Minutes of the Payson City Council Meeting held at the Payson City Center, 439 West Utah Avenue, Payson, Utah on Wednesday, March 04, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Mayor Rick Moore; Councilmembers: Kim Hancock, Mike Hardy, Larry Skinner and Scott Phillips. City Manager Dave Tuckett, City Attorney Mark Sorenson, and Deputy City Recorder Amanda Baker. Councilmember Ford excused.

Motion by Councilmember Hardy to appoint Councilmember Phillips as Mayor Pro tem. Second by Councilmember Hancock.

Motion by Councilmember Hancock to allow the Mayor to amend the agenda as necessary.

PRAYER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Prayer offered by Councilmember Hardy and Pledge of Allegiance led by Mayor Pro Tem Phillips.

CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION by Councilmember Hardy approve the consent agenda. Motion seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Motion carries.

Swearing in of Lt. Ryan Porter.

PUBLIC FORUM

With no comments public forum closed at 6:04 pm.

COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

Golf Pro Tracy Zobell, reported the February golf course numbers are eighteen thousand dollars higher than any other February. He reported there have been five burials at the cemetery and the parks are getting ready for spring.

Police Chief Brad Bishop – gave an update on the weekly police stats and the new policy on body cameras which were purchased through a grant from a state. Chief Bishop also reported School Resource officer Jay Hurst was named SRO of the year. Chief Bishop stated Officer Hurst has been an asset to the department and the school and does a great job making sure that the kids in the school are safe.

Recreation Director Karl Teemant – reported that Gloria Barnett has passed away. She was instrumental in the restoration of the Peteetneet academy and she will be greatly missed. He aslo reported basketball is wrapping up and baseball will be starting this week.

Public Works Director Travis Jockumsen – gave a report on the water condition and the drilling of the new well.

Councilmember Skinner welcomed Lt. Porter and congratulated Officer Hurst. He also congratulated Chamber President Rory Adams for becoming a citizen of the United States.

Councilmember Hardy reported the new helicopter is here and is a good thing. He also reported on what is happening with the dedication of the LDS Temple.

Councilmember Hancock reported Reed Price from the Utah Water Commission has taken another job so there hasn’t been any meetings.

Councilmember Phillips encouraged everyone to clean up the town so that we it looks presentable when everyone we have so many visitors for the Temple open house.

Mayor Moore expressed condolences to the Barnett family they have been a big asset to the city. He also commended Officer Hurst and the police department.

CTC - MAYOR’S YOUTH RECOGNITION AWARDS

CTC Coordinator Councilmember Hancock Lefler and Mayor Moore awarded the Youth recognition awards to Megan Lind *(Payson Junior High)*, Jed Hire *(Payson Junior High)*, and Jarom Harris *(Mt. Nebo Jr. High.)* Brenna Menlove *(Payson Junior High)*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUSINESS OF THE MONTH

Rory Adams, Payson Chamber of Commerce recognized Central Bank as the March Business of the Month.

Motion by Councilmember Hardy to table the appointment of the Finance Director to the next meeting. seconded by Councilmember Phillips

PUBLIC HEARING – REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR USE OF THE RMO-2, RESIDENTIAL MULIT-FAMILY OVERLAY ZONE.

MOTION by Councilmember Hancock to open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Motion carries.

Public hearing opened at 6:30 p.m.

Planner Spencer presented information from the following staff report.

The applicant, Jeff Southwick is requesting approval from the City Council for use of the RMO-2, Residential Multi-Family Overlay Zone to construct two (2) four-plex structures and one (1) duplex structure (total of 10 units) on a vacant parcel located on the southeast corner of the intersection of 300 North and 800 East. The parcel consists of 0.96 acres and is currently owned by the Wilcock Family Trust.

Use of the overlay zone requires approval from the City Council following a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Both the Planning Commission and City Council are required to hold a public hearing and consider public input prior to reaching a recommendation or decision, respectively. The Planning Commission considered the request on February 11, 2015 and forwarded a recommendation of denial to the City Council. The findings of the motion are included in the recommendation portion of this staff report. Property owners within five hundred (500) feet of the proposed project have been notified, the notice has been posted in appropriate locations, and the public hearing was advertised in the newspaper for a minimum of fourteen (14) days.

