PRESIDING: Mayor Rod Mann

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

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator / Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, Finance Director Gary LeCheminant, City Engineer Todd Trane, Planner & GIS Analyst Tara Tannahill, City Attorney Tim Merrill, and City Recorder Cindy Quick


7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)
Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Mike Heil, Pastor of American Fork Presbyterian Church
Pledge of Allegiance – Council Member Kurt Ostler

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rod Mann as a regular 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 Mike Heil, Pastor of American Fork Presbyterian Church and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Council Member Kurt Ostler.

1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES
Wayne Tanaka, representing Friends of the Highland Library, reported on the Highlandia event. 170 people attended and it was a fantastic event. He thanked Mayor Mann and his wife for being the King and Queen of the event.

2. PRESENTATIONS
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a. **Cindy Quick, MMC Designation - UMCA Board**  
Susan Farnsworth, Vice President of the Utah Municipal Clerks Association (UMCA), recognized Cindy Quick for receiving the designation of Master Municipal Clerk.

3. **Consent Items**  
Items on the consent agenda are of a routine nature or have been previously studied by the City Council. They are intended to be acted upon in one motion. Council members may pull items from consent if they would like them considered separately.

a. **Action: Approval of Meeting Minutes**  
Regular City Council Meeting February 19, 2019

b. **Action: Approval of a One-Lot Subdivision**  
City Council will consider a request from Cole Peck for a 1-lot subdivision located approximately at 6992 W 9600 N. The Council will take appropriate action.

_Council Member Ed Dennis moved to approve consent items a. and b. as listed on the agenda.  
Council Member Tim Irwin seconded the motion._

_The vote was recorded as follows:_

* Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
* Council Member Ed Dennis: Yes
* Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
* Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
* Council Member Scott L. Smith: Yes

_The motion passed._

4. **Public Hearing/Action: Conditional Use Permit for Salt Storage Building**  
Planner & GIS Analyst Tara Tannahill presented the staff report for a conditional use permit for a Salt Storage Building located at approximately SR-92 and North Park Drive. In 2015, staff proposed a similar facility at this location, which was approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council as a conditional use permit. The permit expired after one year of inactivity. The current proposal would open up the parking area more for the bus stop and the facility would be fully fenced. She noted that the EPA conducted an audit of the existing facility and they have required that the facility be fully enclosed. The proposed building would be 1,600 square feet in size and 18 feet in height. The hours of operation and delivery times would depend on the weather. Staff had conducted a study of morning, midday, and evening traffic at the bus stop. The Planning Commission recommended approval with the seven stipulations included in the staff report.

City Engineer Todd Trane briefly explained how salt deliveries were currently being handled and explained that it required the truck to back up several times. The new facility would have three times the amount of storage as the existing facility, so deliveries would be less frequent. The current building was at the back of the site and it was not enclosed. With the new facility enclosed, it would allow them to stack the salt higher. Staff was doing the best that they could under the current situation, but the EPA was requiring some changes. The proposed site plan would be a lot safer than what was currently happening. He had met with UDOT to review the plan, and they had requested that the access onto SR-92 be as far west as possible. UDOT also requires a secondary access, which would be on North Park Drive. The new site design would allow deliveries to pull through the site without having to back up. Staff will do everything they can to avoid the bus stop and keep the children safe.
Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about the number of trucks they have coming to the facility, and City Engineer Todd Trane said that they have four plows at all times, and they call in a fifth during major storms.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked staff to share their concerns with moving the facility to the south side of SR-92. City Engineer Todd Trane said that the south side of SR-92 was often overrun with water. They wouldn’t build a salt storage facility there because of the possibility of the water washing out the salt and going into the basin.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing at 7:26 PM and called for any citizens who would like to speak on the item to come to the podium and state their name for the record.

Citizen Comments:

Calvin Garvin, 4076 Shore Line Drive, understood that there was a need for salt storage and there was a need to meet EPA requirements, but he did not agree with this location. There was a high risk for the children at the bus stop. The Viewpoint Neighborhood had about 200 kids, and many of them walk to this bus stop. It would be nearly impossible for the delivery trucks to avoid bus times. He requested that the Council consider other options.

