Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Work Session
Tuesday, May 19, 2026
4:30 p.m.

Mayor:	Eric Jensen
Council Members:	Dianna Andersen Cyd LeMone Steve Rogers Todd Williams
Staff Present:	Scott Darrington, City Administrator Sierra Pierson, Assistant to the City Administrator Christine Petersen, City Attorney Neal Winterton, Public Works Director Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder Denise Roy, Finance Director David Packard, Human Resources Manager Drew Engemann, Fire Chief Keldon Brown, Police Chief Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director Deon Giles, Parks Director Sheri Britsch, Library Director Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director Soad Sing, Administration Intern
Excused:	Dustin Phillips, City Council Member

The City Council and Staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

4:30 P.M. WORK SESSION

Mayor Eric Jensen called the Work Session to order at 4:30 p.m. He made note of the Council Members present. It was noted that Council Member Rogers arrived at 4:31 p.m. Council Member Phillips is out of town, but plans to join the Regular Session by phone.

a. All-Terrain Wheelchair Presentation – Director Zollinger.

Recreation Director, Megan Zollinger, reported that there are now three all-terrain wheelchairs available at the Recreation Center for checkout. She demonstrated how the wheelchairs work and explained that there is a five-point harness system. The wheelchairs have been available for the last couple of weeks, and there have already been three rentals. That means three residents have been able to visit places in nature that were previously inaccessible. The wheelchair is lightweight and has a self-braking mechanism. She highlighted additional features of the wheelchair.

There is a lot of excitement about sharing the all-terrain wheelchairs with the community, especially because they will allow residents to visit areas that they have not visited before. Director Zollinger reported that there has been a lot of marketing done on social media to let residents know that this resource is available. There will also be a display at the Berserker Blitz event. She explained that there is a desire to inform as many residents as possible so these chairs can continue to be used. Director Zollinger noted that those interested can speak to someone at the front desk or reserve a chair online. She asked Council Members to spread the word whenever possible.

Director Zollinger reiterated that the all-terrain wheelchairs improve accessibility for users. There are bouncy wheels that make for a smooth ride. She expressed appreciation for the grant funding that has made all of this possible. The chairs are currently free to check out with a $50 deposit. If there are small repairs needed, there is a company in Payson that is able to handle them. Director Zollinger added that the wheelchair is user-friendly and can easily fit into the trunk of a vehicle.

b. Budget Discussion.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, distributed a handout to the City Council. He explained that Council Members previously requested additional information about the impact of a property tax increase on an average home in Pleasant Grove. The request was to see the impact of a 12% increase, 10% increase, 8% increase, 5% increase, and 3% increase. He referenced the chart on the handout and explained that what is currently proposed by Staff is $4.16 per month, which is a 16.55% increase. That increase would result in revenue generation of $683,088. For comparison, a 12% increase would reduce the amount to $3.02 per month, a 10% increase would be $2.52 per month, an 8% increase would be $2.01, a 5% increase would be $1.26 per month, and a 3% increase would be $0.75 per month. He explained that the New Revenue column on the chart shows the amount of revenue that would be generated based on the tax increase percentage.

During the last City Council discussion, it was determined that there would be a resident survey. Administrator Darrington recommended that residents be surveyed on the $4.16 per month amount, which is based on the average home. He has spoken to Ron Gailey from OnPointe Insights, which is a surveying company that exclusively works with governments. Mr. Gailey attends the Utah League of Cities and Towns ("ULCT") as a vendor and comes to the Utah City Manager's Association ("UCMA") as a vendor. There was a discussion with Mr. Gailey about the logistics of a one-question survey. The idea is to have the largest reach possible, so there is something statistically significant the City Council can look at when considering the options.

Administrator Darrington would like to see the City pursue a one-question survey. Based on the discussion with Mr. Gailey, the question could be something similar to "Would you support a property tax increase on an average home ($570,000) of $4.16 per month, a 16.55% increase, to fund three firefighters, two police officers, and enhance the retention program?" On June 1, 2026, the County will send the new evaluation for the year. His assumption is that the average home will increase from $570,000. If that number increases, then the $4.16 per month will decrease slightly. It is possible to wait until that number is received before the survey is distributed, or the City can start the survey process early next week. He asked for Council Member feedback.

Council Member Todd Williams reported that he was the Executive Vice President of a survey company for six years, where there was surveying conducted for major restaurants and hotels. Questions must be carefully written to rate the highest number of responses and generate the most accurate responses. He understands the desire to educate, but noted that there could be information provided, followed by the survey question. Administrator Darrington explained that, according to Mr. Gailey, there are several possible approaches the City can take.

Administrator Darrington asked for Council Member feedback about the survey timeline. He reported that on June 2, 2026, there will be a public hearing on the budget. On June 16, 2026, a decision needs to be made about what will be proposed for the potential tax increase. Mayor Jensen asked if there has been outreach conducted with the County to determine whether the additional information will be provided on June 1, 2026. Finance Director, Denise Roy, confirmed that there have been discussions with the County, but there is some uncertainty about the date.

Mayor Jensen pointed out that the number could change slightly. It might not make sense to send out a survey with numbers from the previous year. Administrator Darrington reiterated that on June 16, 2026, the City needs to adopt the proposed tax rate. Mayor Jensen suggested sending the survey out on June 2, 2026. Administrator Darrington clarified that this will not be a paper survey. He offered to find out additional information about how resident contact information is obtained.

