HIGHLAND CITY

HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING

Tuesday, September 10, 2019

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland UT 84003

7:00 P.M. JOINT SESSION

Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Council Member Brian Braithwaite

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Joint Sessions May 8, 2018 and January 15, 2019

2. DISCUSSIONS REGARDING OPTIONS AND STRATEGIES FOR THE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING (MIH) PLAN

The City Council and Planning Commission will review and discuss options and strategies for the Moderation Income Housing (MIH) Plan. This item is being presented for discussion only. No action will be taken.

ADJOURNMENT

In accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act, Highland City will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at (801) 772-4505 at least three days in advance of the meeting.

ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
Members of the City Council and Planning Commission may participate electronically via telephone, Skype, or other electronic means during the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING
I Cindy Quick, the duly appointed City Recorder certify that the foregoing agenda was posted in three public places within Highland City limits. The agenda was also posted at the principal office of the public body, on the Utah State website (http://pmn.utah.gov) and on Highland City's website (www.highlandcity.org).

Please note the order of agenda items are subject to change in order to accommodate the needs of the City Council, staff and the public.

Posted and dated this 5th day of September, 2019

Cindy Quick, MMC
City Recorder

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS.

HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT WORK SESSION

Tuesday, May 8, 2018
Waiting Formal Approval

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland UT 84003

DRAFT

PRESIDING: Mayor Rod Mann

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Braithwaite, Ed Dennis, Tim Irwin, Kurt Ostler, Scott L. Smith

PLANNING COMMISSION PRESENT: Jerry Abbott, Tim Ball, Brittany Bills, Brady Brammer, Ron Campbell, Sherry Carruth, Abe Day, Christopher Kemp

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator/Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, City Engineer Todd Trane, City Recorder Cindy Quick

OTHERS: Cameron Treu, Josh Little, Alden Andrew, Natalie Ball, Chris Lee, Mark Thompson, Tanya Colledge, Wade Hadlock, Neal Evans, Gordon Crofts, Ross Welch, Teri Jerman, Leslie Jarrett, Matt Jarrett, Laura Harding, Cynthia Andrus, Chris Dayton

7:00 P.M. JOINT SESSION

Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation –Council Member Ed Dennis

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rod Mann as a joint session at **7:04 p.m.** The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Council Member Ed Dennis.

1. DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PROPOSAL FROM PATTERSON DEVELOPMENT FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The City Council and Planning Commission will review and discuss a proposal from Ross Welch with Patterson Development for a planned development district located at 6000 West 11000 North. This item is being presented for discussion only. No action will be taken.

City Administrator Nathan Crane explained that the purpose of the work session was to discuss a unique proposal for a Planned Development District, which was a tool in the City Code that wasn't utilized very often. First, he would discuss the different roles of staff, the Planning Commission and City Council. Then he would discuss the General Plan, zoning, legislative and administrative decisions, and what a Planned Development District entailed and its purpose. Finally he would give an overview of the proposed project. He encouraged questions and comments from the City Council and Planning Commission.

City Administrator Crane explained that staff had an administrative role in the development review process. Their purpose was to review proposals for code compliance and provide a professional recommendation to the Planning Commission and/or City Council. Staff would not make the final decisions but they would provide information to the Planning Commission and Council so that they could make informed decisions. The Planning Commission's objective was to maintain the vision and objectives of the General Plan and try to balance public and private interests. There would be opportunity for public involvement and participation at the Planning Commission level. They also provide recommendations to the City Council. The City Council is the legislative body and elected representation of the City. They try to balance the needs of the community as a whole. They are responsible for adopting new policies and laws, and are the final decision makers. The goal with all three entities is to balance private property rights and public interest with land use regulation.

City Administrator Crane then referenced the General Plan explaining that the current General Plan was last updated in 2008, which meant it was based on data collected in 2006. The General Plan was designed to set a vision for future land use and other aspects. The General Plan contains community objectives and policies for achieving those objectives. It becomes the foundation for land use regulation in the City. The General Plan and some of its elements are requirements from the State. He noted that the General Plan was not meant to be a static document and should be continually updated and amended. He briefly spoke about the difficulty of balancing all the elements of the General Plan rather than simply "cherry picking" a few key elements to support a position.