Jenny Simmons, a resident of Viewpoint, felt that the current layout of the site was poorly designed. It wasn’t the resident’s problem to fix. She suggested that the City regrade the road so that the school busses would go up the road. The residents have no confidence that the City would beautify the entrance to this facility. The location was ugly and not a great location for children.

James Bachelor, a Viewpoint resident, understood the need for salt, and he commended City staff for taking care of the roadways in the winter. Mr. Bachelor had six children that used this bus stop, and kids are not very self-aware. It would be easy for a child to get behind a delivery truck without being seen. He was terrified of the idea of having large trucks around the bus stop.

Julie Miller, a Viewpoint resident, didn’t think this was a good location for the salt storage. She asked what other locations had been considered for the building. Nothing was more important than children’s safety.

City Engineer Todd Trane said that North Park Drive was an issue. The developer had designed the road to meet the City’s standards at the time, but it did not meet Alpine School District Criteria for bus travel. The grade of the road was 1% too steep for a bus to travel up. To help with safety concerns, the City dedicated a portion of their property for the parking lot and bus stop. This salt facility would utilize the SR-92 access whenever possible. The current situation was more dangerous than what was being proposed. Staff had looked at every other possible site in the City, and they faced similar challenges with all of them. No matter where they proposed the facility, the residents wouldn’t like it.

Danny Herbst, former Highland resident, asked if they had considered the continuation of the road on the north side of the site.

City Engineer Todd Trane said that the adjacent property was in Alpine City. They were currently waiting on a development that has been approved.

Matt Nelson, a resident, said that he appreciated staff’s work on this issue, and he understood the challenge. He didn’t think that they would be able to keep deliveries and bus time separate. It was just a matter of time before an accident happened and a child was hurt. Mr. Nelson said that this proposal was a good one-time solution, but it wasn’t a good long-term investment.
Diane Probst, a resident, asked if they had considered putting salt storage at the gravel pit. She suggested that the trucks use the access on SR-92 exclusively rather than opening up the access on North Park Drive.

Audrey Wright, a resident, said that the children’s safety was paramount. She also had teenage drivers, and their safety was at risk with this plan as well.

Carol Bachelor, a resident, said that her career was in quality process mapping. When the City says that they will “do their best,” it was hard to quantify that because everyone’s definition of “best” was different. She also spoke about lying through statistics. She said that the City’s plan needs to be more rigid.

Vanessa Moody, a resident, didn’t understand why this was the best location. She also questioned why the City wasn’t choosing to regrade the road.

City Engineer Todd Trane said that it would be very expensive to regrade the road.

Council Member Tim Irwin asked what Alpine School District would do if they took away the bus stop. Staff wasn’t sure.

Gary Gardner, a Viewpoint Resident, said that the City wouldn’t be able to beautify the area, as they have proposed. He also was concerned about the safety of the children.

Doug Cortney, a resident, read a few sections of code regarding landscaping requirements. He was concerned that the Planning Commission would recommend approval of this proposal while it doesn’t meet landscaping requirements.

Mayor Mann closed the public hearing at 7:55 PM

Council Member Ed Dennis said that there was another City property to the west that was about 4.5 acres in size. He asked if that property were available for this use. City Engineer Todd Trane said that there were many encumbrances on the property, including many utilities running through the property. If they were to put the facility here, they would have to relocate a 30-inch pressurized irrigation pipe. This alone would far exceed the $145,000 set aside for the salt storage project. Staff could look into this option and get back to the Council with an estimated cost. He noted that this option would take several years to explore and fund. Staff was running out of time as far as salt deliveries for next year. If they don’t comply with EPA requirements, the salt companies wouldn’t deliver to the facility anymore. Frequently, staff hears that they need to do a better job, but they simply do not have the facilities to do it. Staff has been trying to resolve the issues of the salt storage facility for four years. They didn’t move forward with this when it was approved in 2015 because there wasn’t funding.

