!	7-24-17
16 KRISTIE OKEN		10051 N. SAGE RD W. CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO	7-24-17
17 BRITAIN GLADDEN		10051 N. SAGE RD W. CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO PLEASE!	7-24-17
18 SEAN FRANCIS		10051 N. SAGE RD W. CEDAR HILLS, UT		7-24-17
19 CELIA ANI		10061 N. SAGE RD W. CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO	7-24-17
20 MARK MILLER		10081 N. SAGE RD WEST CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO	7/24/17
21 HOPKINSON		10087 N. SAGE RD WEST CEDAR HILLS, UT	NO!	7/24/17
22 WARREN McCULLAN		10087 N. SAGE RD W.	NO!	7/24/17
23 MIKE ADLINGTON		10097 N. SAGE RD. W.		7/24/17
24 BROCKE NELSON		10117 N. MAPLE CT. CEDAR HILLS		7/24/17
25 BEN H. SMIT		10233 N. OAK RD. WEST CEDAR HILLS, UT		7/25/17
26 CONY C. SMIT		10233 N. OAK RD. WEST CEDAR HILLS, UT		7/25/17
27				



# Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property

<b>Petition summary and background</b>	We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026
<b>Action petitioned for</b>	We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Debra Thomas	<i>Debra Thomas</i>	10088 N. Sage Rd W.		7-24-17
Donald Thomas	<i>Donald Thomas</i>	10186 N. Sage Rd W		7-24-17
Debra Walker	<i>Debra Walker</i>	4187 W. Sage Rd		7/24/17
Ann Nielson	<i>Ann Nielson</i>	7201 W Sage Rd		7/24/17
Kate Tilley	<i>Kate Tilley</i>	10077 N Sage Rd W		7/24/17
Alan Tilley	<i>Alan Tilley</i>	10062 N. Sage W		7/24/17
Scott Hancock	<i>Scott Hancock</i>	4160 W. CEDAR HILLS DR.		7/24/17
Laurie Horvath	<i>Laurie Horvath</i>	4160 W. Cedar Hills Dr.		7-24-17
Glen Sjoberg	<i>Glen Sjoberg</i>	10199 Oak Ct.		7/25/17

# Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property

Petition summary and background	We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026
Action petitioned for.	We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Mathew Ross		10138 N. Maple Ct.		7/24/17
Scott Fredrick		4198 W Sager Rd		7-24
<del>Spraine Fredrickson</del>	<del></del>	4198 West Sage Rd		7/24/17
James Wykstra		10153 N. Maple Ct.		7/24/17
Mae Wykstra		10153 N. Maple Ct		7/24/17
CALEB BANKS		4198 W SAGE RD		7/24/17
Bridgette Thompson		10127 N. Maple Ct		7/24/17
Alissa Ross		10138 N Maple Ct.		7/24/17
PROKST FELLER		10158 N MAPLE CT.		7/24/17
ARDEN PEARCE		10160 N. Maple Ct		7/24/17
BONITA PEARCE		10160 N. Maple Ct		7/24/17





Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
ROBERT BRODINE	Robert Brodine	4185 W. OAK AD N.		6 pm
Susan Brodine	Susan Brodine	4185 W. Oak Rd N.		6 pm
Erika Price	Edy Price	4152 W. Oak Rd N.		7/24/17
Rodney Price	Rodney Price	4152 W Oak Rd N		7/24/17
KELLEN PULTE	Kellen	4122 W OAK RD N		7/27/17
Terri Rams	Terri Rams	4186 W. Oak Rd. N		7/24/17
PAUL SORENSEN	Paul Sorenson	4075 W. OAK RD N		7/24/17
Diane Sorensen	Diane Sorensen	4078 W. Oak Rd. North		7-24-17
Josh Beck	Josh Beck	686 W. 1040 N. N. Hts		7-24-17
Alexa Beck	Alexa Beck	686 W 1040 N AF		7-24-17
Holly Lyne	Holly Lyne	234 W. Sierra Dr. Pa		7/24/17
David Lyne	David Lyne	"		"
Mirae Merrill	Mirae Merrill	495 Valderama Dr.		7/24/17
Stacy Beck	Stacy Beck	686 W 1040 N		7/24/17
ALEX BECK	Alex Beck	"		7/24/17

