

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Tuesday, July 17, 2018 6:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Mayor Jenney Rees, Presiding
Councilmembers: Denise Andersen, Ben Bailey, Ben Ellsworth, Mike Geddes,
Brain Miller
Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
Charl Louw, Finance Director
Jeff Maag, Public Works Director
Joel Wright, City Attorney (6:37 p.m.)
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Others: Lt. Gregg Ludlow, Cory Shupe, Ryan Button, Chris Bramhall, Mark
Greenwood

This work session meeting of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Mayor Rees.

1. Update on FY 2019 Council Goals

Mayor Rees explained that the Council met in January for the budget retreat and came up with several goals. She then turned some time over to Mr. Goodwin. Mr. Goodwin explained that Public Works was currently working on several projects. They were watching the pressurized irrigation (PI) system and deciding which project would be next. Staff was also working with the arborist to replace trees in the various City parks. Additionally, they were currently working on funding for Harvey Park. They would not discuss the public safety proposals until they had numbers on the Lone Peak buyout.

2. Presentation - Utah County Health Department – Anti-substance Abuse Youth Group, Outrage

Delaney Maughan, Utah County Health Department representative, explained that the goal of the Anti-substance Abuse Youth Group was to reduce substance abuse. They wanted to get to know local leaders and distribute a survey to the Council to better understand how they could work with the City. She explained the survey was comprised mostly of multiple-choice questions. She gave the Mayor and Councilmembers her business card and asked them to contact her if they had questions.

C. Andersen asked what they did with the survey answers. Ms. Maughan stated that they would use them to find out what type of legislation they might want to pass. Mayor Rees asked what her organization did to pass the legislation. Ms. Maughan said they took the information then determined what information needed to be shared with legislators. Mayor Rees then asked Ms. Simms to clarify their purpose. Sarah Simms explained they used the information to determine the concerns of local municipalities in order to pass local policies. Mayor Rees said she took the survey and commented the questions were geared towards things that were outside of the City's control. She asked if they planned on working on polices that the City could implement. Ms. Simms explained that this was the first survey and they were simply trying to identify the

Council's concerns at this point. She noted some questions that would help them know how to create policies to prevent substance abuse.

C. Geddes asked if they had any preconceived notions about what the cities wanted. Ms. Simms answered in the negative and stated they were concerned about the youth. She said they were open to opinions of what the cities wanted. She explained there were questions about marijuana on the survey. She said this was becoming a big issue nationally and they wanted to know what the City leaders thought on the matter. C. Geddes asked Ms. Simms to clarify what a JUUL was. Ms. Simms explained that a JUUL was a new electronic device that allowed someone to vape. Marijuana could also be smoked out of this device.

Mayor Rees stated she was concerned with the opioid epidemic and the number of kids who were vaping. Ms. Simms explained that there was a State-wide youth group that had the goal of limiting vape flavors as a method for limiting the appeal to youth. Mayor Rees also noted the State allowed cities to prohibit specialty shops. Ms. Simms explained that specialty shops had to obtain a special permit from the County and had to ensure compliance with the terms of said permit. Ms. Maughan said she was concerned with smoking in the high schools because it also affected those who were not smoking.

C. Ellsworth asked if they did training activities and seminars for the youth, to which Ms. Simms answered in the affirmative. She said they wanted to work with parents and would be willing to return for an educational night. In addition, there was a new State campaign to educate parents on substance abuse. C. Geddes asked how these outreach efforts were being funded. Ms. Simms stated these programs were funded through the State, the CDC, and the Masters Settlement grant.

3. Cedar Canyon Subdivision

Mr. Goodwin explained that as a part of the settlement agreement there had been changes. The Planning Commission gave several recommendations, including: various fencing changes, drainage requirements, tree planning, and open space requirements. If this subdivision was approved by July 31st the developer agreed to extend a road to the development.

Ryan Button, representative for the developer, stated that there would be an opening in the fence for the fire department. Using the aid of several images, he described their proposed placements for the fencing.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the homeowners were responsible for planting an extra tree. He said they were concerned about the look of the development so they suggested a second architectural element. Staff recommended adding the provision that setbacks be no closer than eight feet, which was standard per fire code.

Mr. Goodwin said he had some concerns about the commercial portion but the settlement agreement addressed his concerns. Staff recently received an updated CC&R for legal review. He said the developer should show the setbacks on the recorded plat notes.

Mayor Rees asked if all the points from the Planning Commission were addressed, to which Mr. Goodwin answered in the affirmative. He stated many of the issues had been resolved. He noted the concrete wall had already been extended on the southern border. Mayor Rees asked why the

wall was extended. Mr. Goodwin explained it acted as a sound barrier and to mitigate the impact the development had to its neighbors.

C. Geddes noted a vinyl fence between neighbors was a good practice. Mr. Goodwin said there would be a fence whether they wanted it or not and it would belong to the HOA. C. Geddes said he had not heard any comments from the neighbors.

C. Miller said he was concerned with the plain stucco wall and vinyl fencing. Mr. Goodwin said the current design standards called for two structural elements. C. Miller remarked that there would be a lot of houses.

Mayor Rees asked about the fencing color. Mr. Goodwin explained the Planning Commission was leaning towards tan. C. Andersen said she preferred white. Mr. Goodwin stated it was the developer's choice to choose the color. Mayor Rees suggested they narrow down the color to be an earth tone or to match other fences in community. Mr. Goodwin agreed. Mr. Button said the metal would be black wrought iron but the perimeter fence would all be the same.

4. Cedar Hills Gateway Commercial Subdivision

Mr. Goodwin explained that this was a commercial property and there had been concerns regarding the access point. Therefore, a compromise was reached to restrict the traffic out of the access. The developer also agreed to widen a road within the subdivision to ease traffic. He noted the property would be completely walkable. There was no open space but there was a landscaping requirement. When applying for building permits, the businesses would need to also submit landscaping plans.

Mayor Rees clarified that the retention basin was not a part of the open space. She recommended the developer use the retention basin towards the 30% landscaping, but they would be responsible for beautifying the basin. Mr. Goodwin said the City did not require a park in commercial zones and staff could inquire on the costs of putting grass in the basin.

C. Ellsworth asked if they should consider xeriscaping to conserve water. Mayor Rees answered in the affirmative but said this could limit the use of the land. Mr. Goodwin agreed this could be made to look nice. They were interested mostly in a grass area. He noted they were not approving the buildings tonight; the developer still needed to go through the formal approval process.

This meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m. on a motion by C. Ellsworth, seconded by C. Miller, and unanimously approved.

Approved by Council:
August 7, 2018

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC
City Recorder