There was some discussion about the proposed fencing, and City Engineer Todd Trane pointed out the gate along North Park Drive. He noted that this gate would only be open when a delivery truck goes through, and he said that they would have employees outside watching every truck as it backs up. They would have plows access from SR-92 as much as possible, and the gate would be closed when not in use.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked if they could do all of the access from SR-92. City Engineer Todd Trane said that UDOT requires the secondary access. They would gate that access when it wasn’t being used. They would need to cross North Park Drive for salt deliveries. UDOT doesn’t allow access from SR-92 for deliveries because there is not currently a turn lane.
Council Member Brian Braithwaite said that the Council’s highest priority in making decisions was the safety of the residents. This was not an ideal location for any facility, but there will be cars and kids here no matter what. If they choose to eliminate the bus stop, the kids would have to be taken somewhere else, but he wasn’t sure that was the best option. This location made the most sense for the facility and staff has taken safety precautions with this new plan. This plan was safer than what was currently happening at the site. He did think the landscaping issue needed to be addressed.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about xeriscaping, and City Administrator Nathan Crane explained that the site meets the overall requirement of 35% landscaping. The Planning Commission requested that they add xeriscaping along North Park Drive and SR-92. Staff believed the site met the landscaping requirement because of the existing natural vegetation.

City Attorney Tim Merrill added that there wasn’t a final landscaping plan. It was illogical to require a landscaping plan before a conditional use permit is granted. He assured the Council that staff would ensure that landscaping requirements were met. It was also noted that the site plan was conceptual and could be adjusted.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite wanted to ask what the residents would prefer of the following two options. The first option was to keep the current configuration of the site with the fencing, and the second was to have the site open to allow for through traffic of the delivery trucks. The Council could require that the gate remain locked until a City employee opens it for deliveries.

Mayor Mann re-opened the public hearing.

Calvin Garvin didn’t think the east-west fencing was a good idea because it would take away the parking for parents.

Diane Probst said that she had thought of something that would generate more money for the City. There were several residents that had City property behind their homes that they would like to purchase. This would generate money from the sale of property and save the City the cost of maintenance.

Audrey Wright was not opposed to getting rid of the bus stop.

Gary Gardner said that another option would be to take a bus up the hill. This would solve many of their concerns.

Cassandra Dye suggested that they store enough salt for the entire season. This would eliminate the need for frequent deliveries.

City Engineer Todd Trane explained that the facility was only large enough to store salt for one storm.

Ms. Dye was in favor of the proposed plan.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked if they could do a land swap with the adjacent property owner, and staff explained that they had explored that avenue. The owner was unwilling to do a land swap at this time.

Randal Banagas thought there had to be another solution. He suggested that they work together to find a two-year solution.

Calvin Garvin suggested putting a sidewalk across the hayfield for the kids to use.
Council Member Tim Irwin thought they should approach Alpine School District for a better plan for the students.

Brittney Bills said that she had spoken to Alpine School District about some other concerns, and the superintendent made it clear that buses would never go up that hill because of the grade and the narrowness. Insurance wouldn’t cover them. Mrs. Bills said that it was the parents’ responsibility to make sure their kids were safe traveling to and from the bus stop. The City has done the parents and students a favor by providing the parking lot and bus stop.

Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to approve the conditional use permit subject to the seven stipulations recommended by the Planning Commission.
Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite clarified that this was not the final plan for the site. The Council should communicate requirements to have employees spotting as the trucks travel through the site.

There was a brief discussion regarding access.

Council Member Tim Irwin Moved the Question.

Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to approve the conditional use permit subject to the seven stipulations recommended by the Planning Commission.
Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.

Stipulations
1. Development of the site shall conform to the site plan dates stamped February 21, 2019, except as modified by these stipulations.
2. The building shall be enclosed.
3. No deliveries shall be scheduled during normal school bus pickup and drop off times.
4. To the fullest extent possible, the salt building shall not be used during normal school bus pickup and drop off hours.
5. Xeriscape or xeriscape landscaping should be included and standards should be equivalent to what is expected of other developers and possibly include east/west fencing.
6. Approval will be contingent on whether or not access from SR-92 is permitted. If access from SR-92 is not permitted, the new design should be reviewed by the planning commission.
7. The possibility of lighting and security cameras should be considered and are highly recommended.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis No
Council Member Tim Irwin Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith No

The motion passed 3:2.