# Petition OPPOSING re-zoning of a Cedar Hills property

Petition summary and background	We the undersigned residing in Cedar Hills want to voice our opinion and desire in OPPOSITION to re-zoning part of the "Hillside parcel", parcel # 36: 145.0026
Action petitioned for	We desire that this re-zoning be denied. We would rather it remain OPEN SPACE or become a PARK rather than residential development

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Kristin Purkes	Kristin Purkes	4122 W Oak Rd N		7/24/17
Ginga Little	Ginga Little	4028 W Juniper Fd.		7/24/17
Koni Smith	Koni Smith	4045 W Juniper Rd		7/24/17
Nathan Smith	Nathan Smith	4045 W Juniper Rd		7/24/17
Sage Killian	Sage Killian	4080 W Juniper Rd		7/24/17
Shelly Lone	Shelly Lone	10098 N Sage Rd E		7/24/17
DAVID M. HONE	David M. Hone	10098 N SAGE RD. E		7/24/17
Don Duncan	Don Duncan	10077 N. Sage Rd E		7/24/17
CAROL HANSEN	Carol Hansen	4069 W Juniper Rd		7/24/17
Elizabeth Barton	Elizabeth Barton	10065 N. Sage Rd. E.		7/24/17
KUPT MATHER	KUPT MATHER	10089 N. SAGE RD E		24 JUL 17

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Telisa Willis	Telisa Willis	10088 N. Sage Rd E.		7/24/17
Warren Blain	Warren Blain	10054 N Sage Rd		7/24/17
Carol Blain	Carol Blain	10054 N Sage Rd		7-24-17
Caleb Barton	Caleb Barton	10065 N Sage Rd		7-24-17
Elizabeth Drew	<del>Elizabeth</del>	10047 N Sage Rd E		7.24.17
Scott Drew	Scott Drew	10047 N Sage Rd E		7.24.17
Paul Drew	Paul Drew	10047 N Sage Rd E		7.24.17
Scott Grahman	Scott Grahman	10030 N Sage Rd E		7.24.17
Lattisea Graham	Lattisea Graham	10030 N Sage Rd E		7/24/17
Matt Sugarbaker	Matt Sugarbaker	10040 N Sage Rd E		7/24/17
Tom Willis	Tom Willis	10088 N Sage Rd E		7/24/17
George Reynolds	George Reynolds	10089 N Oak Rd E		7/24/17
Priscilla Leet	Priscilla Leet	4012 W Cedar Hills Pr		7/24/17
Kristi Natividad	Kristi Natividad	10057 N Oak Rd East		7/24/17
Mard Natividad	Mard Natividad	" "		7/24/17
JANE AT	JANE AT	10031 N OAK RD E		7/24/17

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Jeanne Mather	Jeanne Mather	10089 N. Sage Rd. E. <small>Corner of Hwy 2</small>	Peer live there - disturb rattles notes come to our house	7/24/17
Mike Taylor	Mike Taylor	10099 N. Sage Road East	Keep the green space!	7/24/2017
Robert Taylor	Robert Taylor	12099 N. Sage Rd. E.	"	7/24/17
Anna Miller	Anna Miller	10107 N. Sage Rd. E.	"	7-24-17
Cam Nelson	Cam Nelson	"	"	7/24/17
William A. Nelson	William A. Nelson	"	"	7-24-17
Judy R. Ball	Judy R. Ball	10116 N. Sage Rd. E.		7/24/17
Larry Ball	Larry Ball	"	"	7/24/17
YUSTON PEAY	Yuston Peay	4135 W. Sage Rd.		7/24/17
Lisa Peay	Lisa Peay	4135 W. Sage Rd.	We want a park or green belt, not building lot.	7/24/17
Roshelle Peay	Roshelle Peay	4135 W. Sage Rd. N.	Keep it a green place/ PARK FOR COMMUNITY!	7/24/17
ORR Peay	ORR Peay	435 W. SAGE RN	KEEP A GREEN AREA FROM OUR NO. 1	7/24/17
Victoria L. Peay	Victoria L. Peay	4164 W. Sage Rd. N.	Keep green belt	7/24/17
Janice	Janice	4177 W. Sage Rd. N.	Keep green belt	7/24/17
Laurie Johnson	Laurie Johnson	4152 W. Sage Rd. N.	green space - our kids play here	7/24/17
Robert Kirk Johnson	Robert Kirk Johnson	"	"	"