City Administrator Nathan Crane then displayed the General Plan Land Use Map, which identifies potential future land uses in the community. The property they would be discussing during the meeting was designated as Low-Density Residential. The applicant was proposing to change that designation to Mixed-Use. Other areas in the City designated as Mixed-Use were pointed out. Based on the 2006 data, Highland had about 5% non-residential or office/commercial use, 0.3% mixed-use, and 61% residential use. The remainder of the City was made up of churches, schools, the cemetery, etc. It was further explained that Mixed-Use developments would be done vertically, with multiple uses in one building, or horizontally, with uses designated to specific areas of a development.

City Administrator Crane explained that zoning was the foundation of land use regulation, and it was designed to help implement the General Plan. Zoning divides the City into different districts and establishes uniform regulation within those districts. Regulations include permitted uses, building heights, setback requirements, landscaping, parking, etc.

DRAFT

He then explained the difference between administrative and legislative decisions. Essentially, legislative decisions create and pass laws, and administrative decisions implement those laws. Rezone requests and General Plan amendments are legislative decisions, and the legislative body may use its discretion. Administrative bodies are bound to follow the laws that are already in place. He noted that if a proposed project meets the laws as outlined, then the applicant is entitled to approval.

The Planning Development District (PDD) was addressed next. When the PDD was adopted by the City Council, it was designed for Mixed-Use development to encourage non-residential uses and to respond to properties with unique physical characteristics. The PDD allowed for custom zoning, meaning the City would set up their own development standards for a particular piece of property including density, height, setbacks, permitted uses, etc. The City would also have control over the design elements of the project, including architecture, recreation areas, design standards, and themes.

The minimum requirements for the PDD were then outlined as shown below:

- The property must be at least 10 acres in size
- A combination of residential and non-residential uses
- Proposed uses based on each area of the project
- Recreation areas of at least 20% of the project
- Must include standards for density, development standards, landscaping, architectural design and theme, circulation, utilities, and compatibility of uses.

City Administrator Crane defined recreational areas as being 20% of the net site area. Recreational areas can be parks, trails, active areas, etc. but cannot be less than 5,000 contiguous square feet. All recreational areas are owned and maintained by an HOA. For commercial areas, there must be 10% recreation, which can include eating areas and plazas. Public parks over five acres in size must be owned and maintained by an HOA.

Commissioner Ron Campbell asked if these requirements were unique to Highland, and Mr. Crane answered affirmatively. The standards were chosen by the City Council that originally adopted the PDD.

City Administrator Crane then presented the proposed project, known as The Groves at Highland. The subject property was 78 acres located at the northwest corner of 6000 West and SR-92. The first step in getting the project started was to amend the General Plan Land Use designation from Low-Density Residential to Mixed-Use and to rezone the property from R-1-40 to Planned Development District. The proposed project would include single-family residential, retail, professional office use, and a senior community divided into senior condominiums and assisted living units. Mr. Crane identified these areas on a map of the property. He noted that this plan was preliminary, and they should expect to see changes.

The residential portion of the project was outlined. There would be 11 executive lots located along the northern property boundary. The minimum house size would be 2,300 square feet on the main level, and all residential in the project was limited to one story. The lot sizes for the executive lots ranged from 0.5 acres to one acre, and they excluded large animal rights. The plan also showed 103 cottage homes ranging in size from 1,700 to 2,800 square feet on the main level. Lot sizes would range between 7,000 and 10,000 square feet, with the larger lots being located by the executive lots to act as a buffer. It was confirmed that all of the homes would be single story and could have basements.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked if there was a bonus area above the garages which was confirmed. This would not be a true second story.

Details regarding the senior community were presented. The assisted living component would be 82,000 square feet and 110 units with the parking requirement of two stalls per unit. For senior condominiums,

there would be 85,000 square feet of age restricted units. The building height was restricted to 44 feet and the parking requirement was 2.25 stalls per unit. It was reported that there would be 48 units.

Mayor Rod Mann asked if there would be a separate building for the senior housing, and the response was that he was unsure. He noted that there was an option for some of the senior condominiums to be assisted living as well.

Ross Welch, the applicant, responded that the amenities for the two senior components would be separate. He provided a short list of some amenities that they wanted to include.

Mr. Crane presented the following chart depicting the residential density of the project:

Residential Areas	Number of Units	Acres	Units per Acre
Executive Homes	11	8.5	2.3
Cottage Homes	103	42.1	2.5
Subtotal of Residential Area	**114**	**50.6**	**2.25**
Senior Condos	48	3.52	13.6
Total for The Grove	**162**	**54.12**	**2.99**

City Administrator Nathan Crane noted that 2.25 density was about four homes above what the R-1-20 zoning would permit.