5. *PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: TEMPORARY USE PERMIT FOR AN AQUA PARK*
City Administrator Nathan Crane presented the staff report regarding the request for a temporary use permit for an aqua park, submitted by Elevate Aqua Park. The half-acre park would be located in the pond at Highland Glen Park and would run from May 13th to September 19th. The inflatable course would only utilize the south dock. The applicant anticipated 100 participants per hour and would be open Monday-Saturday. The applicant was working to get permission for parking on Cedar Hills Drive, so that this use would not take up the Highland Glen parking. This item was discussed by the Council previously, and their concerns included parking, intruding on the other uses at the pond, insurance, restrooms, and security.

Aaron Jones, the applicant, said that a letter had been sent to the residents regarding his proposal, and some of the information was misleading. The purpose of the aqua park was to provide a family-friendly source of enjoyment. The inflatable playground was completely customizable, and they only intended to take up half an acre of the pond. He was requesting a temporary use permit so that the company and the City would test out the use for a year. If the use wasn’t working out, they could easily take everything out without disrupting the park. They planned to bring in a shipping container that would be modified to be an admissions and concessions stand. They also intended to bring in ten portable toilets for the patrons’ use. He spoke about the economic impacts of having the aqua park in Highland City and discussed pricing and business hours. The designated parking to for the aqua park would be a short three-to-five-minute walk away, and they would include directions to that parking area in the confirmation emails sent to every participant. They would not be taking up any of the fishing docks and the aqua park would be buoyed off. Mr. Jones spoke about surveillance equipment and other efforts to keep the park secure. He described the exit strategy, insurance, and lifeguards.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked Mr. Jones if he had looked at other locations for the aqua park, and he responded by describing several other locations he researched, including areas of Lehi and Tibble Fork. The water at Highland Glen Park was more pleasant than that of Tibble Fork, and the water in Lehi City was owned by the Water Conservancy District.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite was still concerned about parking, and he was sure that people would park wherever they felt was closest. The park was already at capacity during the summer months. He also worried about liability.

Council Member Kurt Ostler declared a potential conflict of interest. He expressed concerns about parking, restrooms, security, and the relationship between the City and Elevate Aqua Parks. City Attorney Tim Merrill briefly spoke to the legality of the use.

Council Member Tim Irwin like providing recreational opportunities to the residents of Highland, but he wasn’t convinced that this was a good location for an aqua park. Council Member Scott L. Smith agreed.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing at 9:21 PM and called for any citizens who would like to speak on the item to come to the podium and state their name for the record.

Citizen Comments:

Rick Nydegger, a resident, gave a brief history of Highland Glen Park beginning in the last 1970s, including the City leasing the property from the State and the restrictions associated with that. Sections of the park are dedicated as wetlands. Mr. Nydegger said that it was unfair to the residents of Highland for the City to appropriate a portion of the lake for use by a private entity. He believed that this venture would increase the cost of security and maintenance at the park, which the residents would be paying for. He also was worried about safety.
Jay Roundy said that he was responsible for several reservoirs in Utah, Colorado, and Arizona, and he did the designs for the campgrounds in American Fork Canyon. He did not want to get involved in the aqua park, but his partners permitted it. He said that Strawberry, Jordanelle, and Deer Creek had become eyesores. This use would not be a huge money maker, and recreation doesn’t support itself. Highland Glen Park was already at capacity, and adding this use would overcrowd the area. This was a little piece of heaven in Highland, and Mr. Roundy didn’t want that to be lost.

Brent Webb thought that the aqua park would be a great addition to the City, and he appreciated that the applicant was only seeking a temporary use at this time. The applicant was only proposing to take half an acre of the lake, which would leave plenty of room for other recreational activities. Mr. Webb said that dreams were meant to be realized, and as a community they should be helping each other realize their dreams.

George Brook said that the pond was a benefit to the City, and the people who live around it would like to maintain some serenity. He was concerned about the increase in people, traffic, and parking.

Audrey Wright said that she was a frequent user of the park, and often she has to turn around and go home because there is nowhere to park. Every summer, the scout troops have a Webelo Day Camp, and there are single adult activities all the time. The Murdock Trail merges right where the applicant was proposing to put the trailer. The idea of an aqua park is good, but this was not a good location.

Adam Wingate, a Saratoga Springs resident, said that he works at Traverse Mountain for a tech company. He and his family were always looking for recreation close to them, and this would be a wonderful addition to the park. He liked that Highland was community-focused, which was why they chose a dance studio in Highland for their daughter to attend and why they ate at Blue Lemon after every dance. The applicant clearly was concerned about safety, and they were trying to provide a wholesome, family-oriented activity for the community.