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Roy Beck		4012 W. Cedar Hills Dr	Dont need it	7/24/17
Charles Wilkes		4095 Cedar Hills DR	leave as is!	7/24/17
Teresa M. Wilkes		4095 Cedar Hills Dr	We need green space	7/24/17
W. Wilkes		"	"	7/24/17
Cheri Condie		4221 W. OAK RD. NO.	NO - TREE ZONE NO - OPEN SPACE WE BOUND THE COURSE & GOLF	7-25-17
John Condie		" " "	THE PERSONNEL @ THE CITY OFFICE SAID IT WOULD STAY OPEN	7-25-17
Sharon Brisk		4034 W. Oak Rd 71.		7-25-17
Caitlin Price		4140 W. Sage Rd. N.		7-25-17
Kate Gandy		4062 W. Oak Rd. N.	Leave it dangerous to change.	7-25-17
Will Comin		4163 W. Sandalwood Dr same	leave it	7-25-17
Lanah Carter		same	Build a turtle pond	7-25-17
Wendy Cornin		4163 Sandalwood Dr.	Park walking trail	7-25-17
KENNETH B. LEMMON		4177 SANDALWOOD DR	PARK	7/25/17
Natalie Scott		4229 Sandalwood Dr.		
Ryan Scott		" "	view, value of our home	7-25-17



32 W. Center Street  
Midvale, UT 84047  
P (801) 352-0075 F (801) 352-7989

**LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS  
PREPARED FOR  
RANCE JONES  
CEDAR HILLS, UTAH  
(July 6, 2018)**



**PORTION OF LOT 26  
PLAT "I"  
CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION  
TO PURCHASE**

A portion of Lot 26, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Common Northwesterly (Rear) corner of Lot 19 and Lot 18, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder; thence S68°42'57"W along the Northwesterly line of Lot 18 and 17 of said plat 173.00 feet to the Easterly Right-of-Way line of Oak Road; thence along said road the following 2 (two) courses and distances: N21°17'03"W 144.74 feet; thence along the arc of a curve to the right with a radius of 100.00 feet a distance of 76.28 feet through a central angle of 43°42'115" Chord: N00°34'06"E 74.44 feet to the Westerly corner of Lot 5 of said plat; thence S55°34'18"E along said Lot 5 and along Lot 4 of said plat 178.52 feet; thence S55°16'13"E 80.00 feet to the point of beginning.

Contains: 20,899 square feet or 0.48 acres+/-

**15' TRAIL EASEMENT**

A 15' Trail Easement across a portion of Lot 26, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Common Northwesterly (Rear) corner of Lot 19 and Lot 18, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder; thence S68°42'57"W along the Northwesterly line of Lot 18 and 17 of said plat 173.00 feet to the Easterly Right-of-Way line of Oak Road; thence N21°17'03"W along said road 15.00 feet; thence N68°42'57"E 162.89 feet; thence S55°16'13"E 18.09 feet to the point of beginning.

Contains: 2,519 square feet or 0.06 acres+/-

**PORTION OF LOT 26  
PLAT "I"  
CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION  
TO GIFT TO CEDAR HILLS TOWN**

All of Lot 26, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder.  
LESS AND EXCEPTING the following:

Beginning at the Common Northwesterly (Rear) corner of Lot 19 and Lot 18, PLAT "I", CEDAR HILLS SUBDIVISION, according to the Official Plat thereof recorded November 11, 1977 as Entry No. 38094 Map # 1918 in the Office of the Utah County Recorder; thence S68°42'57"W along the Northwesterly line of Lot 18 and 17 of said plat 173.00 feet to the Easterly Right-of-Way line of Oak Road; thence along said road the following 2 (two) courses and distances: N21°17'03"W 144.74 feet; thence along the arc of a curve to the right with a radius of 100.00 feet a distance of 76.28 feet through a central angle of 43°42'115" Chord: N00°34'06"E 74.44 feet to the Westerly corner of Lot 5 of said plat; thence S55°34'18"E along said Lot 5 and along Lot 4 of said plat 178.52 feet; thence S55°16'13"E 80.00 feet to the point of beginning.

Net Area: 1.22 acres+/-



# Utah County Parcel Map


Tools

361450026

(Enter the Map Title.)

Please disable your pop-up blocker before clicking.

Click the 'Help' tab above for further instructions on how to print the map.



GIS Division of the Utah County Information Systems Dept | GIS

This on-line parcel map is for reference only and no liability is assumed for any inaccuracies, incorrect data or variations with an actual survey.





© 2010  
G