There was not originally a City Council Meeting planned for June 16, 2026, but the law states that the tax rate must be adopted before June 22, 2026. There is a meeting scheduled on June 22, 2026, so in order to adopt something before that date, another meeting needs to be scheduled. It was noted that June 15, 2026, is a State holiday, so it is not recommended to meet on that date. The proposed meeting on June 16, 2026, can be scheduled at 5:00 p.m. and will have only one agenda item.

Administrator Darrington explained that the intention is to have the survey results before June 16, 2026, so the City Council has enough information to make a decision. On June 22, 2026, the interim budget will be adopted. There will not be a public hearing held on that date, as the public hearing for the budget will take place on June 2, 2026. When the interim budget is adopted, there is a carve-out that is specific to the property tax. There will be a public hearing held on August 11, 2026, related to the property tax. That will be a standalone meeting, because by law, it is not possible to have anything else on that meeting agenda. Once the tax rate is adopted, information will be provided to the public. He shared information about the educational component.

Administrator Darrington asked the City Council for feedback about the survey release date. Council Member Steve Rogers thought it made sense to release the survey as soon as possible. Council Member Dianna Andersen and Council Member Williams agreed. Council Member LeMone asked about safeguards that will ensure the same resident cannot submit a survey response more than once. Administrator Darrington reported that the survey experts have certain safeguards in place. He noted that the more feedback received, the more statistically significant the survey will be. Council Member LeMone asked that an email be sent out that includes all of the details.

c. Read the Property Tax Impact Statement – Director Roy.

Director Roy read the Property Tax Impact Statement. It was noted that the same statement will be read during the Regular Session. It will be read at all meetings with the budget on the agenda.

d. Open and Public Meetings Act Training – Attorney Petersen.

City Attorney, Christine Petersen, provided Open and Public Meetings Act training, which is required on an annual basis. The Open and Public Meetings Act is found in Utah Code § 52-4-101. The policy behind the Open and Public Meetings Act is essentially that the public's business should be conducted in public. The actions of elected officials should be taken openly, and deliberations should be conducted openly. The Act requires elected officials to be trained on compliance annually. The basic premise is that all meetings are open to the public, but there are narrowly defined exceptions. She read a quote from David Church, who was the ULCT General Counsel.

It was noted that the Act defines what a meeting is, which is the convening of a public body when a quorum is present. Attorney Petersen explained that in Pleasant Grove, a quorum is three members of the City Council. The Mayor and two City Council Members do not make a quorum, because the Mayor does not vote except in the event of a tie. Attorney Petersen noted that there should not be a group text or group email created to discuss an item of public business or something that is on the agenda of a City Council Meeting. She reported that a meeting must be for the purposes of discussing, receiving public comment about, or acting on a matter over which the public body has jurisdiction or advisory power. Convening is identified to mean the calling of a meeting of a public body by a person authorized to do so for the purpose of either discussing or acting on a matter over which the public body either has jurisdiction or advisory power. These broad definitions are intended to included almost all gatherings of the City Council. Exceptions to the definition are specific and narrow in nature, such as a chance meeting or social meeting.

Information about noticing requirements was provided. Attorney Petersen reported that the Open and Public Meetings Act requires compliance with certain noticing requirements, such as when, where, and what a meeting is about. This ensures the public has notice of what the governing body will discuss at the meeting. If a public body holds regular meetings, there needs to be annual noticing. In Pleasant Grove, that is normally done at the beginning of the year. However, the schedule can change throughout the year if necessary. Attorney Petersen reminded Council Members that the City Council Meetings in Pleasant Grove are scheduled to take place on the first and third Tuesday of the month at 6:00 p.m. Each meeting requires its own notice at least 24 hours prior to the meeting and must include the agenda, date, time, and location of the meeting.

There are certain posting requirements. Notices must be posted at the principal place of business for the body or at the building where the meeting will take place. In Pleasant Grove, there is notice posted at City Hall. Additionally, the agenda is shared on the Utah Public Notice website and City website. The statute encourages public bodies to develop additional methods of notifying the public. In an emergency, the noticing requirements may be suspended. The best notice possible must be provided. An emergency meeting cannot be held unless an attempt has been made to notify all members of the public body and a majority of the public body approves the meeting.

Attorney Petersen reported that there must be an agenda posted that provides enough detail to notify the public about the topics that will be discussed and the decisions that may be made during the meeting. If an item is not on an agenda, no final action can be taken on that item. An item brought up by the public can be discussed, but would have to be scheduled as an agenda item at a later date before any final action can be taken. As for Closed Meetings, which are often called Executive Sessions, there are some instances when a meeting may be closed to the public. These exceptions are narrow and are spelled out in the Open and Public Meetings Act. Every meeting, even if it is anticipated to be closed, must be convened as a public meeting first before the motion is made to close the meeting to the public. The reasons for holding a Closed Meeting are limited. Attorney Petersen shared several example scenarios for a Closed Meeting with the City Council.

If a Closed Meeting is to be held on the same day as a regularly scheduled meeting, the Act requires that both be held in the same location as the regularly scheduled meeting, with limited exceptions. The purpose is to discourage public officials from having secret pre-meetings outside the view of the public prior to the regular meeting. Attorney Petersen reviewed the rules for Closed Meetings.