Tyler Standiford, a resident of the Viewpoint neighborhood, was concerned about the increased traffic and parking. This was not a good location for an aqua park.

Teri Jerman, a resident, said that her grandchildren love to ride their bikes up to Adventureland Park and go fishing. It was a great experience and great memories for them. She didn’t believe that this use would not enhance the park. This use may even drive away current users.

Thomas Hales was also opposed to the proposal. The commercial use seemed incompatible with what was at the park now, and this would be a health hazard to the local wildlife. He was also concerned about increased vandalism.

Cassandra Dye, a resident, talked about how the park had been improved over the past several years. She was in favor of the aqua park.

Cindy Horrocks agreed that the park had changed for the better. She suggested that additional parking would be better by the baseball diamonds. The high school brings in portable toilets for their activities, but they aren’t kept there through the summer. Ms. Horrocks didn’t want the park turned into an amusement park.

Vess Pearson, a Highland resident, said that he frequents the park and he hasn’t experienced any parking issues, and he rarely sees anyone at the south part of the pond. He didn’t understand how placing an aqua park at this location could be negative. Everyone would still be able to enjoy their own type of recreation.

Drew Pearson, an Alpine resident, opined that the park was being underutilized, contrary to what others had said. This use would bring revenue to Highland City and they would be catering to more than just one
neighborhood. If the aqua park doesn’t work, the City could “pull the plug” and the company would pack up and leave.

Laurie Burningham said that she uses the park every day in the spring, summer, and fall. The park was over-crowded, and the duck population had slowly been decreasing over the past three years. She had seen debris in the lake and on the beach. Adding this use would be a nightmare.

Jeff Nelson, a Saratoga Springs resident, said that the park was not as crowded as people were making it out to be. Giving the aqua park a one-year trial was worth a shot.

Paul Kawakami, a resident, said that the amount of people they anticipated for this use was just less than a battalion. That was a lot of people. The park has been cleaned up and improved over the years, and he didn’t want to see that undone by this use.

Dave Brown was concerned about Council Member Kurt Ostler’s ability to vote, since he had a conflict of interest.

Mayor Mann said that the Council Members were only required to disclose their conflict of interest by law. They could choose to vote or not.

Mr. Brown expressed his support for the proposal and said that it would provide more recreation for a variety of people.

Jamie Squire was opposed to the application. She pointed out that most of the individuals expressing support for the proposal were not residents of Highland. She encouraged the Council to put the needs of Highland residents first.

Gail Berry was concerned that this use would disturb the water in the pond and cause unnecessary evaporation. Highland City was focused on water conservation, and this proposal did not fall in line with that.

Doug Cortney liked that the applicant had updated their presentation to address the concerns raised by the Council during the previous meeting. He was concerned about liability.

LaVee Kawakami was concerned about the negative affects this would have on the natural habitat at the lake.

Brennen Creer said that the concept of change was not a bad thing. It would be good to give this use a trial run.

Ed Corbett, a resident, said that it was presumptuous for others to tell Highland residents how busy their park was. The park was extremely busy, and adding more people to the park would create more problems.

Briggs Hall, a resident, said that commercial enterprises were not allowed on Sunday in Highland. He asked if this use would be open on Sunday.

City Attorney Tim Merrill said that the applicant has indicated that they would be closed on Sunday.

**Mayor Mann closed the public hearing at 10:22 PM.**

Council Member Brian Braithwaite thanked everyone for their participation. He said that he would have a hard time approving something that takes away from Highland residents. Although the aqua park would be
a benefit to Highland youth and families, it would also bring in many residents from other cities, and that becomes a problem. Highland insurance wouldn’t cover this type of facility.

Council Member Ed Dennis MOVED to deny the temporary use permit for the aqua park, based on the fact that it may be an excellent idea which we’re not opposed to, but the location is too restrictive and too small to accommodate this type of facility. He encouraged the petitioner to work with the Dry Creek Reservoir people to possibly locate there where it would be more practical and have less impact.

Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite     Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis            Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin            Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler          Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith       Yes

The motion passed.

NOTE: Council took a break at 10:33 p.m. and reconvened at 10:40 p.m.