Commissioner Sherry Carruth asked how tall the assisted living facility would be, and the response was that it would be approximately 35 feet. The senior condominiums were limited to 44 feet.

City Administrator Crane then presented the following information to describe the retail area:

- Total square footage: 95,700 square feet
- Mid-size box retail: 50,000 square feet
- Retail pads and multi-tenant buildings: 6,000-8,000 square feet
- Uses consistent with the C-R Zone
- Larger signage permitted: 7 feet in height and 49 square feet of signage area

Office space was detailed as follows:

- 95,000 total square feet
- 3,000 to 14,000 square foot buildings
- Height limited to 35 feet
- Parking: 4 stalls per 1,000 square feet of office space

He explained that they had tried to address compatibility within and surrounding development. Along the north property line, the homes would be on larger lots, limited to a single story, and would have an open space trail with a landscape buffer behind the homes. Along the east property line, there would be a landscape berm and an eight-foot solid wall. Internally, the project would have eight-foot walls between residential and commercial uses, lighting mitigation effort, landscape buffers between uses, and the uses themselves would be transitioned.

Recreational areas were addressed by presenting a map that illustrated various options. The following table is a summary of the recreation areas provided:

	Total Acres	Recreational Area	% of Recreational
Residential Area	50.59	13.2	26.1%
Frontage Area	27.32	8.75	32.0%

DRAFT

Total for The Groves	77.91	21.95	28.2%

City Administrator Crane noted that residential recreation would include:

- 13 acres
- 1.5-mile-long linear park and trail system
    - Trail would be eight (8) feet wide
- Outdoor workout stations
- Benches
- Hidden Forests
- Clubhouse
    - 6,000 square feet
    - Swimming Pool
    - Tennis/Basketball court
    - Exercise room
    - Golf simulator

Mayor Mann asked for clarification regarding the Hidden Forests, and Mr. Welch explained that they would be heavily wooded areas with benches. This would replace the original idea of a reflecting pond.

In response to a question from the group, Mr. Crane confirmed that staff had looked at the City's infrastructure and found that the current system could handle the increase from the project without upsizing.

He then presented the circulation chart and a summary of the lengthy traffic study for the project. He reported that the addition of this development would not have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

Council Member Kurt Ostler questioned the validity of the traffic study since it was conducted a few years ago.

City Engineer Todd Trane explained that the development would have an impact on traffic, but if they looked at the bigger picture, this development wouldn't change the projected date of when the intersection would reach Level F. With or without the development, the intersection would fail unless the City made necessary changes. City Engineer Trane had outsourced the current study to another traffic engineer that the City uses as a consultant but he hadn't received the comments back yet. Staff anticipated that changes would be made to the proposed project to mitigate traffic issues but that would happen during the site plan review.

Commissioner Tim Ball mentioned that the data for the traffic study was taken during the summer of 2016, and that happened to be the week where many people were on vacation. The data they had was from the lowest traffic time of the year. He felt that the study was obsolete. City Engineer Trane confirmed that the data was taken at that time and staff was aware of the issue he raised. During site plan review, staff would request that the developer conduct a new traffic study when school was in session. That updated information would be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council so that they could make an informed decision.

City Administrator Nathan Crane stated that one of the purposes of the meeting was to provide information to the Planning Commission, Council, and residents. The next step in the process included:

- Neighborhood Meeting
    - May 9th at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers
        - Developer will present the project
        - Residents free to ask questions
- Planning Commission Public Hearing

DRAFT

- May 22nd at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers
- City Council Public Hearing
  - Tentatively scheduled for June 19th at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers
  - Specific notices will be sent to the public

He suggested that the citizens participate through public hearings, written correspondence to staff, the Planning Commission (planningcommission@highlandcity.org) and the Mayor and City Council (citycouncil@highlandcity.org). All written correspondence would be included in the staff report and shared with the Planning Commission and City Council.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked why the developer hadn't done a feasibility study to show if the retail would be a benefit to the community. Mr. Welch responded that they hadn't conducted the study yet because the plan was very preliminary, and things could still change.

Council Member Scott L. Smith questioned the need for office space in Highland, when there was already so much space available in Lehi. City Administrator Crane explained that a market study was done in 2015-16 which showed office space as a probable use in Highland. He clarified that these offices would be for small services such as insurance agents or small medical offices. He explained that there would not be office spaces like the Adobe building. Mr. Welch confirmed that the largest office space available would be 20,000 square feet.