**Analysis**

The parcel is located in R-1-75, Residential Zone and the applicant is eligible to improve the property to accommodate single family dwellings on lots containing at least 7,500 square feet and 75 feet of frontage, provided the minimum requirements of the development ordinances are satisfied. There has been previous development approval granted on the subject parcel. On December 5, 2007 the Payson City Council granted approval of the Wilcock Vistas Subdivision which consists of four (4) single family dwelling lots. The applicant has submitted an application seeking approval of multi-family structures as a more compatible use that will benefit the neighborhood and community. After a review of the application and presentation by the applicant, and in consideration of this staff report, the City Council will need to determine whether the proposed use is preferable to the previously approved project. Because approval to use an overlay zone is a legislative act, the City Council is under no obligation to approve the request of the applicant. The applicant is entitled to improve the parcel consistent with the Wilcock Vistas Subdivision without any further approvals of the Planning Commission or City Council.

The applicant’s proposal includes a request to construct three (3) multi-family structures. Two-family structures (i.e. twin home, duplex), three-unit structures, and four-unit structures are potentially allowed in the R-1-75, Residential Zone, but require approval from the City Council to implement the provisions of the RMO-2, Residential Multi-Family Overlay Zone. Approval of the overlay zone is similar to a zone change request and is therefore a legislative action of the City Council. When contemplating a zone change, and in particular the use of an overlay zone, the City Council generally considers, but not exclusively, the following:

* The General Plan designation of the property
* The purpose and intent of the underlying zone and compatibility with surrounding uses
* The availability of infrastructure, and capacity of roadways and parking
* Saturation and over-population of land
* The public need and public input provided a public hearings

The General Plan is required by State law and guides development related decisions and future land use patterns in the City. Residents, public and private utility providers and landowners rely on the General Plan to plan for and complete improvements, make wise financial investments, and secure a desired quality of life. The Land Use Map of the Payson City General Plan indicates a Medium High Density land use designation which would allow a density range between 3.9 – 5.9 units to the acre. The applicant is requesting approval for ten (10) units on 0.96 acres which is approximately ten (10) units to the acre and thus significantly higher than the density range identified in the General Plan.

The City Council should seek to determine whether the proposed project is consistent with the provisions of the zoning district, if existing utility services, roadways, and parking are adequate to serve the proposed project, if overcrowding of the parcel or the neighborhood will occur, and if the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed project will benefit the community.

In order to assist the City Council in their formation of findings for their decision, staff would suggest that the City Council consider the following factors:

1. Approval for the use of the RMO-2 Overlay Zone indicates the proposed use can be compatible with surrounding uses. The applicant is proposing single story above grade structures, slab on grade, with an exterior finish of stucco with a stone wainscot on all exterior walls. The units are 1,225 square feet and contain three (3) bedrooms, two (2) baths, living room, kitchen and other essential features. The City Council may require certain design guidelines or architectural features be implemented to ensure the project is compatible with the surrounding uses.
2. A current title report will need to be provided to the City indicating any liens or encumbrances associated with the property. All easements, right-of-ways and other dedications must be indicated on the project drawings.
3. The City Council will need to determine if the project density is appropriate. The General Plan indicates 3.9 – 5.9 units to the acre and the applicant is requesting ten (10) units on a 0.96 acre parcel. The project density will almost be consistent with the density provisions of the General Plan if four (4) units were removed from the project. Fewer units will also allow better placement of buildings and project amenities on the site.
4. At a minimum, the applicant must provide two (2) off-street parking stalls for each dwelling unit, one of which must be covered. The applicant is proposing a covered carport (single car) and uncovered parking stall for each unit. The parking stalls must satisfy the requirements of Chapter 19.4 of the City Zoning Ordinance, including the provision of parking for handicapped persons. Additional information will need to be provided regarding the design of the carport structures.
5. The concept plan provides information on the location and sizes of the utility services for the project. If the request is approved, the applicant will need to provide complete project plans and infrastructure construction drawings will need to be submitted to staff for review and approval. At a minimum, the drawings will need to include the following:
	1. The structures must satisfy the setback requirements of the underlying zone and the access requirements of the Payson Fire Department.
	2. Addresses for each building and unit in the project.
	3. Details of utility services (drinking water, pressurized irrigation, power, and sewer) for each structure. The plans must include the location, size and type of material for each utility lateral.
	4. A looped drinking water main line through the entire development.
	5. A connection to the pressurized irrigation main line in 300 North or 800 East.
	6. Underground electrical services for the structures and units.
	7. A note indicating that all improvements must be completed in accordance with the development ordinances and the Standard Specifications and Standard Plans of Payson City.
	8. All utilities outside of the public right-of-way are the ownership and maintenance responsibility of the applicant or property owner, as applicable.
6. Geotechnical studies will need to be completed for the project site and submitted for review by staff. The applicant will be required to implement the recommendations of a geotechnical study. The study will ensure that the construction drawings are completed in a manner that will result in structural stability for the units and site improvements.
7. A storm drainage plan will need to be submitted that indicates how the water generated from the twenty-four (24) hour, twenty-five (25) year storm event will be accommodated on the site. If a retention basin is proposed, the design must indicate no more than a five to one (5:1) slope on the sides of the basin. Percolation tests will need to be completed for the basin area. Furthermore, the applicant will need to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that details the plans for sediment and erosion control for active construction sites must be filed with the Utah Department of Environmental Quality and Payson City.
8. The applicant will need to work with the Payson Power Department on the layout of electrical facilities for the proposed project. Payment of all fees associated with labor and materials provided by the Payson Power Department are the responsibility of the applicant and will need to be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. The applicant will need to work with the Fire Chief to address the specific needs for fire access, on-site fire hydrants, signage, and other fire code requirements. The parking layout may need to be modified to ensure access to all areas of the building. The applicant is responsible for any review fees and fire hydrant testing. Additionally, structures consisting of more than two (2) units must include internal fire sprinkling systems. Therefore, the four-plex structures must be designed with fire sprinklers.
10. A detailed landscaping plan will need to be prepared and submitted for review and approval. At a minimum, the following will need to be addressed:
	1. The types, sizes and location of planting materials.
	2. Details regarding an underground automatic sprinkling system connected to the pressurized irrigation system.
	3. Retaining walls may need to be incorporated into the landscaping design to stabilize all slopes in the proposed project.
	4. A landscaping maintenance plan will need to be submitted for review and approval.
	5. The landscaping standard for multi-family dwelling units is different than those for single family dwellings. The applicant will need to be aware that all areas not used for buildings or parking must be completely landscaped prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, not just the front yard areas of each structure.
11. The RMO-2 Overlay Zone requires amenities to be provided for the residents of the project. The ordinance indicates that the amenities must be proportionate to the proposed number of units in the development. The concept plan identifies an amenity area that includes picnic tables, barbecue area, and playground. More information will need to be provided regarding the quantity, design, size, etc. of these amenities for the City Council to determine if the proposed amenities are sufficient for ten (10) residential units.
12. Letters from all private utility providers (i.e. Questar Gas, CenturyLink, Comcast, UTOPIA) indicating knowledge of the project and a willingness to provide service to the development will need to be provided. Furthermore, the applicant will need to contact the Post Office to determine the method of mail delivery for the proposed units. The location of any proposed community box unit (CBU) must be approved by Payson City. The applicant will be responsible to satisfy the conditions indicated on the acknowledgment letters from the private utility service providers.
13. A public utility easement will need to be indicated around the perimeter of the parcel. The easement will need to be a five (5) foot easement around the perimeter of the parcel and ten (10) feet along any public right-of-way. Because the Site Plan will not be recorded, the public utility easement documentation will need to be prepared and submitted to Payson City for recordation in the office of the Utah County Recorder.
14. If the overlay zone is approved, the following items will need to be addressed before a building permit is issued for any structure:
	1. Transfer of adequate water to serve the proposed development with both drinking and irrigation water in accordance with Title 10, Water Ordinance. The applicant will need to provide a documented estimate for monthly culinary usage for the structures and the amount of irrigable acreage on the development site.
	2. A performance guarantee will need to be submitted to ensure that public improvements, project landscaping, and amenities are completed in accordance with the regulations of Payson City. The performance guarantee shall be equal to one hundred twenty (120) percent of the approved engineer’s estimate. Submission of public works inspections fees, in cash, will be calculated by staff and must be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
	3. A pre-construction meeting will need to be scheduled with the City Engineer to discuss construction details, inspection requirements and project timelines.

These items represent the issues staff identified for the City Council to consider in the formation of their decision. The City Council will need to determine if the proposed project is compatible with surrounding uses and more beneficial to the community than development that would occur in compliance with the underlying zone requirements. The City Council is under no obligation to recommend approval for use of the RMO-2 Overlay Zone even if all requirements of the development ordinances can or will be satisfied by the applicant. The staff, Planning Commission or City Council may require additional information in order to make a well-informed decision.

**Recommendation**

This staff report identifies items that are not consistent with the Payson City Development Code. It was the intent of the staff to complete a thorough review and identify all items that do not satisfy the requirements of Title 10, Water Ordinance; Title 19, Zoning Ordinance; Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance; the Standard Specifications and Standard Plans; and any and all other development requirements of the City. However, the application does not include a lot of detail. Therefore, additional requirements may be identified once more information and detail is provided. The applicant is responsible to satisfy the relevant requirements of the development ordinances and construction standards of Payson City. The applicant has indicated a willingness to address these conditions and the requirements of the development ordinances following approval of the overlay zone request.

The applicant is seeking approval for use of the RMO-2, Residential Multi-Family Overlay Zone to construct ten (10) multi-family units on 0.96 acres located on the southeast corner of the intersection of 300 North and 800 East in the R-1-75, Residential Zone. On February 11, 2015, the Planning Commission recommended denial of the overlay zone request based on the findings that the area is currently zoned for single family homes and the concerns raised by the citizens in the area.

The City Council will need to determine if the construction of multi-family dwellings is appropriate in this location. The City Council, following a public hearing, may:

1. Remand the request for use of the overlay zone back to staff or the Planning Commission for further review or with direction to provide additional information. This action should be taken by the City Council if it is determined that there is not enough information provided by the applicant in order for the City Council to make a well-informed recommendation.
2. Approve the request for use of the overlay zone as proposed. If the City Council chooses to recommend approval of the request as proposed, staff would suggest than an opportunity to require the applicant to modify the request in a manner that will be more consistent with the land use goals of the City will be missed.
3. Approve the request, provided the applicant is willing to modify the proposal to address the concerns found by staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council to be inconsistent with the development ordinances of Payson City.
4. Deny the proposed request for use of the overlay zone. This action should be taken if the City Council determines that use of the overlay zone is not appropriate in this location or that the applicant is unwilling or unable to satisfy the regulations of the Payson City development ordinances and the land use goals of the City Council. Denial for the use of the overlay zone shall not constitute a takings claim because the applicant will not be denied the ability to use the property in accordance with the underlying zone.

The decision of the City Council, whether in favor of the request or in opposition of the request, should include findings that indicate reasonable conclusions for the decision.

Mr. Jeff Southwick stated the biggest hurdle is that there is an overwhelming concern by the citizens in the area. He stated he has some frustration because he is choosing to build in areas that already have a high populous of apartments. He expressed his desire is to stay in Payson and to provide a nice product and intends to manage them himself. He stated he realizes that he wouldn’t be able to invest in a nice product without building. His plan is to wants to appeal to those with special needs making it handicap accessible and with no stairs. He stated he intends to make it looking nice. He feels that it won’t decrease their property values. He explained the types of materials he would be using and feels that everything would be really nice.

Councilmember Hancock asked what the monthly rent would be. Mr. Southwick expects that he could ask about $850-900. Councilmember Hancock also expressed concern with cost of having radiant heat and questioned if it would drive the utilities up. Mr. Southwick explained that it is the best way to heat the house and expects that it will decrease by 10%.

Councilmember Skinner mentioned that he has the right to 4 homes on that property. Planner Spencer stated he could have possibly 5 to 6 homes depending on if he could get the required frontage.

Mr. Clayton Holbrook said he is concerned with the number of units, he stated there is already a problem with parking in the area and feels that the parking should be addressed.

Mr. Daniel Boles, representing the citizens in the area. He provided the Council with a petition signed by 125 residents that are opposed to this project. (this petition is at the end of the minutes) He requests that the overlay zone be denied and the single family dwelling regulations be upheld. He requested that in the future the Council deny similar projects. They will welcome single family dwellings. He stated property values will decrease and will negatively impact the area. When and if future requests are made they request that more residents be notified. He stated very few received the required notification letters. They feel that this is a single family neighborhood and should be kept that way.

Mr. Max Carter who has lived in Payson for 73 years would like this application denied. He expressed that there are enough apartments in the area as he showed pictures of most of the apartment complexes and trailer park in their area. He would like this request denied because there are plenty in the neighborhood.

Motion by Councilmember Phillips to close the public hearing. Seconded by Councilmember Hardy

Planner Spencer stated she has received other letters from property owners in the area which were provided to the Council before the meeting.

Councilmember Skinner asked about the notification requirements. Planner Spencer stated the property owner on record gets the request and all property owners within 500 feet would have received the notice.

Mr. Carter stated he didn’t receive any letters.

Public hearing closed at 6:58p.m.

Councilmember Phillips mentioned that it is not consistent with the general plan.

Councilmember Hancock stated that it rests on the applicant to convince the Council that it is in the betterment of the city. He questioned if it would be more acceptable to the neighborhood if it were duplexes rather than 10 units.

Councilmember Skinner stated that as far as apartment rental units go Mr. Southwick has given a good quality option and appreciates the quality presented here. He also stated he appreciates all the work that the Planning Commission put in a lot of hard work and hates to override what their decision was based on all the hard work they have done.

Councilmember Hardy thanked Mr. Southwick for providing a good proposal in terms of the types of materials being used. He state in the staff report it encourages the consideration of the general plan and land designation, the purpose of the underlying zone, compatible uses, infrastructure and parking. Councilmember Hardy expressed concern in all those areas that will impact the decision.

MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to deny the request because it is not consistent with the general plan. Seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Voting aye: Councilmembers Phillips, Hancock, Hardy, and Skinner. Voting Nay: None. Motion carries.

PUBLIC HEARING – BUDGET AMENDMENT

MOTION by Councilmember Hardy to open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Phillips. Motion carries.

City Manager Dave Tuckett presented information from the following budget amendment summary.

The following is an explanation of the items scheduled for the budget amendment on March 4, 2015.

**Water Department:** Last council meeting, you were presented with the cost to purchase two vehicles for the water department. The cost to purchase the two vehicles is $63,300. This will greatly assist the water department in their maintenance efforts. These funds will be taken out of the water department fund balance.

**$63,300.00 from water fund balance.**

**Temple Open House Public Affairs Committee:** Larry Skinner, Mike Hardy, Jill Spencer & Janeen Dean are all serving on the Public Affairs Committee for the temple open house. They would like some funds dedicated to helping promote the City of Payson during this event. They are proposing to create some signs, posters and informational cards to be placed in our local restaurants. They have some preliminary estimates to have these items created. I am requesting that the council appropriate $4,000 from fund balance to assist in this effort. This amount can be placed in the economic development line item of the Mayor & Council budget.

**$4,000.00 from general fund balance.**

**Wastewater Clarifyer**: A major part of the sewer clarifier is damaged and needs to be replaced. The bid to purchase and install the 31-inch Cage Drive Unit is $29,697. Please see the attached bid document. We are asking that $30,000 be appropriated from fund balance.

**$30,000 from Capital Projects fund balance.**

**Public Safety Facility:** The City Council appropriated funds to pay for half of our obligation for the new dispatch center. We have the ability to use impact fees to cover the other half of our obligation. We are proposing that we appropriate $142,000 from Public Safety Impact Fees to pay the other half of our obligation.

**$142,000 from Public Safety Impact Fees**

**Purchase of Property at 200 South & 900 East:** The Wilcock family agreed to sell the parcel of land for $77,000. We are working on a Real Estate Purchase Contract and a closing date. We are requesting $80,000 appropriated from the Capital Projects Fund to purchase the property and handle any closing costs.

**$80,000 from the Capital Projects Fund.**

Councilmember Hardy asked if we get this part will it be usable when we upgrade the plant. City Manager Tuckett stated that it would and we are hoping to add another so that we will be able to keep running.

Councilmember Philips abstained from the discussion.

Kenneth Abbott expressed that he likes the idea of promoting local businesses but thinks the restaurants should be paying for the table toppers.

Councilmember Skinner asked if there cost is different if we don’t have to dig as deep at the well site

Motion by Councilmember Hardy to close the public hearing. Seconded by Councilmember Hancock.

Motion by Councilmember Hardy to approve the budget amendments as presented. Seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Roll call voting aye: Councilmembers Skinner, Hardy, Hancock. Councilmember Phillips abstained from the motion.

DISCUSSION REGARDING ENCLOSING THE LAP PORTION OF THE POOL

Councilmember Ford joined the meeting by conference call.

Mrs. Kimberly Kunz is a longtime resident and loves the area. She stated she is a small business owner that does hair out of her home so she gets a lot of opinions on this subject. She created a Facebook page supporting the enclosing of the pool. She stated within the weeks’ time they have 800 likes and reached 6,578 and have 902 people engaged. Mrs. Kunz provided a copy of the facebook statistics mentioned here.

Mrs. Kunz explained her reason for enclosing the pool. She also expressed ways the pool could be utilized during the winter if it were covered. This included:

* Using the pool for physical therapy
* Water Aerobics classes
* Year round swimming lessons
* Scuba diving practice
* Swim team practice

Mrs. Kunz provided letters from JoAn Ellsworth, Sean Weight and Brad Mangum which are attached at the end of the minutes.

Payson High school swim coach Jillian Oakley stated their team practices are in Provo right now. They have a small team and have become larger. She stated other teams in the area could use a place closer to practice as well. She reiterated that there are people in the community that do this sport competitively. She stated their desire is to let the Council know that there is support from the community not just the high school swim team. She stated they would like to move this forward and questioned what we can do to move it forward.

Councilmember Hardy asked what kind of a cover is being proposed

Mrs. Oakley stated that there are three options. A bubble would be approximately 800 thousand dollars. The second option, a sprung structure which is semi-permanent would cost. The third would be a block building and would cost 2.3 million.

Councilmember Hardy expressed concern with a bubble structure because they can be cold. He also questioned what they have in mind for a rec center.

Mrs. Oakley stated they would love one like Provo but they know we can’t afford it. She stated they would like some walking tracks, exercise rooms, gyms and a climbing wall.

Councilmember Hardy stated Springville recently turned down a 21 million dollar facility. He questioned if the citizens be willing to pay for that through bonding.

Mrs. Oakley suggested a $5 monthly fee on the utility bill to help maintain the pool.

Councilmember Ford asked if the operating cost would be different depending on which roof we chose.

Recreation Director Teemant stated the operating cost would be about the same but the brick building would save on some heating.

Councilmember Hancock asked how big our lap pool is.

Recreation Director Teemant stated our pool is a high school regulation size, not Olympic size. He also stated the footing and electrical conduit for a cover is already in at the pool.

Councilmember Skinner asked if we accepted funds from the school district if we would lose some control over the pool. Recreation Director Teemant agreed that it could be a concern. He stated they would at least like to use it.

Councilmember Ford stated they would be able to use it anyway with the inter-local agreement.

Mrs. Oakley stated at least two teams would use this pool. She also suggested ways to get revenue.

Councilmember Skinner questioned if we are legally able to build up a recreation fund for future projects.

City Attorney Mark Sorenson stated he thinks we may be able to.

Councilmember Skinner stated he would love to see the facility but if we are going to impose another tax on our citizens it needs to be for a reservoir up the canyon.

Discussion was held regarding the need for a covered pool.

Mr. Jay Rindlisbacher stated he taught swimming for 36 years. He has also been involved in running swimming pools. He believes that we need to cover our pools. He said that some of the larger cities put one cent for every dollar in to a recreation fund. He expressed how important swimming is. He stated he goes to Provo every morning to swim and is now taking other seniors over with him. He stated he is ready to vote for it.

Mr. Don Helvey stated he sees the need for a reservoir. He said feels like there is a general agreement that this would be a good thing. He hopes that the Council find a way to do it while getting a reservoir.

Kimberly Kunz shared some ideas for ways you could modify the pool.

Mr. Ross Huff, used to take his son to the pool in Provo 5 days a week. He believes it is a great family experience and would be a great thing for Payson.

Jacob Albreight explained that the youth would have more opportunities for jobs, proximity from the Junior High & High school. Having a pool this close opens up opportunity for the swim team to swim. Being able to swim every day would help their performance.

DISCUSSION REGARDING MOVIES IN THE PARK

City Manager Tuckett reported that he has been working with Carolyn at the Chamber to determine their hard costs for having the movies in the park. He stated the City would like the Chamber to split the cost of these movies. City Manager Tuckett would like direction from the Council for moving forward with these movies.

Councilmember Phillips asked if this is a time sensitive issue or if we could wait until after the budget meetings. He also said he would like to move ahead with what we have planned so far.

City Manager Tuckett stated we could wait.

Councilmember Hardy would like to revisit this next month.

Councilmember Hancock stated he can’t remember a single time they have approved a 4-plex in the city. He stated if we are not going to approve them the RMO-2 overlay should be taken out of the ordinance.

Council directed staff to remove the RMO Overlay zone from the ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Councilmember Hancock to adjourn. Motion seconded by Councilmember Phillips. Motion carries.

Council adjourned at 8:15 p.m.