MAPLETON CITY CITY COUNCIL MINUTES MAY 7, 2025

PRESIDING AND CONDUCTING: Mayor Dallas Hakes- Excused

Mayor Pro Tem Leslie Jones

Members in Attendance: Kasey Beck

Reid Carlson Jessica Egbert Therin Garrett Leslie Jones

Staff in Attendance: Cory Branch, City Administrator

Sean Conroy, Assistant City Administrator/Community

Development Director

Rob Hunter, Public Works Director/City Engineer John Jackson, Public Safety Director/Police Chief Logan Miner, Parks and Recreation Director

Minutes taken by: Camille Brown, City Recorder

The items may not have been heard in the order below.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Cl. Carlson gave the invocation, and Cl. Egbert gave the Pledge of Allegiance.

OPEN FORUM:

Miss Springville/Mapleton Roxy Packard expressed her gratitude for the opportunity to serve and shared her excitement about beginning her community involvement following her upcoming graduation. She recently attended the Mapleton track meet with her royalty, where they enjoyed working with local youth and helping with race times. Her attendants are Whitney Jarman, Paige Ballard, and Scarlett Fullmer.

She introduced her community service initiative, "Shop Local, Support Local," which focuses on promoting and supporting small businesses in Mapleton and throughout Utah. Emphasizing the importance of investing in local entrepreneurs rather than large corporations, she encouraged community members to inform her of any new business openings so she can attend and offer her support. She also expressed interest in partnering with the Chamber of Commerce for ribbon cuttings and engaging with young entrepreneurs, including possibly visiting schools to inspire students to consider business ownership.

CONSENT AGENDA

Item 1. Approval of City Council meeting minutes- April 9, 2025

Item 2. Consideration of a Resolution to approve the proposed leveling course bid from

Eckles Paving for Slant Road and East 1600 North. Resolution No. 2025-23

Item 3. Consideration of a Resolution to amend the boundaries of a conservation easement in

the South Hollow subdivision. Resolution No. 2025-24

Item 4. Consideration of a Resolution to award the 2025 Cross City Overlay project to Black

Forest Paving. Resolution No. 2025-25

Item 5. Consideration of a Resolution to approve the 2025 HA5 High Density Mineral Bond

contract with Holbrook Asphalt. Resolution No. 2025-26

Item 6. Consideration of a Resolution entering into a Memorandum of Understanding

between Utah County Sheriff's Office and Mapleton City regarding the retention

of evidence in misdemeanor cases. Resolution No. 2025-27

Item 7. Consideration of a Resolution entering into an Interlocal Agreement between

Nebo School District and Mapleton City. Resolution No. 2025-28

Motion: Cl. Egbert moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Second: Cl. Beck seconded the motion.

Vote:

Cl. Carlson Yes
Cl. Egbert Yes
Cl. Beck Yes
Cl. Jones Yes
Cl. Garrett Yes

Vote: Passed 5:0

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Item 8. Consideration of an Ordinance to apply a Transferable Development Right Receiving Site Overlay (TDR-R) to an existing 2-acre parcel located at 1575 South 1000 East.

Sean Conroy, Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director reviewed the staff report for those in attendance. The applicant is requesting a TDR receiving site overlay for a 2-acre property at the corner of Peterson Lane and 1600 South. The property is not part of a plated subdivision and backs onto a public trail. The proposal would allow the lot to be split, with a future subdivision application required. Staff recommends approval, as the site meets eligibility requirements and aligns with the General Plan.

The applicant, Mel Huffaker stated that their goal is to have their daughter building a home next to them.

The public hearing was opened at 6:11 pm and no comments were made.

Motion: Cl. Egbert moved to approve an Ordinance to apply a Transferable Development Right

Receiving Site Overlay (TDR-R) to an existing 2-acre parcel located at 1575 South 1000

East.

Second: Cl. Garrett seconded the motion.

Cl. Egbert Yes
Cl. Beck No
Cl. Jones Yes
Cl. Garrett Yes
Cl. Carlson Yes

Vote: Passed 4:1
Ordinance No. 2025-05

Item 9. Consideration of an Ordinance amending Mapleton City Code (MCC) Title 18 regarding

standards for residential accessory buildings

Sean Conroy, Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director, reviewed the staff report for those in attendance.

The public hearing was opened at 6:16 pm.

Benjamin Hickman voiced concerns about proposed building regulations that increase setback requirements for tall accessory structures. Planning to build a 25–26 ft. tall outbuilding, the resident explained that the new rules would force the structure farther into their yard, creating unusable space that is out of sight and potentially vulnerable to theft.

They also noted a recent development behind their property where elevated homes overlook their yard, resulting in a loss of privacy. While they didn't object to that project out of respect for property rights, they now feel their own rights are being limited by these new restrictions.

The resident emphasized the practical need for a taller building to accommodate a vehicle lift and expressed willingness to enhance the appearance of the metal structure to fit the neighborhood.

Sharee Killpack expressed support for property rights but emphasized the importance of considering neighbors when building large structures. Referring to a nearby tall outbuilding, she urged others to imagine living next to something double the height of a typical wall and questioned whether just because something is allowed, it should be done.

She pointed out that their neighborhood has CC&Rs (Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions) that were ignored by the property owner, and suggested the city should have some level of oversight, perhaps as simple as a permit checkbox to confirm architectural committee review.

Sharee also advocated for basic aesthetic standards in residential zones, noting that commercial buildings like Maverik or Quick Quack look better than some large metal residential outbuildings. She supported a setback-to-height ratio that would naturally discourage overly large structures and help preserve neighborhood character.

Trent Wride raised concerns about the appropriateness of large accessory buildings in residential areas. While acknowledging the need for space especially for those with hobbies or work-related equipment, he pointed out that his own business storage and auto lift are in an industrial zone, not a residential backyard.

He noted that many large metal buildings going up in neighborhoods appear to be used for commercial or work-related purposes, not recreation or residential needs. He questioned at what point such structures become incompatible with residential zoning and emphasized the need to consider the building's use when determining what's acceptable.

He acknowledged that the current proposal isn't perfect but felt the Planning Commission's compromise was reasonable. He also empathized with the earlier speaker's privacy concerns due to poor planning but reiterated that the core issue is the scale and function of these buildings in a residential context. The public hearing was opened at 6:30pm.

The councilmembers expressed appreciation for the effort that had gone into the draft but felt that the issue was not yet ready for a final decision. There was a strong consensus that the item should be continued to allow for additional research and refinement. Councilmembers noted that while the current proposal was moving in a positive direction, there were still unanswered questions and concerns that warranted further consideration.

One of the primary issues discussed was the height and setback standards for accessory buildings. Several members mentioned that allowing structures up to 40 feet tall within 25 feet of a property line could negatively impact neighboring properties. Some referenced other cities, such as Riverton, which have more restrictive standard, typically capping accessory building heights at 25 feet and requiring greater setbacks. There was a desire to see a broader comparison of best practices and how other

communities manage similar issues.

Another key topic was the potential use of accessory buildings for business purposes. Councilmembers raised questions about whether large structures might be used commercially and whether a conditional use permit should be required in such cases. Staff clarified that accessory buildings are permitted only for residential use, and when a violation occurs, enforcement is possible. However, it was acknowledged that the city cannot deny a permit upfront solely based on suspicion of future commercial use. The zoning context of a property also emerged as a factor worth considering. Several council members suggested that if a residential lot backs up to a commercial zone, or is designated for future commercial use on the general plan, then perhaps additional flexibility in building height and placement could be justified in those specific cases.

Design standards for accessory buildings were also discussed. While there was openness to considering requirements that buildings match the primary home in color or materials, councilmembers expressed caution about being too prescriptive or adding costs unnecessarily. Staff noted that while state law restricts design standards for primary residences, similar limits do not necessarily apply to accessory structures, leaving room for potential design guidelines.

Staff suggested that they have received positive feedback to consider limiting how much of a property's rear width could be occupied by an accessory building. For example, rather than allowing a long structure across the entire rear property line, the ordinance could restrict this to 50 percent of the lot width. Reducing maximum lot coverage from 30 percent to 20 percent was also supported by some to reduce the impacts.

Throughout the discussion, councilmembers emphasized the importance of balancing individual property rights with the rights of neighboring property owners. They acknowledged that this is a complex issue and that getting the policy right is especially important in a small-town context like Mapleton. There was broad agreement that ordinances should not be overly rigid but should also evolve to meet new challenges. Several members noted that if any part of the revised ordinance turns out to be problematic in practice, it can be addressed and amended again in the future. To help guide the next draft, one councilmember volunteered to create a comparison chart showing how other cities regulate height, setback, and ADU standards, and to follow up with colleagues in those communities to learn from their experiences.

Motion: Cl. Egbert moved to continue the item pending further discussion and analysis.

Second: Cl. Carlson seconded the motion.

Cl. Beck Yes
Cl. Jones Yes
Cl. Garrett Yes
Cl. Carlson Yes
Cl. Egbert Yes

Vote: Passed 5:0

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Item 10. A discussion item to review development options for approximately 55 acres of land located at approximately 200 West and 2800 South.

Sean Conroy, Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director, advised the council that this item has been continued to another meeting.

MAYOR, COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

- **CI. Egbert** reported that they had a community preparedness committee meeting, three upcoming events were discussed for the rest of the year. These include supporting the Pioneer Week events, especially the lost children initiative, a combined public safety night with the committee and public safety efforts (possibly in conjunction with the farmers market), and a self-reliance or preparedness fair. Details for each event are still being worked out.
- **CI. Beck** stated that yesterday, the second annual MYCC scholarship was awarded, and he expressed gratitude for those who helped review the essays. It's clear that the scholarship means a lot to the graduating seniors. The update on the recipients and their future plans will be shared soon.
- **CI. Garrett** thanked all who participated in the community cleanup, which was once again a success with strong community involvement. However, there were some issues at the dumpster site during a windstorm, which caused trash to blow into nearby properties. The cleanup cost approximately \$14,500 for two days, and 133 residents redeemed dump vouchers as part of the effort.

Logan Miner provided an update on the parks and recreation impact fee analysis, noting that land values, central to the calculation, have increased significantly since the last study in 2019. The current impact fee is \$3,156 per single-family home, based on a land value of \$150,000 per acre. If land values are updated to \$300,000 or \$400,000, the fee could increase to \$5,400 or nearly double, respectively. The council discussed a possible midpoint of \$350,000 per acre with a more frequent review cycle (every 3 years instead of 5) to keep up with market changes. The goal is to ensure fees are fair, defensible, and reflective of actual costs.

Staff also reported on recent and upcoming community events. The inaugural "Splash of Color" event was a success, selling out quickly and drawing strong community participation. Some lessons were learned for improvement, such as avoiding aerosol paints and improving activity flow.

Upcoming events include the Opening Day parade and coaches vs. players baseball game this Saturday, with about 750 youth participating in baseball and softball. "Chalk the Walk" is scheduled for Monday with a continued focus on health and wellness. Spring rec programs are wrapping up, and summer programs are beginning.

The new maintenance shop is on schedule, and staff will offer a walkthrough when ready. City Park's redesign is being finalized, with construction planned to begin after Pioneer Days and finish before December's "Lights On" event. Lastly, Brady Orton has joined the city as a new park's technician.

Chief Jackson reported that Travis was back on his bike yesterday and came into the PD. It was great to see him out and about again, even though he's moving a bit slower.

On the PD side, Officers Walker and Miller went down to Maple Mountain High School to recruit for the upcoming Youth Academy starting in three weeks. There's a great group of kids in the law enforcement class, and several Mapleton residents are expected to sign up. It'll be a fun experience, and Cl. Egbert will be contacted to help out with it as it gets closer.

Motion: CI Egbert moved to adjourn the meeting.

Second: Cl. Garrett seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed unanimously at 7:41pm

APPROVED: May 21, 2025

Camille Brown City Recorder