Commissioner Abe Day asked if they would be able to tie set plans to conditional uses, and the response was affirmative. Usually the PDD sets the zoning, and then individual site plans would come before the City for review as projects come in. Mayor Mann asked if the site plans would be approved administratively or legislatively. City Administrator Nathan Crane was uncertain about the language that existed in the ordinance but noted that they could set the approval any way they wanted.

Commissioner Tim Ball asked if a financial analysis had been done so they would know the cost of the development to the residents. City Administrator Crane responded that there were two components to consider: enterprise or utility components and soft costs. All of the enterprise funds were designed to represent true costs but soft costs had not been studied yet. Commissioner Ball felt that the information would be extremely important when making decisions about the project. City Administrator Nathan Crane reported that staff was working to find a model that would appropriately convert tax value. He hoped that they would have the model available soon.

Commissioner Jerry Abbott asked why they would want to increase the density if the intersections would fail. Mr. Trane said that no matter what is developed here, the intersection will fail by 2040. The intersection will need to be widened in the next 20 years. Commissioner Jerry Abbot was still concerned about allowing more density.

Mr. Trane confirmed that the complete 281-page traffic study could be found on the City website. There was continued discussion regarding the traffic study and future plans for the intersection.

The group then discussed the senior housing component, and the comment was made that many senior citizens want to remain in Highland without having a large lot to maintain, but they do want some "elbow room". Mr. Crane confirmed that the home sizes in this project would be similar to that of Coventry. The community would be designated as 55 and older.

Council Member Scott Smith commented on the proposed trail and said that they receive many complaints about trails located behind homes. Mr. Welch explained that they were looking to create an active community to walk through and be involved in. Although the cottages weren't age restricted, the product

would attract the older residents. Fences would not be allowed in this part of the development. Council Member Kurt Ostler was concerned about privacy and safety. Mr. Welch said the purpose of that was to provide an open gathering area in the back rather than the front. Council Member Scott Smith said that while the concept was nice, but he didn't think it was realistic.

Council Member Ed Dennis said he had never heard anyone say that they like the trails behind their homes. He felt that the concept did not work. These trails required a lot of maintenance, and they were normally used by people that were not from the area. There was a serious concern about people stealing from homes and hiding along the trail.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite argued that this concern was anecdotal and didn't exist. He also said that properties with trails are more valuable. He requested proof that trails were a safety concern.

Council Member Ed Dennis said he personally had packages stolen from his porch and then the items were later discovered along the trail behind his home.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite said that Police Chief Gwilliam had reported that theft was not any higher in trail areas than anywhere else in the City. There was subsequent deliberation on the matter.

Mr. Welch said he would be willing to speak with Council Member Ed Dennis after the meeting regarding open space and trails. He assured him that the trails in the development would be maintained by the HOA. He felt that the area would be safe because all the neighbors would be able to see the trails from their windows. It was designed to be inviting.

Council Member Ed Dennis commented that a firm had been contracted to do an economic study to forecast the City's revenue and expenditures. The Council needed to analyze revenue growth and commercial growth to give them a better feel of the project from a revenue perspective.

Regarding community value, Mr. Crane said that office was a good use for Highland City because they typically didn't have a need to be open on Sunday.

Mayor Mann recommended that they schedule a time when the City Council and Planning Commission could walk the perimeter of the property.

Commissioner Brittney Bills asked if there had been any interest in the mid-sized retail units yet. Mr. Welch explained that there were only a few options since there was already a Smiths, Walmart, and a Ridley's in the area. There was some potential for Whole Foods or Sprouts, or perhaps a smaller movie theater with reclining seats. Currently, they had no tenants lined up. Mr. Welch said it was hard to market without knowing the zoning first. They then briefly talked about their idea to promote American history with a museum, a replica of Mount Vernon, restaurant, etc. They were potentially going under contract for that this week, and then they would have to raise the money to fund it. However, if that historical component doesn't go through, they would move forward with the plans presented.

Council Member Dennis said that there would be more acreage available for larger lots, or more retail, if the trails were removed.

In response to a question from Council Member Kurt Ostler, Mr. Welch said that the pool and clubhouse would be for residential use only.