6. ACTION: MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENT – SHORT TERM RENTALS
This item was continued

7. PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: ADOPTION OF A MUNICIPAL TRANSIENT ROOM TAX (continue)
This item was continued.

8. ACTION: JUSTICE CENTER SECURITY (continue)
This item was continued.

9. MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATION ITEMS
   • Review of the FY 2019/2020 Budget Calendar – Gary LeCheminant, Finance Director
     Finance Director Gary LeCheminant briefly outlined the budget calendar for Fiscal Year 2019/2020. There would be a work session on April 9th, and the tentative budget would be adopted on May 1st. The final budget must be adopted by June 19th.

   • *Results of the 2019 Resident Survey – Erin Wells, Assistant City Administrator
     Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells presented the results of the 2019 Resident Survey and said that the report would be posted to the website tomorrow. She briefly went over the statistics regarding the demographics of the survey participants, an interest in adult activities at the library, and how participants prefer to receive information from the City. The quality of life was rated between “good” and “excellent,” but she saw an overall decrease in satisfaction. She theorized that this decrease was a result of several divisive issues that had faced the community lately. There was a decrease in satisfaction in every category, and she found this information disconcerting.
Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells then presented information regarding what services, and the biggest concern was the residents wanted to see less deviation from R-1-40 to smaller lots and multi-family zoning. She also presented the survey results regarding road repair, communication, and the financial health of the City. She was interested in the questions regarding City recreational opportunities. There was a high request for recreational opportunities, but they weren’t financially self-sustaining, so the City hasn’t pursued that.

Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells then addressed the potential for increased funding for police and fire, and the support for an increase was about 50%. She wasn’t sure if people were aware that there was a need for an increase. This year, they asked a question about whether residents wanted large sports tournaments in Highland, and 62% said no, 29% said yes, and 9% did not respond. They did not define what a “large” sports tournament was. The final question was about what type of elements they wanted to see in the parks and the results were as follows: Walking paths (32%), general playground (28%), all abilities (25%), open fields (24%), pickle ball (17%).

Council Member Tim Irwin said that it would be impossible to accommodate what everyone wants in terms of recreation, so it was better that they focus on keeping taxes low and letting residents spend their money where they choose.

Mayor Mann recognized Doug Courtney, who volunteered his time to enter more than half of the survey data into the system.

Mayor Mann presented information regarding recorded driving speeds on Canal Boulevard, and there was some discussion. Police Chief Brian Gwilliam said that the average driver goes between five and nine miles per hour over the speed limit.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS
a. Future Meetings
- March 26, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall
- April 2, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Rod Mann called for a motion to adjourn.

*Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to adjourn the meeting and Council Member Kurt Ostler SECONDED the motion. All voted yes and the motion passed unanimously.*

*The meeting adjourned at 11:05 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 March 19, 2019. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council Meeting.

Cindy Quick, MMC
City Recorder
Welcome to the Highland City Council Meeting
March 19, 2019

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION
Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Mike Heil, Pastor of American Fork Presbyterian Church
Pledge of Allegiance – Council Member Kurt Ostler

UNSC heduled Public Appearances
Time set aside for the public to express their ideas and comments on non agenda items. Please limit comments to three (3) minutes and state your name and address.

Presentations
• Item 2a – Cindy Quick, MMC Designation – UMCA Board

Consent Items
• Item 3a – Approval of February 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes
• Item 3b – Approval of One-Lot Subdivision

Conditional Use Permit for Salt Storage Building
Item 4 – Public Hearing / Action
Presented by – Tara Tannahill, Planner & GIS Analyst
Summary of Request

- 1,600 square foot covered salt storage building with 4,800 square foot concrete retention pad. The proposed building height is 18’.
- Hours of operation and deliveries will be dependent on weather.
- Main access to site will be from Park Drive.
- There will be no staff parking.