Meeting Minutes must be kept of all open and closed meetings, with the exception of personnel and security discussions. The Meeting Minutes must include the date, time, and place of the meeting, who was there, who was not there, and the substance of what was discussed or decided on. This includes a summary of the comments made by the members of the body and the public.

There must also be a record by individual vote of the actions taken, the names of anyone who made a public comment at the meeting, and any other materials a member of the public body requests to be entered into the record. Attorney Petersen noted that Meeting Minutes must state the reasons for a Closed Meeting, where the Closed Meeting was held, and include a vote to close the meeting. Closed Meeting Minutes or recordings must include the date, time, and place of the meeting, the names of the members present and absent, and the names of other persons present, except where disclosure would infringe on the confidence necessary to fulfill the purpose of the Closed Meeting.

The Meeting Minutes for public meetings are public records and will be accessible to the public after a reasonable period of time. Cities are required to have a policy in place that outlines what a reasonable timeframe is to make draft and final versions of the Meeting Minutes available to the public. All open meetings must be recorded and there must also be written Meeting Minutes. It is not possible to edit the recording. The public may record any open meeting, but it must be done in a way that does not disrupt the meeting. Attorney Petersen informed the Council that it is a criminal offense to knowingly and intentionally violate the Open and Public Meetings Act.

e. Staff Business.

Library Director, Sheri Britsch, reported that there is the Utah Library Association ("ULA") conference tomorrow. Five members of staff will be presenting together in a session focused on programs for frequently underserved groups. She is proud of staff for sharing that information.

Director Zollinger reported that the pool will open on Thursday. Parks Director, Deon Giles, reported the cemetery will be staffed all weekend with crews from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. An inspection is planned for the splash pad on Thursday. If all goes well, the splash pad will open on Memorial Day. There is a lot happening between Memorial Day and the high school graduation.

Fire Chief, Drew Engemann, reported that the station is busy. There have been three resignations submitted in the last several days, which has been difficult. It is possible that two more will submit resignations next week. Chief Engemann reported that there is currently work being done to prepare for the pancake breakfast, Strawberry Days, and everything else that is planned.

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, reported that two members of the Planning Team have been lost recently, as those employees moved to different cities. There were two openings, but a new front counter person has already been hired. There will soon be a full staff.

Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, reported that this is Public Works Week 2026. He took a moment to thank those working in the Public Works Department for their commitment. The department handles a lot of different tasks in order to take care of the various citizen needs.

Director Winterton shared information about the work that is being done in Pleasant Grove. There are a number of traffic calming measures and crosswalk enhancements being added near Pleasant Grove Junior High School. Example door hangers were provided to Council Members. These are reminders and education tools that can be used to inform residents about the current conditions.

Director Winterton hopes that residents are turning off their sprinkler systems and are using manual mode right now to save water. The water that comes down is there, but soon, the reserves will be used. He stressed the importance of continued messaging. Director Winterton reported that the City received a completion letter for the stormwater audit. All of the capital projects and road enhancement projects are currently on schedule, including the Battle Creek trailhead, which is scheduled to open on the weekend. Some roads have received chip sealing and there will be micro surfacing done shortly. Council Member Rogers mentioned the notices that ask people not to park on the streets. He wanted to know what can be done if someone chooses to park on the street anyway. Director Winterton explained that towing might occur if it disrupts the planned micro surfacing. However, in the last four years, there have been only one or two vehicles that needed to be towed, so it is not a common issue that the City has had to deal with.

Council Member LeMone asked if the City or the Public Works Department has shared information on social media about Public Works Week. This was denied. Council Member LeMone encouraged the City to create a post about this so the Public Works employees are recognized. There is a luncheon scheduled on Thursday at 11:30 a.m., and Council Members are invited.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: At 5:31 p.m., Council Member Andersen moved to ADJOURN the Work Session. Council Member Williams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

The City Council Work Session Minutes of May 19, 2026, were approved by the City Council on June 22, 2026.

Wendy Thorpe

Wendy Thorpe, CMC
City Recorder
(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder's office.)

Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Regular Session
Tuesday, May 19, 2026
6:00 p.m.

Mayor:	Eric Jensen
Council Members:	Dianna Andersen Cyd LeMone Dustin Phillips (via telephone) Steve Rogers Todd Williams
Staff Present:	Scott Darrington, City Administrator Sierra Pierson, Assistant to the City Administrator Christine Petersen, City Attorney Neal Winterton, Public Works Director Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder Denise Roy, Finance Director David Packard, Human Resources Manager Drew Engemann, Fire Chief Keldon Brown, Police Chief Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director Deon Giles, Parks Director Sheri Britsch, Library Director Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director Soad Sing, Administration Intern

The City Council and Staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

6:00 P.M. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1) CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Eric Jensen called the Regular Session to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed those present. He noted that Council Member Phillips was attending via telephone.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by City Administrator, Scott Darrington.

3) OPENING REMARKS

The Opening remarks were offered by Council Member Andersen.

4) APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION: Council Member Rogers moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Phillips, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

5) PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

6) OPEN SESSION

Mayor Jensen opened the Open Session.

Bob Scott commended Council Member Williams for voting against the property tax increase at the last meeting. He also commended Council Member LeMone for questioning the amount. Mr. Scott believes a property tax increase should be a last resort. He suggested that the City Council ask Staff Members to return with a budget that prioritizes the police and fire needs. He pointed out that in 2023 there was a property tax increase considered, but it failed in a vote. As for a possible survey question, he believed the right question needs to be posed to residents.

Jerry Bushman reported that he attended a City Council Meeting in March to share comments about a City Ordinance and the number of vehicles that can be on a property. He was referred to a member of Staff, but never heard back. Mr. Bushman has returned to the City Council to highlight the same issue. He lives on a cul-de-sac, and there are trailers and junk cars parked along the road. The City Council has written certain policies and ordinances. He feels there should be an obligation to enforce them. Mr. Bushman sat on the Planning Commission for approximately 10 years in another city and is aware that there are ordinances that exist to address these issues. He reiterated the need for enforcement. A home is a significant investment and something needs to be done. He asked the City Council to look into this matter and provide feedback about next steps. Mayor Jensen asked that Mr. Bushman speak to Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas. Administrator Darrington offered to walk out with him and discuss this matter.

Council Member Steve Rogers noted that there have been previous discussions about a Code Enforcement Officer that is parking specific. The neighborhood that Mr. Bushman lives in is not an isolated issue, as there are similar issues seen in other areas of Pleasant Grove. He stressed the importance of enforcement. It was reiterated that there will be a discussion with Mr. Bushman.

There were no further comments. The Open Session was closed.

7) CONSENT ITEMS

- **A. City Council Minutes for the March 24, 2026, and April 14, 2026, Meetings.**
- **B. To Consider for Approval Payment No. 7 (PR 1 for 2026 CY) to Geneva Rock Products, Inc. for the Pavement Preservation Project.**

C. **To Consider for Approval Payment No. 2 to Black Forest Paving for the 1100 East Area Waterline and Roadway Reconstruction Project.**

D. **To Consider for Approval Payment No. 3 to Geneva Rock Products, Inc. for the Battle Creek Trailhead Parking Improvements Project.**

E. **Payment Approval Reports for May 14, 2026.**

MOTION: Council Member Andersen moved to APPROVE the Consent Items. Council Member Williams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Phillips, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

8) BOARD, COMMISSION, AND COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS:

A. **None.**

9) PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. **Public Hearing to Consider a Resolution (2026-25) Adjusting and Amending the Actual and Anticipated Budget Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; and Providing for an Effective Date.** ***Presenter: Director Roy***

Finance Director, Denise Roy, reported that there are several proposed budget amendments. In the Class C Road Funds, there are two major projects that were awarded on February 17, 2026. The projects are for scrub and micro and 800 North and 680 North, which results in $5.5 million that needs to be allocated in the Class C Road Funds. Fund Balance will be used for those projects.

In the Transportation Fund, there is an appropriation of $550,000 for the 1100 East project. That bid was awarded on January 6, 2026. The budget also needs to be amended in Water for $300,000 for the 1100 East project, which was awarded on January 6, 2026. There also needs to be an amendment for $1.1 million for the 800 North and 680 North project, which was awarded on February 17, 2026. Some Water Impact Fees will be used on the 1100 East project and 800 North and 680 North project. Those were awarded in January and February for $475,000 and $825,000.

In the General Fund, there are some additional fuel expenses for parks and fire, so there is a $25,000 gas increase proposed. Director Roy reviewed some Pool related items. There is a request to use some Fund Balance, because some personnel and chemical prices are still being worked through. There are also some personnel expenses listed in the Recreation Fund. The Cultural Arts shows some additional operational expenses. She explained that there is storage needed for PG Players and she wants to make sure there is the budget authority to cover those kinds of costs.

Council Member Rogers asked about the personnel line items. He questioned whether the budget for next year has already been increased to address the shortfalls that are being seen. Director Roy confirmed this, especially when it comes to the pool related items. There have been several meetings about the pool and she has looked at both the revenues and personnel expenses. One of the difficulties with the pool is that the seasons are in two different fiscal years. There was a bit of a disconnect with the pool opening last year, so there have been discussions about the schedule.

Director Roy reported that the next budget anticipates certain costs, such as the chemicals. Administrator Darrington noted that the pool has its own Fund Balance as a special revenue fund. Additional discussions were had about the swimming pool and the associated costs. Administrator Darrington explained that some personnel has been cut back as have some of the operating hours.

Mayor Jensen opened the public hearing.

Bob Scott did not believe the supporting documents were available to the public ahead of the City Council Meeting. It was clarified that residents can access the Meeting Materials Packet online.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Andersen moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-25 – Adjusting and Amending the Actual and Anticipated Budget Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; and providing for an effective date. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Phillips, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

B. Public Hearing to Consider Ordinance (2026-016) for a Zone Change to Remove the Valley Grove Mixed Use (VGMU) Overlay from Approximately 4.5 Acres of Land and to Apply the Grove Business Park (GBP) Overlay to Approximately 2.9 Acres of Land, Located at 877 South Mountain View Lane. Applicant: St. John Properties. *Presenter: Director Cárdenas.*
****THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM 04/14/2026 and 04/28/2026****

Ahead of the discussion on Item 9B, Director Cardenas addressed the comments made during the Open Session. He reported that based on the Code Enforcement files, there was some action taken and the neighbors put in a fence, but there is additional enforcement that needs to be done.

Director Cardenas presented the Staff Report and explained that Item 9B, Item 9C, and Item 10A will be presented at the same time. The reason there are two rezones on the agenda is because the proposed rezone applies to two different parcels. There is also an item on the agenda that relates to a Development Agreement. Director Cardenas shared a map of the area and explained that in the past, the City made an agreement with St. John Properties for a certain amount of retail in exchange for a promenade and residential. The previous Development Agreement applied the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay to specific areas and allowed the developer to build a certain amount of residential. The applicant is proposing to remove the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay Zone, which allows for residential and retail uses. The request is to apply the Grove Business Park Overlay to portions of 877 South Mountain View Lane and 1018 South 1300 West, which allows flex space and light manufacturing. The applicant would like to construct a flex space building.

Director Cardenas shared additional information about what is proposed. The applicant would like to have a flex space building with the front of the building facing the west and the back of the building facing 1300 West. The applicant is proposing to leave the three lots facing North County Boulevard for retail and commercial uses. The applicant proposes the creation of a Development Agreement. He explained that the existing Development Agreement would be impacted by this.

The applicant proposes a Development Agreement, which will state that the area will be rezoned by applying the Grove Business Park Overlay to allow for flex space. Director Cardenas explained that the Development Agreement is a proposal from the applicant. While Staff read the proposal and provided suggestions, the Development Agreement did not come from Staff. The applications related to Zone Changes and the Development Agreement were brought to the City by the applicant. Several items from the proposed Development Agreement were reviewed:

- The promenade shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the second, and probably final, residential building;
- Proposes that the new retail use (15,000 square feet) shall be counted toward the phasing requirements to build the second residential building;
- Provides for enhanced landscaping;
- Proposes enhanced building design requirements;
- Provides for a minimum of 15,000 square feet of retail uses on Lots 2, 3, and 4 (Lots 2 and 3 being completely dedicated to retail uses);
- As the applicant is proposing to eliminate the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay Zone, the total amount of residential use goes from 1,155 units to 1,040 units for the entire project.

In the original Development Agreement, there were three residential buildings, which were pointed out on a map of the area. There was phasing proposed, and in the final phase, the developer had to finish a promenade that would create a walkable area and allow residents to access the commercial and retail uses. In the amendment to the Development Agreement, the applicant is proposing that the promenade be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the second building. In the previous agreement, the promenade was the final step for the third building. Since there might not be a third building, the applicant is proposing a shift in the phasing.

Council Member Williams asked what would happen if the applicant sold the second building and the new owner wanted to make certain changes. Director Cardenas explained that in a situation like that, there would need to be a discussion with Staff. The applicant would have the right to propose a new Development Agreement and that could be brought to the City Council.

Council Member Williams wanted to know if the required amount of retail space has been calculated. Director Cardenas reported that by the time of the second building and the promenade, there will be approximately 140,000 square feet of retail uses. The last time he checked, there was between 80,000 to 85,000 square feet of retail, so there is still more that needs to be built.

Director Cardenas explained that the Development Agreement proposes that the new retail use be counted toward the phasing requirements to build the second residential building. Administrator Darrington asked if that was added into the agreement, because he believed there was some pushback from Staff on that. It was clarified that Staff did not recommend this be included.

The Development Agreement provides for enhanced landscaping. Director Cardenas shared an image with the City Council for clarification and reported that the applicant proposes additional landscaping beyond what is required in order to make the site look more aesthetically pleasing. The applicant is proposing to build a berm that would be 2 to 3 feet tall along 1300 West. In addition, there is a proposal for enhanced building design requirements. The enhancements would include four-foot bump outs at each entrance, color and texture variations on the front façade, glass windows to the ground, wrapped glass on both the north and south front corners of the building, vertical elevation changes on the roof line, windows in roll up doors along the back, and no truck loading docks. The applicant is willing to include these items in order to receive approval.

The applicant is proposing to eliminate the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay Zone, which means the total amount of residential will shift from 1,155 units to 1,040 units for the entire project. Director Cardenas explained that the Development Agreement proposes removing the zone that allows for retail and residential for a zone that will allow for flex space and light manufacturing.

Staff recommends the City Council consider denial of what has been proposed by the applicant. Director Cardenas explained that this is a gateway to the City and Staff does not believe the Development Agreement provides enough protection. Council Members discussed the applicant proposal. City Attorney, Christine Petersen, explained that if the City Council does not believe flex space is appropriate, both Zone Change applications would need to be denied. She reminded Council Members that the terms of the original Development Agreement are still in place. What is before the City Council is a package deal from the applicant, which includes the three requests.

Director Cardenas explained that the reason there are two Zone Change items on the agenda has to do with the fact that there are two parcels. He shared an interactive map with Council Members to demonstrate what has been requested by the applicant. Council Members asked clarifying questions about some of the areas shown on the map, including in the buildings in Lindon.

The applicant representative, Marty Beaumont, explained that he is with St. John Properties. This is the third time discussing this item, but the intention this time is to address a number of items that were not completely fleshed out previously. Removal of the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay and the application of the Grove Business Park Overlay will make it possible to enhance the area. The building enhancements proposed are not typical of what is normally seen on a flex building. As far as the back of the building is concerned, this area will be addressed through the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Beaumont noted that during the previous Development Agreement discussions, there was some uncertainty about what would happen with the promenade. The proposed Development Agreement addresses that uncertainty and commits to the full promenade with the Certificate of Occupancy for the second residential building. Right now, the Development Agreement states that the promenade will happen with the Certificate of Occupancy for the third residential building. As for the construction of the retail commercial area around the promenade, there are certain limits that need to be met. He reviewed the Concept Plan and reiterated that the intention is to complete the promenade prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the second retail building.

Item 2.1 of the Development Agreement was discussed. Mr. Beaumont reported that this indicates that only retail space uses shall be allowed on Lots 2 and 3 of the developer property. 2.2 indicates that on Lots 2, 3, and 4, there has to be a minimum of 15,000 square feet. There is a desire to have flexibility to bring those in based on the market conditions. The proposal is to strike 2.1 from the approved Development Agreement. Other than that, there is agreement with everything else that has been proposed. There were two renderings shared with the City Council. Mr. Beaumont pointed out the inclusion of the Valley Grove sign, which is envisioned to enhance the corner.

Council Member Phillips asked if it would make sense to include a condition in the Development Agreement that would ensure the 15,000 square feet was added. This condition would make the City feel comfortable that the square footage would not need to be monitored on a regular basis. Administrator Darrington explained that even if there was something included that would be a pain point for St. John Properties, the City would still need to make a determination about what is retail and whether the 15,000 square feet is being met. It is for the ease of the City that certain lots are asked to be made retail, so it will be easier to manage the uses. Council Member Phillips pointed out that the long-term management will likely be more difficult than the short-term management. There is turnover that makes the long-term management somewhat challenging to deal with.

Council Member Williams explained that, based on previous experience, the lots could be sold and then developed by someone else. He wanted to understand the worst-case scenario if the lots were sold. Director Cardenas clarified that the renderings shown by the applicant are not part of the Development Agreement. They do not guarantee that what was shown will actually be built to look like that. The worst-case scenario would be that the property was sold and then whoever purchased the property would fight Staff on every requirement in the agreement.

Mr. Beaumont reported that Lot 4 is the largest lot and has the potential for the most change. Management will still need to occur, but what is proposed provides additional flexibility to move people in and out. The other two lots will not create the heavy burden of management. He reiterated that there will need to be management regardless, but there is flexibility requested.

Director Cardenas explained that if the request is denied, then the yellow area shown on the map could be retail or residential. However, there is an area that has to be either retail or office. Right now, the residential does not extend all the way to 1300. Council Member Rogers asked to review some of the zoning that is highlighted on the map. He wanted to know what would happen if the request was approved and flex space was allowed in an area that was not zoned for that use. Other property owners might approach the City Council with a similar request. He expressed concerns about the precedent that could be set in this area if the proposals are approved by the City Council.

Attorney Petersen clarified that the Business and Manufacturing Park Zone on the east side of 1300 West was always planned to be a buffer zone between more intense uses and the commercial uses. 1300 West was designed to be the boundary of that buffer zone. When the Business and Manufacturing Park Zone was put in that location, there was not an awareness that 1300 West would eventually become a major thoroughfare. To allow that buffer zone to cross over onto the west side of 1300 West was not what the City had originally planned. Council Member Andersen asked about commercial sales and what the doTERRA building would be considered. Director Cardenas shared a map with the City Council that provided some additional clarification.

Council Member Williams mentioned the original Development Agreement and pointed out that a certain number of units were allowed. He asked about the number of units proposed by the freeway. Director Cardenas reported that the building that was approved has 472 units. Council Member Williams asked how much residential could theoretically be put on 4.5 acres. Director

Cardenas explained that the main factor that will determine the number of units on 4.5 acres is the parking that can be accommodated. He noted that it is difficult to have underground parking because of the water table. Council Member Williams believed that in order to fulfill the original Development Agreement, there would need to be a couple of hundred units on the property. Attorney Petersen clarified that the developer does not have to have that many, but the developer is entitled to put a certain number of units on a combination of the three parcels. 472 have already been used, and there could theoretically be 472 more in the second building. There is also entitlement to use the third parcel for whatever remains. It was reiterated that parking can limit the number of units.

Mr. Beaumont reminded the City Council that the proposal provides certain benefits to the City, such as building enhancements, landscape enhancements, and another acre of promenade built sooner than originally anticipated. There is a lot being offered through the Development Agreement. He feels there is an opportunity to build sooner and address some previous issues.

Mayor Jensen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Council Member Andersen reported that she works across the street and sees this area on a regular basis. She has seen flex space done well. There is opposition to the residential development because traffic is a challenge at specific times of the day in the area. If there were 300 units, that would be 300 to 400 people coming and going at around the same time. She does not think that what is proposed would be unattractive when coming into town, because there would still be the necessary upkeep.

Council Member Phillips feels there are certain elements that could slow down the development of this project. Those elements are economically driven, such as an economic downturn. The developers appear motivated to move this work forward. As for the earlier comment made about setting a precedent, there is no exception being made for one developer, but there is a negotiation taking place, and there are certain concessions that have been proposed. The question is whether the City Council feels those concessions provide enough value to the City to approve what has been proposed by the developer. He personally feels that the concessions are enough.

Council Member LeMone noted that if there are concerns about traffic, then the 1,000-plus units should not have been approved. She does not feel comments about traffic are relevant at this time. What has been proposed will benefit St. John Properties. There is a limited amount of land left, and she does not want unattractive brick buildings for flex space. She is worried that there will be sales tax revenue lost with what has been proposed by the applicant. Council Member LeMone is concerned that people coming to a major gateway of the City will see an unattractive development.

MOTION: Council Member Andersen moved to APPROVE Ordinance 2026-016 – Zone Change to Remove the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay from Approximately 4.5 Acres of Land and Apply the Grove Business Park Overlay to Approximately 2.9 Acres of Land, Located at 877 South Mountain View Lane. Council Member Phillips seconded the motion. Council Members LeMone, Rogers, and Williams voted "No." Council Members Andersen and Phillips voted "Yes." The motion failed with a vote of 3-to-2.

MOTION: Council Member LeMone moved to DENY Ordinance 2026-016 – Zone Change to Remove the Valley Grove Mixed Use Overlay from Approximately 4.5 Acres of Land and Apply the Grove Business Park Overlay to Approximately 2.9 Acres of Land, Located at 877 South Mountain View Lane. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. Council Members LeMone, Rogers, and Williams voted "Yes." Council Members Andersen and Phillips voted "No." The motion passed with a vote of 3-to-2.

C. Public Hearing to Consider Ordinance (2026-017) for a Zone Change on Approximately 0.74 Acres of Land to Apply the Grove Business Park (GBP) Overlay, Located at 1018 South 1300 West. Applicant: St. John Properties. ***Presenter: Director Cárdenas.***
****THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM 04/14/2026 and 04/28/2026.****

This item was discussed at the same time as Item 9B and Item 10A.

Mayor Jensen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member LeMone moved to DENY Ordinance 2026-017 – Zone Change on Approximately 0.74 Acres of Land to Apply the Grove Business Park Overlay, Located at 1018 South 1300 West. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. Council Members LeMone, Rogers, and Williams voted "Yes." Council Members Andersen and Phillips voted "No." The motion passed with a vote of 3-to-2.

10) ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE

A. To Consider Resolution (2026-17) Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Development Agreement with Valley Grove IV, LLC ("Developers") Regarding a Flex Space Development Located at Approximately North County Boulevard and 1300 West, Pleasant Grove, Utah, Providing for Development of a Flex Space Development, and Other Related Matters. ***Presenter: Director Cárdenas.***
****THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM 04/14/2026 and 04/28/2026.****

This item was discussed at the same time as Item 9B and Item 9C.

MOTION: Council Member Rogers moved to DENY Resolution 2026-17 – Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Development Agreement with Valley Grove IV, LLC, ("Developers") Regarding a Flex Space Development Located at Approximately North County Boulevard and 1300 West, Pleasant Grove, Utah, Providing for Development of a Flex Space Development, and Other Related Matters. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. Council Members LeMone, Rogers, and Williams voted "Yes." Council Members Andersen and Phillips voted "No." The motion passed with a vote of 3-to-2.

B. To Consider Resolution (2026-26) Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Underground Right-of-Way Easement Granting Rocky Mountain Power an Easement for the Relocation of Power Lines at Discovery Park to Accommodate a New Cell Tower for AT&T Located at Approximately 100 East and 1555 North, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and Providing for an Effective Date. ***Presenter: Attorney Petersen.***

Attorney Petersen reported that the easement for Rocky Mountain Power is another step in the construction of a new cell tower at Discovery Park. The City Council has previously approved the Lease Agreement for AT&T to build the tower, but some power lines needs to be moved. The existing power lines are not exactly in the easement already granted. There is a modification requested so Rocky Mountain Power can install transmission lines to service the cell tower.

MOTION: Council Member Andersen moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-26 – Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Underground Right-of-Way Easement Granting Rocky Mountain Power an Easement for the Relocation of Power Lines at Discovery Park to Accommodate a New Cell Tower for AT&T Located at Approximately 100 East and 1555 North, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and Providing for an Effective Date. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Phillips, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION.

A. Property Tax Impact Statement for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2026, and Ending June 30, 2027, and Providing for an Effective Date. ***Presenter: Director Roy.***

Administrator Darrington explained that in order to meet State law, the Property Tax Impact Statement for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027, needs to be read into the record. This was also read during the Work Session. Director Roy read the statement.

B. Continued Items from the Work Session, if Needed.

Police Chief, Keldon Brown, reported that there have been responses to several different locations where 60 to 100 juveniles have been congregating for a fight night. Some of the locations have included Grove Creek trailhead, Manila Creek Pond, and the high school football field. In addition, he noted that e-bikes are out and there have already been speeding issues. He explained that so education and enforcement measures are continuing to be prioritized in the community.

Chief Brown noted that there are background checks taking place for possible new hires. Discussions were had about some of the incidents that have taken place more recently in the community. Council Member Rogers thanked the Police Department for serving younger citizens.

12) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE JUNE 2, 2026, AND JUNE 22, 2026, CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS.

The future City Council Meetings were not discussed.

13) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member LeMone was at the pickleball courts earlier in the day. There were some junior high school students on the next court over, and there was a friendly game against them. The students told her that they were there to practice for the Strawberry Days tournament. She likes that Pleasant Grove takes recreation programs seriously, because it provides a lot of opportunities.

Council Member Williams mentioned the new parking lot at Battle Creek and noted that it has been receiving overnight vehicles. He asked City Staff to look into this issue further.

Council Member Rogers stated that he would like to have a more robust conversation about the budget during a City Council Meeting. He would like to do this before Council Members are asked to approve a final budget. Staff is recommending a property tax increase for the police and fire needs. In order to accomplish that without a property tax increase, there would need to be money taken from other parts of the budget. There are other departments that offer a lot of services to residents, such as parks and library services. Pleasant Grove offers things to every sector of the community in a coordinated manner. He does not want residents to think that the City Council is taking an easy way out by considering a property tax increase. Council Members are looking carefully at all of the services provided by the City and are considering how to ensure there is a focus on different sectors of the community. Administrator Darrington asked that specific items be emailed to Staff so then those can be addressed more specifically during the meeting on June 2, 2026. There can be a scheduled discussion with Council Members Rogers and Williams.

Council Member LeMone agreed with the comment made that residents have different needs. When there is a child that cannot read, the library becomes the most important service, and when there is a sewer line that breaks, the Public Works Department becomes the most important service. The intention is to meet the needs of all residents with the various services that are provided. Council Member Rogers stated that people in the City are diverse, as are their needs and interests.

Council Member Rogers expressed appreciation for the comments shared during the Open Session by Mr. Bushman. Residents need to know that there is a "report and address" style of enforcement. When someone brings something to the attention of the City, it becomes possible to address the issue. He asked for information about parking enforcement. Administrator Darrington reported that the Police Department has been writing tickets and giving out warnings for those parking illegally. This is mostly happening at night in locations where people are ignoring the red curb. There is a difference between a situation like that and an unlicensed trailer on the side of the road. The latter has more to do with code enforcement as opposed to law enforcement. Council Member Rogers added that there are concerns about areas where there are narrow roads, such as 900 North, 350 East, and some cul-de-sacs. He wants to make sure other areas are also being monitored.

Mayor Jensen suggested that Council Members who receive complaints about these issues send an email to Administrator Darrington. Council Member Andersen mentioned another area of concern, which on 220 South after the signal. It is difficult to see when vehicles are coming because of the parking that is taking place there. Administrator Darrington offered to look into this. Council Member Williams stressed the importance there being strict parking enforcement.

The Council further discussed parking enforcement. Administrator Darrington used Provo as an example and explained that there is parking enforcement in place there. It was noted that parking enforcement is separate from code enforcement. Chief Brown reported that there have been discussions about a parking officer, but it is difficult to find someone to fill a position that would only be a few hours a week. It is not possible to address on-street parking in areas where the curb is not red, but it is likely that there will continue to be parking issues unless something is done.

Chief Brown reported that the tow companies are towing approximately eight vehicles a week out of 220 South. Council Member LeMone does not want the police officers to be overly focused on parking enforcement because there are other issues that need to be handled by those officers.

Council Member Williams pointed out that whenever there is a development approved that has 1.3 parking spaces per unit, there tends to be a parking problem. There are then discussions about enforcement. Council Member LeMone noted that these issues are not only associated with high-density areas, as there are also issues near schools when there are no sidewalks on the streets. Council Member Williams suggested that there be additional red curbs. Council Member LeMone would like to hire a part-time parking enforcement officer who can focus on these issues.

Chief Brown explained that between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., there is not usually a problem with parking. This tends to be more of an issue at night and on the weekends. Council Member LeMone suggested that an attempt be made to hire someone part-time in order to address parking enforcement. Attorney Petersen explained that if there is a dedicated parking enforcement person, there needs to be an administrative process determined to handle appeals and collections. These would not be criminal matters, so issues would not necessarily be handled by the Justice Court. She noted that Provo has a robust parking enforcement department with a collections system.

Administrator Darrington offered to come back to the City Council with a proposal related to parking enforcement. When this was initially discussed, the focus was on red curbs rather than narrow streets. He noted that narrow streets will involve a separate discussion about enforcement. If there is a determination made that parking should be limited on narrow streets and in certain areas, then information will need to be brought back to the City Council for consideration.

Council Member Rogers believed there should be an administrative process to deal with code enforcement infractions. Attorney Petersen clarified that there is one, but there is not a strong appeal or collection process established. Council Member Rogers felt there should be a process in place as well as someone dedicated to part-time parking enforcement in the community. Administrator Darrington reported that Staff will develop a plan and bring information back.

Mayor Jensen thanked Staff and St. John Properties for all of the hard work that has been done. He appreciates the businesses that have been brought into The Grove, as there are some new businesses that will have ribbon cuttings in the next two weeks. These businesses have chosen Pleasant Grove for their business and that is because of efforts made by others. Mayor Jensen informed Council Members that there is a golf tournament scheduled to take place on Friday.

14) SIGNING OF PLATS

No plats were signed.

15) REVIEW CALENDAR.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the calendar items. The Public Works luncheon will take place on Thursday at 11:30 a.m. The Memorial Day program will be on May 25, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

16) ADJOURN

MOTION: At 8:19 p.m. Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Phillips, Rogers, and Williams voting "Yes."

The City Council Minutes of May 19, 2026, were approved by the City Council on June 22, 2026.

Wendy Thorpe

Wendy Thorpe, CMC
City Recorder
(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder's office.)