Commissioner Tim Ball initiated a discussion about affordable housing, and Mr. Welch confirmed that the homes in the development would not be considered affordable housing. The condominiums were a

penthouse design. If the City requested it, he could search for affordable housing designs and incorporate that. He anticipated the homes would be upwards of $500,000. Mr. Crane commented that affordable housing was a complex issue that involved a lot of components and increasing density would not solve the affordable issue.

In response to a question from Commissioner Abe Day, Mr. Welch said that fencing would be allowed on the executive lots.

Mr. Crane distributed comment cards to the members of the group to write down any concerns or comments for the developer.

Commissioner Jerry Abbott asked about what would take place at the Planning Commission meeting for this project. It was explained that the developer would present and there would be a public hearing. All of those comments, and the comments of the Planning Commissioners, would be recorded and given to the City Council. The Planning Commission could choose to continue the item if they needed additional information or asked for changes, or they could recommend approval or denial to the City Council. Commissioner Jerry Abbott and others were concerned that the process felt rushed. Mr. Crane said that they would develop a strategy for collecting public comment, and if any significant revisions needed to be made to the plan, they would continue the item and bring it back to the Planning Commission.

The conversation turned back to the trail system, and Mr. Crane presented a map that identified trail locations.

Mr. Welch reported that they had put out flyers for the neighborhood meeting, but they had included an incorrect address. They put out another mailer today with the correct address and they put up a new notice at the Civic Center. The meeting would be held the following evening in the City Council Chambers.

A female resident from the audience, no name given, expressed a concern that comments made at the neighborhood meeting would not be relayed to the Planning Commission and City Council. Mayor Mann assured her that the meeting would be recorded and minutes taken. Council Member Christopher Kemp requested that she attend the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings as well. Nathan Crane added that the Commission and Council were also available via email or telephone. Mayor Mann confirmed that he was open to phone calls.

There was a brief discussion about what constitutes a quorum, and Mayor Mann confirmed that if Commissioners and Council Members were present at the neighborhood meeting, it would not be a quorum if they were simply present and listening. They could not be involved in the discussion or debate at all.

Mr. Crane said that staff could schedule additional public meetings, if necessary.

Natalie Ball, a resident, expressed a concern that developers will say things to appease residents at the neighborhood meeting, but will not follow through later.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite said the developer would provide a report and the residents can respond to that report. Mr. Welch asked if it would be helpful if he provided a form that residents could fill out, and Ms. Ball answered affirmatively.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT

Mayor Rod Mann called for a motion to adjourn.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to adjourn the meeting and Council Member Ed Dennis SECONDED the motion. All voted yes and the motion passed unanimously.

*The meeting adjourned at **8:58 PM**.*

I, Cindy Quick, City Recorder of Highland City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on January 9, 2018. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council Meeting.

Cindy Quick

Cindy Quick, CMC
City Recorder

DRAFT

HIGHLAND CITY

HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT WORK SESSION MINUTES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019
Waiting Formal Approval

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland UT 84003

PRESIDING: Mayor Rod Mann

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Braithwaite, Ed Dennis, Tim Irwin (via phone), Kurt Ostler, Scott L. Smith

PLANNING COMMISSION PRESENT: Jerry Abbott (excused), Tim Ball, Brittney Bills, Ron Campbell, Abe Day, David Harris, Christopher Kemp

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator/Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, City Engineer Todd Trane, City Recorder Cindy Quick

OTHERS: Helene Pockrus, Sherry Kramer, Darryl Ostler

7:00 P.M. JOINT SESSION

Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Helene Pockrus

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rod Mann as a joint session at **7:03 p.m.** The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Helene Pockrus.

Mayor Mann thanked those present at the meeting and explained that they would receive an overview from the Boyer Company and then he would provide an opportunity for public comment.

1. DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PROPOSAL FROM THE BOYER COMPANY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

City Administrator Nathan Crane oriented the Council and Commission regarding a proposal from Spencer Moffat with the Boyer Company for a planned development district located roughly at 9900 N 4800 W. The development would consist of approximately 112 acres south of Lone Peak High School, currently owned by the State of Utah. He oriented the Council and Commission with the location of the development by

sharing an Existing Conditions map. The General Plan Land Use Map from 1995 was distributed. It was noted that the property was designated as Open Space, Business Park District. The property had potential for different types of uses. In 2008, the General Plan Land Map showed the property as Mixed-Use which included residential, commercial, office, and institutional uses in a single building or same area. The General Plan also states that "the state school site should be developed into a mixed-use project."

He shared a few of the land use goals that relate to the property.

- To promote a wider range of housing options to meet Highland City's fair share of moderate-income housing.
- Consider higher density alternatives, such as integrated mixed-use developments, in master planned predetermined locations.
- Ensure that commercial and mixed-use developments are well designed and fit in with the existing community.
- Create a specific master plan and design guidelines for the State school mixed-use site.

He then read a statement regarding affordable housing from a survey done, "Notwithstanding the weak community support for alternative housing types….the city may choose to focus on solutions such as ….multi-family housing mixed-use developments such as the area south of LPHS." It was noted that 'affordable' does not necessarily mean low-income housing, it means alternative housing, with different price points that may be more affordable than a two-acre lot. However, there would not be any low-income housing. The site was intended as an alternative housing product, a mix of different land uses and densities and more than just single family housing.

A brief overview of the USDC plan was provided to orient the Council and Commission of where we've been and where we are today.

The Master Plan for the development was shown and the alley-loaded product was pointed out. The plan was to have 225 single family residential lots, 630 apartments, 50 townhomes, and 200 senior apartments. The density map was then displayed.

City Administrator Nathan Crane introduced Spencer Moffat and turned the time over to him to illustrate the plan. He noted that the Boyer Company had made adjustments based on input from staff.

Spencer Moffat, with the Boyer Company appreciated the opportunity to develop in the Developmental Center Land. He felt that it was a great community. He wanted the Council and Commission to be aware that the Boyer Company was the developer for Highland Heights.

He briefly oriented the Council and Commission regarding the Boyer Company and who they were. Some of their notable projects included: The District, in South Jordan; the Vista Center, in Draper; the Business Depot, in Ogden; as well as, Holbrook Farms, in Highland and Jordan Heights, in South Jordan.

Their goal was to create a community where residents and businesses can grow long term. They wanted to ensure this project would be somewhat of a legacy that everyone could be proud of. He felt that development experience truly matters and noted that the Boyer Company was a master developer. They work the land development side and were acutely involved with planning communities. They also partner with home builders that provide a diversity of housing types and styles. He felt that planning was so important, especially on the front end. He believed it would make for a smoother project on the back end as well. He emphasized that they plan to spend a lot of time at the front end to ensure the project is planned out well.

Mr. Moffat then described how they like to provide a theme for each project. He distributed some examples of Themeing and Monumentation. He felt that one very important element in creating a development was the branding of that development. He gave the example of Holbrook Farms and pointed out how important it was to incorporate the family branding throughout that project. He hoped to have a similar type branding when creating the project in Highland City.

The original USDC plan was shown. He explained that the project had been shared with the Mayor and Nathan and during that meeting they received valuable feedback. With their feedback he was able to make some great changes, for example: making open space more useable, providing trail connectivity, ensuring that homes do not front Canal Blvd., provide road connections to Lone Peak High School, reduce private alleys, provide areas for commercial and flex space, consider churches and schools, look at reducing density, etc. The new plan was then displayed. He explained it was a bubble plan with just basic ideas. He reminded them they were unsure exactly how it would all work out. The plan was to show road connectivity, parks and trails, and different pods where they could be flexible with the uses for each pod depending on what use works out best for each area of the development. He welcomed their feedback and suggestions.

Mr. Moffat next pointed out the way they planned to disseminate traffic through the development. Several different home types were briefly discussed. He explained that they would work to find the right home type for each pod. Pictures of several types were shown to illustrate those types they would like to incorporate in the development; Estate Lots, Cottage Lots, Carriage Lots, and Town Homes were shown. He then asked for feedback from the Council and Commission.

Mayor Mann then allowed an opportunity for those present to make public comment.

Sherry Kramer, a resident, shared her excitement that the Boyer Company was going to be heading this project. She complemented them on the project plan. She commented that Highland City was her favorite place that she had ever lived. She hoped that the development would be of high quality and beautiful. She referenced Station Park in Farmington and how she felt that development was so well done with high quality and a classic design. She hoped that the commercial would be incorporated well with residential. She understood that there would be people who wanted to live in a high density as well and asked that it be of high quality. She referenced Ivory Ridge as a great example for a mixed-use development and mentioned that they included an indoor tennis and aquatic facility. She also thought pickleball would be a great amenity to include as well.

Mr. Moffat thanked Ms. Kramer for her suggestions and commented that he agreed that pickleball had become a demanding amenity.

Darryl Ostler, a resident, asked how they planned for church buildings that may need to go into the development.

Mr. Moffat responded that they would meet with representatives from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and other organizations to see if they wanted a site in the development. The same process would take place with School Districts. He felt those pieces of a development provide great success to a project and noted that they planned to incorporate churches and school in the development.

Helene Pockrus, asked whether or not the Senior housing would be single level or multi-level, and whether or not there would be condos.

Mr. Moffat explained that they were a little early in the planning stages to know for sure. However, he referenced the Leisure Villas as an example of the type of development they would hope to build. More of a traditional single family type product.

Mayor Mann turned the time over to the Council and Commission for comments.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about the Residential and Flex Space area notation on the plan. He noted that the plan also showed that area as commercial, retail, office space and attached high density. He asked for more information regarding the vision for those areas.

Mr. Moffat responded that those areas could include a mix of commercial and retail, however, the demand would need to be there for that to take place. Although it could be a combination of uses, he felt that it would most likely be office space, like medical offices and perhaps some retail. There would definitely be residential and a multi-family component. He reported that they would create a cap on density for each pod and with a total of 775 units for the whole development.

Council Member Kurt Ostler spoke about the Highland Development Center Market Analysis report done in 2017. He explained that the study showed the area as high residential and that commercial was not likely. The study showed that if they build out the area that Highland could lose anywhere from $700,000 to $317,000 based off an older plan. He next referenced a study done by Farmland that said for every dollar the city brought in property tax, it would cost $1.28 to service it. If they were to go heavy residential in the area, and not commercial, it could end up costing residents a lot of money. Mr. Moffat was unaware of the study but felt it was important to find the proper balance.

Council Member Ostler then explained that in the Highland General Plan it set a standard that per 1,000 in population there should be 4.75 acres of park. He noted the three-acre park and asked if that was the only park planned. Mr. Moffat responded that there would be additional pocket parks disseminated throughout the project, as well as, detention and trails.

Council Member Kurt Ostler wondered if the property would be purchased and Mr. Moffat said it would be purchased. There had been some conversations for leasing the commercial and retail areas, but their preference was to own the property.

Council Member Ostler mentioned that the area was listed as a gateway treatment. Therefore, the area should have nice signage and special landscaping welcoming people to Highland. He asked if they planned to keep an open space feel in the area and provide an open view corridor.

Mr. Moffat felt that was a good suggestion and noted that North County Blvd was a very busy road. He felt that if setback was 150 feet, that would be challenging, however, providing a landscape buffer was something they were open to.

City Administrator Nathan Crane explained that those types of issues would be addressed during the theming of the project.

Council Member Scott L. Smith noted a conflict of interest being that he sits on the USDC Governing Board and he also lives west of the project, so it would personally affect him. He provided some background information noting that at one time USDC owned 750 acres. Over the years it had been split off into the Highland Glen Park, two golf courses, and the High School. Approximately 250 acres remain. The development was designed to provide funds, now called the Sustainability Fund, for the disabled throughout the state. He suggested that it was a trust land, in a way. The property had been in Highland for 41 ½ years

and he would personally like to see it stay in Highland. However, there was interest to annex it into other cities because it could generate tax revenue. He next asked about whether or not there were plans to control speed and traffic flow, especially on the through roads connecting to the High School.

Mr. Moffat explained that originally there was not a road planned for on the west, however, the City recommended extending the road to Canal Blvd as an additional outlet. He noted additional connection points to disseminate the traffic and said that they would also plan for traffic calming on those roads in conjunction with the City through the engineer process.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked if the Murdock Canal pipe had been hardened on the west side road. City Engineer Todd Trane confirmed that it had been hardened where they would cross it.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about the sewer and utilities. City Engineer Trane explained that they were working through that process to see how it will impact utilities. They have planned an Open house at the end of February.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite said conceptually he thought the development plan was fun. However, it was very generic, He understood that it was a process and asked what the time frame was to vet out the planning and provide a much more refined look.

Mr. Moffat responded that it would take time. They envision the process like an hour glass, starting out big and then narrowing it down, and then of course it become big again once the developing starts. They hoped to narrow it down in the next couple of months, taking time for public meetings to obtain the information needed. Their hope was by the end of the year to have more details of what the project would actually be.

Council Member Braithwaite appreciated his estimations and again noted that he liked the conceptual plan. He felt that parks were critical in the high density areas and requested they include open space. He also wanted to understand the demographics for those who might be coming into the area. Mr. Moffat agreed with his comments and wanted to incorporate parks throughout the area perhaps even dog parks.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked how many units would be provided in the Senior Housing section, whether or not it would be age restricted, and what type of amenities they planned to include. Mr. Moffat explained that those details were still unknown, however, it would need to be a sizeable community to receive any interest in the project. It would either be age encouraged or age restricted and there would definitely be amenities included in the project.

Council Member Ostler questioned what the price point would be for the affordable housing in the area. Mr. Moffatt mentioned that he was on the Salt Lake County Affordable Housing Board and that was important to them. He noted that it seemed that the affordable price range for newlyweds and small families was in the high twos. That would be their goal but it was hard to find in Highland.

Council Member Ostler asked if they were still planning for the American Fork Fire Station to be located in the development. Mr. Moffat revealed that he had been contacted, and others had interacted with them. The desire was to located the station on Canal Blvd or in the general area. Council Member Ostler asked if they planned to keep it in Highland City and the response was affirmative.

One resident commented that there was some of the property that was in American Fork boundaries. City Engineer Todd Trane explained that the south piece along Murdock trail was in Highland boundaries and that area was pointed out. It was noted that the State owns property on the other side.

Council Member Ed Dennis wondered what were some of the barriers in the project that they needed to discuss or be aware of. Mr. Moffat asked for their help to ensure adequate utilities. He noted that the Development Center was charging a lot for the property and so economics would come into play. He mentioned that it would of course be important to them to make a return. He suggested that they allow as much density as they can. He asked them also to provide a clear understanding of the process and an estimate on the length of time the process will take.

Council Member Ed Dennis wondered if they had any concerns with commercial. Mr. Moffat responded that it was important to ensure they planned for the "right size" in the commercial areas. He also mentioned that requiring a business to be closed on Sundays was challenging when marketing to national tenants, not impossible, but challenging.

Council Member Scott L. Smith definitely wanted to see some commercial in the development and felt that retail food made a lot of sense being that they were so close to the High School. Mr. Moffat agreed.

Mayor Rod Mann mentioned that he had spoken with the Mayor of Lehi and noted that he was involved with development. Mayor Johnson suggested that it would take about 20 acres for a Senior community.

Mr. Moffat mentioned that it was important to get the right style and architecture for the development and clarified that they had specific design guideline requirements for builders and wanted to ensure they do a good job on the project.

Mr. Moffat briefly reviewed the themeing and monumentation elements for the project again. He clarified that they themed the project in order to make it clear when people are traveling through the development. He illustrated the main entry monument and mentioned that he would like to have them tour some of the projects the Boyer Company has completed.

Mayor Mann asked if they had ideas for naming the roads. Mr. Moffat said he understood that was a big deal and would try to be very thoughtful and welcomed any suggestions.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked if they would do traffic studies. Mr. Moffat spoke affirmatively, he understood traffic was a big deal. He explained that they would do traffic studies early on, in conjunction with the City.

Council Member Smith wondered if they had any communications with UDOT for roadways. Mr. Moffat explained that City Engineer Todd Trane was their point of contact and they were working with Horrox as well. He pointed out the curvature to the roads to slow down traffic. City Engineer Trane said that the design criteria required them to provide a traffic analysis.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about the road on the west and whether or not it would be a two lane road. City Engineer Trane explained that they were anticipating it to be an extension of Night Peak Blvd. If units front the road, then it would be a normal residential road. That would all be worked out through the engineering process.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to adjourn the joint meeting and Planning Commission Member Christopher Kemp SECONDED the motion. All present voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The joint session adjourned at 8:10 PM.

DRAFT

2. CLOSED SESSION

The Highland City Council may temporarily recess the City Council meeting to convene in a closed session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, and pending or reasonable imminent litigation, and the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205

At 8:11 PM Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the City Council convene in a closed session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, and pending or reasonable imminent litigation, and the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205. Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion. All Council Members voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to adjourn the closed session and Council Member Ed Dennis SECONDED the motion. All voted yes and the motion passed unanimously.

*The closed session adjourned at **9:29 PM**.*

I, Cindy Quick, City Recorder of Highland City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on January 15, 2019. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council and Planning Commission Joint Work Session.

Cindy Quick

Cindy Quick, CMC
City Recorder

DRAFT