2015 School Bus Activity Study

- Staff observed bus activity from 7:00 AM to 8:45 AM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2015</td>
<td>7:15 am</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:20 am</td>
<td>4 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 am</td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:45 am</td>
<td>9 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>5 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2015</td>
<td>7:15 am</td>
<td>1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:20 am</td>
<td>4 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 am</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:45 am</td>
<td>12 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>6 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 School Bus Activity Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Time</th>
<th>3/5/2019</th>
<th>3/7/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:11 AM (HS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM (ES)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM (MS)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM (ES)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 PM (ES)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 – Same as drop off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 PM (ES)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 – Same as drop off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:26 PM (HS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:42 PM (ES)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05 PM (MS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:37 PM (ES)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Time</th>
<th>3/12/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:37 PM (ES)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizen Participation

- Radius Notification
  - One written correspondence has been received in favor.
  - Three written correspondence have been received not in favor

Planning Commission Recommendation

The Commission voted 7-0 to recommend approval of the Conditional use Permit subject to the following stipulations:

1. Development of the site shall conform to the site plan dates stamped February 21, 2019 except as modified by these stipulations.
2. The building shall be enclosed.
3. No deliveries shall be scheduled during normal school bus pickup and drop off times.
4. To the fullest extent possible, the salt building shall not be used during normal school bus pickup and drop off hours.
5. Xeriscape or xeriscape landscaping should be included and standards should be equivalent to what is expected of other developments and possibly include east/west fencing.
6. Approval will be contingent on whether or not access from SR-92 is permitted. If access from SR-92 is not permitted, the new design should be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
7. The possibility of lighting and security cameras should be considered and are highly recommended.

Options

1. Recommend approval of the conditional use permit with appropriate stipulations. Staff has prepared draft stipulations that could be used. Additional stipulations may also be needed. The Commission may include any conditions which are deemed necessary to mitigate potential impacts and insure compatibility of the use with surrounding development, insure compliance with this ordinance, and which are required to preserve the public health, safety, and general welfare, or
2. Recommend denial of the conditional use permit. If the Commission recommends denial the conditional use permit, appropriate and specific findings will need to be drafted; or
3. Continue the conditional use permit to allow the applicant to address the issues outlined by the Commission.
PROPOSED SALT DELIVERIES

TEMPORARY USE PERMIT FOR AN AQUA PARK

Item 5 - Public Hearing / Action
Presented by – Nathan Crane, City Administrator/Community Development Director

Proposal

• Aqua Park at Highland Glenn Pond
• Open
  – May 13th – Sept 16th
  – M-W: 11:00 am to 5:00 pm
  – TH-Sat: 10:00 am to 7:00 pm
  – Peak Times: 12 pm to 3 pm

Proposal

• Participants
  – M-W: 100 per hour/600 per day
  – TH-Sat: 100 per hour/1,000 per day
• Primary Parking is proposed Cedar Hills Drive
Considerations

- Existing Park Use
  - Fishing, Trails, Water Surface Area, Beach Area
- Insurance
- Parking
  - Location and Number
- Restrooms
- Security
- Impact on Existing Improvements
- Emergency Access and Response
- Additional Maintenance Costs

MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENT
SHORT TERM RENTALS

Item 6 – Action/Ordinance
Presented by – Tim Merrill, City Attorney

ADOPTION OF A MUNICIPAL
TRANSIENT ROOM TAX

Item 7 – Public Hearing / Resolution
Presented by – Tim Merrill, City Attorney

JUSTICE CENTER SECURITY

Item 8 – Action
Presented by – Brian Gwilliam, Police Chief

MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF
DISCUSSION COMMUNICATION ITEMS

- Item 9a. – Review of the FY 19/20 Budget Calendar – Finance Director Gary LeCheminant
- Item 9b. – Results of the 2019 Resident Survey – Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells
24% of Highland households which gives us a 95% confidence level that these results can be attributed to the population with a 3% margin of error.

Precinct Data Population Estimates:
SW = 53%, NW = 26%, NE = 5%, SE = 16%

2017 ACS (Not including Minors)
19-24: 12%
25-34: 10%
35-44: 25%
45-54: 24%
55-64: 16%
65+: 13%

More Library Materials
30%
20%
10%
0%

Weekly 13%
Large Family Events 25%
One Time Adult Classes 9%
Large Event for Specific Age 8%

Preferred Information Sources
30%
20%
10%
0%

Leaflet 23%
Internet 63%
Library 6%
Newspaper 3%
TV/Correspondence 2%

Quality of Life
2016 2017 2018 2019

FUTURE MEETINGS

- Item 10a - Future Meetings
  - March 26, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm
  - April 2, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm