

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2022, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK ROOM LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL
BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Weichers, Council Member Douglas Petersen, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Shawn E. Newell, Council Member Ellen Birrell

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Records Culture and Human Resources Director/City Recorder Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Police Chief Robby Russo, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Finance and Administrative Services Director Scott Jorges, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, Systems Administrator Alex Earl

1. WELCOME – Mayor Weichers.

Mayor Mike Weichers called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. REVIEW OF BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA – Mayor Mike Weichers.

The Business Meeting Agenda items were reviewed and discussed.

Mayor Weichers made note of Resolution 2022-45 – Awarding a Retiring Police Officer His Badge and Approving His Purchase of a Police Firearm. Chief Russo reported that when an officer retires, it is customary to award them their badge and firearm as recognition for their service. Jeremy Nelson will be retiring from the Cottonwood Heights Police Department after 20 years of combined service in Cottonwood Heights and Ogden.

With regard to Resolution 2022-46 – Approving Entry into a Consulting Agreement for an Update of the Moderate-Income/Affordable Housing Plan, Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson, explained that this is a State requirement and is done on an annual basis. The report will include updated demographic numbers and population data as well as information about housing stock, availability, and affordability. It will provide an update on the implementation goals established by the 2019 Affordable Housing Plan. The General Plan update looks at the Affordable Housing Plan and allows new goals to be set. This was simply a smaller report that is required annually. Council Member Birrell wondered if the Council should discuss the report to determine whether there should be different prioritization. Mr. Johnson stated that the report itself relates to data, updates, and progress. It must be submitted by October 1. However, the Council could initiate a review and update the actual Affordable Housing Plan, if desired. Affordable housing is part of the General Plan and will be discussed as part of the General Plan updates.

Resolution 2022-47 – Declaring Certain Property Surplus was next discussed. Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jorges, reported that the audio/visual displays in the

Community Room are being updated. One screen and two projectors are quite large. The intention was to declare them surplus and remove them. Council Member Petersen noted that the issue with those items pertains to the amount of light in the Conference Room. He added that the bulbs alone are quite expensive.

Mayor Weichers reported that the last Action Item on the Business Meeting Agenda related to Resolution 2022-48 – Consenting to an Appointment to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee. City Manager, Tim Tingey, reported that he interviewed candidates for the position. The candidates were well qualified and excited to serve. Ultimately, Aline Longstaff was recommended for the appointment. She has a passion for outdoor activities, including bicycling and hiking. Ms. Longstaff has a unique background as she was also an attorney. Mayor Weichers reported that the Consent Calendar would also be reviewed during the Business Meeting.

3. Y2 ANALYTICS SURVEY DISCUSSION – Partner and Vice President of Research, Kyrene Gibb.

Mayor Weichers introduced Kyrene Gibb from Y2 Analytics who is the Partner and Vice President of Research. She was present to discuss the results of the study commissioned by the City. Ms. Gibb shared some of the high-level findings from the Cottonwood Heights 2022 Official Citizen Survey. She would share detailed information later in the meeting. In terms of the General Health of the City, residents were satisfied with the way the City is being run and the overall quality of life in Cottonwood Heights. On average, Cottonwood Heights residents gave a score of 82 out of 100 for the City’s quality of life, which was quite high. 80% of residents approved of the job the elected officials are doing and two-thirds of residents felt that their tax dollars were being put to good use. Some of the residents’ concerns related to traffic, growth, water management, and housing availability.

Ms. Gibb shared information about City Services and Communication. Most service ratings were fairly consistent with what had been seen in prior years. Residents remained the most satisfied with Fire and Emergency Medical Services, garbage collection, drinking water, recreation programs, parks and open spaces, emergency preparedness, and City events. This was a consistent satisfaction list based on what has been seen in the past. There was some movement in numbers, but not a lot of significant change from prior years. When residents were given a hypothetical budget to allocate services they wanted to see continued investment or improvements in, the areas with the most focus were parks and recreation as well as the preservation of open space. Large shares of the hypothetical budget were also allocated to the maintenance of City streets and Police services. When asked about communication from the City, traditional channels, such as the City newsletter and *The Cottonwood Heights Journal* were popular and met resident needs. Residents also felt that emails and City newsletters distributed via email could be better utilized.

Information related to Neighborhood and Community Development was reviewed. Ms. Gibb explained that 94% of residents felt that preserving neighborhood views was important. 89% of residents wanted the community to be more walkable and 82% were concerned about there being a place in the community for their children and grandchildren. There were a few questions regarding the need for a senior center. Residents were divided on the issue. It was not seen as a high priority when ranked against other possible developments. The types of developments

residents most wanted to see included small shopping centers and mixed-use housing. When residents were asked what would fit well in their neighborhoods, there was a strong preference for single-family homes. Mixed-use development was something most residents wanted to see elsewhere in Cottonwood Heights. Small shopping centers were seen as something that might fit in well in their neighborhoods or elsewhere in the City. Ms. Gibb reported that residents were asked about their perceptions of safety on roads and street maintenance. Attitudes towards the condition of streets had improved but attitudes regarding congestion and the way streets are utilized throughout the City had declined.

Ms. Gibb overviewed the survey methodology. She reported that 767 Cottonwood Heights residents were sampled via address-based sampling from the publicly available registered voter file. This was a lower response rate than Y2 Analytics had hoped for. When the City was ready to ask residents more focused questions as part of an additional survey, supplemental sampling would be included so that there was a good representative base of resident panelists. Council Member Birrell asked about the breakdown for each district. Ms. Gibb did not have that information but offered to share it with Council Members following the City Council Meeting.

Mayor Weichers asked how many residents started the survey but did not finish. Ms. Gibb discussed the drop-off rate and explained that there was not one consistent breaking point. There were approximately 150 partially completed surveys. Council Member Birrell asked what was typical. Ms. Gibb reported that the typical response rate for a City-sponsored survey is around 10%. For this particular survey, the response rate was 3% to 4%. Supplemental invitations were sent out via text message and additional emails were sent as well.

Mayor Weichers asked if the incomplete survey answers had been counted. Ms. Gibb explained that as many answered questions as possible had been counted. However, those answers were not reflected in the weighted distribution because the respondents did not answer some of the key demographic questions at the end of the survey. Council Member Birrell asked about the average length of time it took each respondent to answer the survey. Ms. Gibb offered to look into that information and share it with the Council in the future. She explained that a sample size of 767 interviews in a City the size of Cottonwood Heights resulted in a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. It was important to keep that in mind as the data is reviewed.

Ms. Gibb shared a chart regarding Quality of Life ratings. Very few scores were below 50 on the 0-100 distribution. Residents are highly satisfied with their quality of life in Cottonwood Heights. The most common response was 90 on the 0-100 scale. The average from the current survey was the highest seen in the City and came in at 82 on the scale. When residents were asked what they liked most about living in Cottonwood Heights, some common responses included location. For instance, the proximity to the mountains and transportation access. The character of the City was also praised as well as clean neighborhoods, safety, and the fact that the City is family-friendly.

When residents were asked about the issues in the City, the main concerns pertained to growth, traffic, and housing. Water was more of an issue in the current year than it had been in the past. Residents understood that growth leads to more water issues, traffic, and additional housing concerns. The main concerns were intricately connected. Residents were also asked about potential future issues in the next three to five years. The common answers were growth, traffic,

water, and housing. Overcrowding and development were also referenced. The way the City is changing and how the City will manage that growth was a major concern for residents.

Residents were also asked how they felt about the value they receive for their tax dollars. 16% rated it as an excellent value, 51% rated it as a good value, 26% rated it as a fair value, and 7% rated it as a poor value. Two-thirds of residents gave this a positive rating. That was consistent with what had been seen in the past and there was no statistical movement since the question had been posed to residents three years ago. Ms. Gibb noted that there had been a few questions about the character of the City. A strong majority of residents agreed that Cottonwood Heights was a wonderful place to raise a family. The majority of residents also felt safe living in the City. These were positive indicators of the overall quality of life. Seeing those numbers in the mid to upper 80s was a good sign for the health of the City and the overall perceptions. Approximately two-thirds of residents believe that the City does a good job managing City services, has the kinds of businesses they want in the City, and that the City provides necessary services.

Areas where there was a shift compared to the last survey results pertained to the following:

- Cottonwood Heights is growing and developing in a positive way.
- Overall, I am happy with the affordability of housing options in Cottonwood Heights.

Just under half of the respondents believe that the City is growing and developing in a positive way. 31% disagreed and felt that the City is not growing and developing in a positive way. That was a statistically significant change from 2019 when the question was last posed. This was something to keep an eye on but she noted that it is an issue across the State of Utah. Ms. Gibb addressed the affordable housing question. She explained that most residents are not happy with the affordability of housing options in the City. Housing availability and affordability was a serious concern. Residents were also asked if they approve of the job the Mayor and City Council are doing. 80% of residents either approved or strongly approved. That had increased by approximately three percentage points compared to the 2019 total approval rating.

Residents were asked if the Mayor and City Council are involved and visible in community events and if they are accessible and communicative. Three out of four residents agreed that the elected officials in the City are accessible, visible, and communicative at least some of the time. Very few residents felt this was something that was done poorly. In terms of City Staff, there were similar ratings. 28% of residents felt that City Staff handled the resources available to them in a responsible way. 79% felt that was done at least some of the time. One in four felt that City Staff provided fair and accurate information to the public all or most of the time. Three-quarters agreed that this was something that is done at least some of the time. 22% suggested that City Staff engaged with the community and listened to community members all or most of the time. Three out of four suggested that this happened at least some of the time. Those were positive ratings overall and there were no statistically significant shifts.

Mayor Weichers wondered if the negative responses were fairly consistent throughout the survey answers. For instance, if someone answered one question negatively, he wanted to know if the respondent was more likely to do so throughout the survey. Ms. Gibb confirmed this. Some answers did not follow that trend, but there were usually consistencies where dissatisfied residents

would express negative opinions throughout the survey. Council Member Birrell noted that not all residents have experience contacting or communicating with City Staff.

The City Service ratings were reviewed. Ms. Gibb reported that the City Services that received the highest satisfaction rating on the 0-100 scale were Fire and Emergency Medical Services, garbage collection, and drinking water. The scores were in the 80s and very positive. This was consistent with the scores from 2019. Recreation and fitness programs had a rating of 78.7 and the recycling program had a rating of 69.7. Those numbers were comparable with the previous survey numbers. Ms. Gibb explained that residents were also satisfied with City parks and open spaces, emergency preparedness, and community events. Stormwater drainage, snow removal services, and Animal Control also scored well and were in the high 60s. There were consistently positive ratings overall, though there was a slight decline in a few services. One, in particular, was planning, zoning, and building services. That particular department tended to take on the brunt of the growth and development concerns that were happening in the City.

Council Member Birrell wanted to understand why results in the high 60s were considered positive. Ms. Gibb explained that when residents were given a sliding scale from 0-100, that scale started at 50 because it was a neutral response. An average that fell below or near 50 would be identified as a service that was potentially in need of improvement. Anything above 50 suggested that there was at least a moderate level of satisfaction and the scale was being moved in a positive direction. It was not beneficial to think of the scores in terms of letter grades. Generally speaking, anything above 65 was a good indication of satisfaction with the service.

Residents were asked specific questions about City events. City events were one of the most highly rated City services. 50% of respondents indicated that they attended Butlerville Days in the current year. This was comparable to what was seen in 2019 and there was no statistically significant change there. Ms. Gibb noted that there was a lot of enthusiasm in the comments related to the event. Residents like having the opportunity to celebrate the history of the City. Other events were significantly less attended than Butlerville Days, however, 10 to 20 percent of residents surveyed were still engaging in those other activities. One in six residents stated that they had never attended any of the City events. Some events had seen significant increases in attendance, specifically the Christmas lights and Arts Council productions.

Ms. Gibb explained that residents were asked to rate the quality of City events. Overall, there were a lot of positive ratings. One resident suggested that they had not attended any City events, but then stated that City events were terrible. However, when looking at actual City event attendees no residents gave a terrible rating. There were a lot of statistically significant improvements in this area. Ms. Gibb pointed out that the Thanksgiving Day 5K was very well received and 94% of attendees gave it an excellent or good rating.

Residents were asked to share comments about City services on a general level. Ms. Gibb explained that residents were very appreciative of the emergency services and the level of response. Some of the areas that residents were not as satisfied with had to do with snow removal and surface street maintenance. Residents were still focused on the improvements that they wanted to see on City streets. One comment stated that the Police Department needs to make more of an effort to be part of the community. Residents wanted to see more interaction.

When residents were asked about allocating a hypothetical \$100 budget to improve City services or invest in City services, the highest average allocation was just shy of \$8 to City parks and open spaces. That was followed closely by trail development. Approximately half of the residents put some portion of their hypothetical budget into open spaces and trail development. Recreation was a high priority for residents and it was something they wanted to see continued investment in. Police Services received a higher average allocation. That would suggest that residents saw this as something that needed investment. There were polarizing attitudes about Police Services, but it was a high-priority investment for the one-third of residents who put some portion of funding there.

Council Member Birrell felt it was important to make sure that City parks and open space were not lumped together with trail development. That was not all recreation. Some of the trails related to walkability. Ms. Gibb felt that was reinforced by the residents who listed sidewalk maintenance as one of the areas that need to be improved. More than one-third of residents wanted to see investment in that. Pedestrian safety and friendliness were priorities for many residents.

Residents were asked a series of questions related to public safety in the City. 57% of residents agreed that the Police Department was equipped to address the issues that posed the biggest threats to the safety of the community. Ms. Gibb noted that this was down slightly from 2019. The difference was statistically significant. She explained that there were a lot of attitudinal shifts across the State that were comparable. The majority of the ratings for the Police Department were positive but were down slightly from the 2019 survey numbers. Overall, 60% of residents agreed that the Cottonwood Heights Police Department was professional and responsive. 61% trusted the Cottonwood Heights Police Department to deter and deal with crime in the City. As for the question about whether the Police Department was too assertive on Code or Ordinance enforcement, more residents felt that the Police Department was not assertive enough.

Ms. Gibb overviewed the Communication Habits and Preferences chart. 40% of residents stated that they received information about the City from *The Cottonwood Heights Journal*. 36% stated that their primary information source was a newsletter distributed by mail. Those traditionally printed modes of communication were heavily relied on in Cottonwood Heights. Residents who preferred that source were being well served. On the other hand, when it came to emails from the City or a City newsletter distributed via email, there were significantly fewer residents who currently relied on that source versus the number who would prefer to rely on that source. It seemed that there was an opportunity to increase City reach through digital platforms. As for social media and the City website, residents turning to those channels had their needs met.

Residents had also been asked what they most wanted to receive more information about. According to the survey results, residents most wanted to receive information about community events, new and pending development, City events and meetings, and prospective building plans. Ms. Gibb reported that residents were also asked how they would prefer to engage or interact with the City. Attending City events was the most popular response and contacting the City via email or phone was the next highest answer. One in four residents suggested that they were interested in participating in public meetings or open houses. It was clear that residents wanted to be engaged

with the City. The least popular way of engaging was serving on Advisory Boards, Committees, or Community Councils. A niche population that was interested in that.

When residents were asked if they had contacted the City in the last year, 46% stated that they reached out to a City office to seek information, file a complaint, or inquire about a service. The majority of those who contacted the City were satisfied with those interactions. 62% gave a positive satisfaction rating. Ms. Gibb reported that the survey also asked about the residents' experiences interacting with City offices. Overwhelmingly, residents felt that City Staff was helpful, polite, attentive, and eager to offer information.

The survey asked residents what aspects of the community were important priorities. An overwhelming majority of residents stated that preserving the skyline and neighborhood views were either important or somewhat important. 94% of respondents felt that was at least somewhat important to them with 71% stating that it was very important. What residents liked the most about living in Cottonwood Heights was the proximity to the canyons and the mountain views. Having a place for children and family members in the community and making the community more walkable were also important priorities to the majority of residents. As for affordable housing, 73% of residents felt that was at least somewhat important to them. There was a disconnect between the desire to provide affordable housing and the creation of places for family members to live in the community. That was a consistent gap in public perception throughout the State. Council Member Bracken believed it was important to better understand that gap and suggested pairing those contradictory desires together on a sliding scale. Council Member Birrell agreed. Looking at the data, there may be some confusion.

There was discussion regarding housing affordability. Ms. Gibb reported that single-family housing is most preferred in the community. Council Member Petersen noted that there is a project in the City with 23 units that is not affordable. It was noted that the number of units does not necessarily create affordability. Ms. Gibb commented that this is not an issue unique to Cottonwood Heights. There was a desire to see housing types that residents had become accustomed to, such as single-family dwellings, be affordable. However, that was not necessarily happening. There was a disconnect between housing costs of the past and current housing costs. Council Member Bracken noted that this data would be beneficial to consider in the General Plan.

Residents were divided about whether there should be a City-run senior center. Ms. Gibb explained that residents are more interested in seeing a small shopping center, additional mixed-use developments, or single-family homes. One in five residents also felt that the City needed more townhomes with individual yards. Council Member Birrell noted that for the next survey, it was important for the City to better explain the meaning of mixed-use development. She believed that mixed-use development has a shared open space. She was in favor of mixed-use development. While she understood there was commercial use, there was also higher density use with a shared green space. Ms. Gibb pointed out that other than mixed-use development, all of the potentially higher-density housing options were viewed less favorably by survey respondents.

Residents would most like to see single-family homes with large yards in their own neighborhoods. However, there was also an appetite for additional community amenities, like a small shopping center or mixed-use development. Though the latter was desired, many residents did not want that

in their own neighborhoods. 27% of residents wanted to see mixed-use development somewhere in the City but only one in five wanted to see them in their area. Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”) tend to be a relatively popular way to address the middle housing gap. Residents would prefer to see townhomes with individual yards somewhere else in the City rather than in their own neighborhoods. However, it was still a relatively popular way to bridge the housing gap. One in five residents felt that single-family garden courtyard homes would be suitable for their area. Ms. Gibb noted that there were other options residents were opposed to.

Ms. Gibb was surprised by the data related to assisted living communities and senior living facilities. Residents tended to think that those types of amenities do not belong in their neighborhoods. Council Member Birrell noted that the prices for assisted living centers are often high and a resident would need to be fairly affluent to be able to afford to live there.

The survey included a sliding scale question with opposing statements. Residents did not see the numbers associated with the scale position as they responded. The intention was to see which statement residents felt closest to. When asked about neighborhood streets, there was a wide range of attitudes about whether speeding was a significant problem. More residents felt that speeding in their neighborhood was a significant problem. The attitudes had become stronger compared to three years ago. Ms. Gibb overviewed the Neighborhood Streets Evaluation chart.

On average, more residents felt that the streets in their neighborhood were in good condition. Attitudes about the surface maintenance of City streets had improved significantly compared to 2019. There had not been a notable shift in the responses about streets and their safety for cyclists. Residents were slightly more likely to say that streets in their neighborhood were unsafe for cyclists compared to three years ago but it was a very minor shift. Ms. Gibb reported that there had been a significant shift when residents were asked if streets were safe for pedestrians. More residents felt that streets were safe for pedestrians than before. Council Member Birrell noted that many respondents stated that they do not ride a bicycle but then felt that the streets were fairly safe for bicyclists. The perceptions of non-bicyclists may not be fully accurate. Ms. Gibb noted that bicycle ridership has increased since 2019. Residents who indicated that they ride their bicycles once a week or more around the City had grown fairly substantially. Those who indicated that they never rode a bicycle in the City had decreased by eight percentage points.

Ms. Gibb shared additional information about neighborhood streets. Residents were either ambivalent about the speed limits in their neighborhood or felt that the speed limits should be lowered. Very few residents felt that the speed limits on their neighborhood streets should be higher. Most residents also stated that the streets in their neighborhood are quiet. In terms of traffic congestion issues, residents were more concerned about major thoroughfares through the City than neighborhood streets. The majority of residents believed City streets are in generally good condition and that score had increased over time. Bicyclist and pedestrian safety were seen as lower on major thoroughfares throughout the City than on neighborhood streets.

Some of the questions related to accessibility for different modes of transportation. Residents felt the City was very accessible for vehicle travel. Half of the residents felt that the City had excellent or good accessibility for pedestrians. 47% felt that the City was accessible by bicycle. 35% felt that the City was accessible through public transit. Residents were asked what features or attributes

might increase their likelihood of using public transit. 59% of residents stated that they would be at least somewhat likely to use public transportation more if there were additional options or modes such as bus rapid transit, light rail, and streetcars. Residents were also more likely to use public transportation if transit stops were conveniently located. Free or reduced fares were appealing to 58% of residents. More connectivity was viewed favorably as well. One in five residents stated that they were not at all likely to take public transportation under any conditions.

Residents were asked what type of pedestrian safety improvements they were most likely to support. The strong majority supported improved signage at crosswalks and intersections as well as additional sidewalks throughout the City. Approximately 90% of residents were in favor of those potential improvements. Ms. Gibb reported that raised crosswalks or speed tables and increased right-of-way for pedestrians were also popular suggestions. The majority also supported additional midblock crossings. Most residents felt that improving pedestrian friendliness within the community was a priority. Ms. Gibb believed that was reflected in the survey data.

Ms. Gibb discussed support for potential bicycling improvements. She explained that dedicated bicycle lanes were more popular, with three out of four residents in favor of more dedicated bicycle lanes throughout the City. The majority of residents were also interested in more shared bicycle lanes. Most of the comments about bicycling in the City were focused on access to bicycle lanes and ensuring that there was a safe separation between cyclists and vehicles. Council Member Birrell noted that shared bicycle lanes were part of a neighborhood bypass route system for the City. Those shared lanes had 63% support. That meant more than half of the residents wanted to see shared bicycle lanes. Dedicated bicycle lanes were the safest option, but there was also some benefit to shared lanes. Those lanes would be part of an active transportation system. Ms. Gibb noted that several residents had made comments about driver awareness of bicyclists. Council Member Birrell reported that Murray City posted signs stating: “Give Bicyclists three feet. It’s the Law.” Council Member Petersen commented that it is difficult to mandate responsibility.

Council Member Birrell asked about the districts respondents live in and the amount of time it took for respondents to complete the survey. Ms. Gibb offered to provide that information to the Council following the City Council Meeting. She noted that Y2 Analytics would also break out all of the questions by district so the Council could see the response variations between each district. Council Member Bracken was curious to see how the senior center question broke out based on the different age range categories. Mayor Weichers thanked Ms. Gibb for her work.

4. STAFF REPORTS.

a. Unified Fire Authority Presentation – Fire Chief Burchett.

There was no Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) presentation.

b. City Project Priorities Discussion – City Manager, Tim Tingey.

Mr. Tingey reported that a City Project Priorities Discussion Memo was included in the packet that outlined several issues. He explained that the City had been working on many of the initiatives the Council put forward as part of the last Council Retreat. The priority was to move those items

forward. A number of additional issues were brought up over the past several months by Council Members and residents. He would outline some of those issues and asked that the Council provide direction on how to proceed. Mr. Tingey explained that it was possible to wait on the items until the next Council Retreat in 4 ½ months. However, it was also possible for City Staff to move forward on some of the issues now.

Mr. Tingey reported that the first item related to unwarranted stop signs in intersections. A few City Council Members had indicated that this was a significant concern. Many of these signs were put into place before Cottonwood Heights was incorporated. Salt Lake County used them for traffic calming. There had been many complaints from residents about their placement. These unwarranted stop signs made drivers stop more frequently and often resulted in higher speeds between intersections. They also added unnecessary delays to motorists and there could be higher crash rates for left-turning vehicles in these areas. Mr. Tingey shared sample images. If the Council wanted City Staff to address this more over the next few months, notices would need to be shared with residents to inform them that there would be a change to the traffic configuration. The City would also need to budget for additional temporary signage.

Council Member Birrell wanted to hear from the Council Members who were in favor of removing the unwarranted stop signs. She found it contradictory for residents to state that they wanted to see traffic calming measures put in place but also to remove the stop signs. Council Member Newell explained that in his neighborhood there are stop signs that are only 100 feet from one another. This was unnecessary and a lot of residents drive through them. There are also stop signs in cul-de-sacs. A stop sign in a cul-de-sac does not make sense. Several signs in his district were unnecessary. It was noted that stop signs are not permitted to be used as traffic calming measures. The signs needed to be warranted. When stop signs are put in for traffic calming, it creates a safety perception but does not increase safety. In some cases, the unwarranted signs were actually more dangerous. The Council discussed unwarranted stop signs in the community as well as various traffic concerns.

Council Member Birrell suggested that the Transportation Plan analyze the more dangerous locations throughout the City. If the Council wanted to remove the unwarranted stop signs, she felt it was important for the Transportation Plan to include information about mitigating high speeds. The plan also needed to disincentivize people from cutting through neighborhoods. If the Transportation Plan looks at these issues and creates a prioritization list, over the next five years, the City would be able to address issues in several key areas. Every Council Member had mentioned problem areas in their districts. She wanted to see a systematic and prioritized approach taken so dangerous areas can become safer. Mr. Tingey stated that there were a number of areas in the City where residents want traffic calming measures. It was necessary to analyze, prioritize, and come up with some costs. Those could be brought forward at the Council Retreat.

Mr. Tingey further discussed traffic calming measures. Mayor Weichers suggested design and construction elements on Bengal Boulevard adjacent to Brighton High School to further enhance safety for pedestrians. Council Member Birrell asked for additional details about the suggestion. Mayor Weichers explained that residents had been concerned about crosswalks. A bulb-out would narrow the road and cause vehicles to instinctively slow down. He clarified that the roundabout would not be redesigned. The discussion related to the area by Butler Hills. Council Member

Birrell supported bulb-outs and felt it was important to look into areas where that would be appropriate. Mayor Weichers felt that this area, in particular, was more urgent due to the roundabout and the students in the area. Mr. Tingey reported that the proposal was to study traffic calming to better understand and prioritize the needs throughout the City.

The Council further discussed the unwarranted stop signs. Chief Russo reported that he frequently receives calls from residents about vehicles not stopping at unwarranted signs. He was not comfortable writing tickets for violations because the signs should not be there in the first place. The situation creates difficult situations for the Police Department.

Mr. Tingey reported that another item included in the memo related to the maintenance of easement areas. There are several subdivisions where developers have constructed a subdivision with a private road. Timberline Drive was an example of this where there is a public road that goes to a certain point and then a private drive. The City Council has addressed the issue numerous times because many residents want the City to take over the maintenance of private roads. Mr. Tingey explained that a lot of properties were developed this way prior to incorporation. The private access areas were created but over time the developers did not pay taxes and the accesses were taken over by the County. The County deeded ultimately deeded them to the City. Utah Law states that if an easement is being used for private access, the users are required to maintain the access. This includes snow removal and road improvements.

Some residents on Timberline Drive requested that the City take over maintenance. This would include snow removal, road improvements, and surfacing of the road. Mr. Tingey and Mayor Weichers met with area residents. There were concerns from precedent and logistical perspectives. In addition, a new ordinance would need to be written to address the issues since Utah Law currently requires that those residents maintain the easement area. Mr. Tingey invited Council direction on the issue. Six other properties were identified as well so it was important to consider precedence.

Council Member Birrell wondered if this could be treated as a special taxation district. It was noted that special taxation districts are normally used to make improvements to public infrastructure. This was not public infrastructure. Mayor Weichers shared additional background information. He explained that Timberline Drive was created by a developer as a private access road. The developer did not pay the taxes and the County took that back. The County had deeded it to Cottonwood Heights. As a result, the City owns the road but the residents need to maintain it. City Attorney, Shane Topham clarified that the City owns the land and not the road itself. Mayor Weichers explained that there are six areas like this in the City and it was his preference that the City maintain those roads. Since the City owns the land underneath, it made sense for the City to maintain the roads. Council Member Petersen wondered if the road could be upgraded to standard. Mr. Tingey confirmed this but explained that it would require the City to take portions of driveways and the residents had no interest in that.

Council Member Birrell noted that Timberline Drive does not have the proper width and the property owners were unwilling to donate the edges of their properties to make the road legitimate. She was not sure how it would be possible to proceed. Mayor Weichers was not certain that every road in the City currently meets the standards. Mr. Topham reported that the Council previously

adopted a chapter in the Transportation Title to deal with the conversion of private roads to publicly dedicated roads. However, as mentioned by Mr. Tingey, a requirement was that the roadway needs to be brought up to City standards before the City accepts the dedication. There was one instance where this had been done. In all other cases, the Council had rejected requests from residents who wanted the City to maintain a private road.

Mr. Topham reported that Utah Law is clear and states that those who use an easement are responsible for maintenance. Timberline Drive is a road to nowhere and serves as an access drive for residents that live along the roadway. There is no City component of the use, which is private. Under the law, those residents are required to maintain the improvements on their easement. If the City decided to take on the cost of the improvements and maintenance, Utah Code Title 10 Chapter 8 Section 2 would need to be considered. Mr. Topham explained that a Code Amendment would be necessary if the Council decided to move forward with this proposal. There may also need to be a public hearing and further consideration of Utah Code.

Mr. Tingey asked the Council if City Staff should look at Code changes to maintain private drives. Council Member Birrell could only support that if the Codes related to development are changed. She did not want to see situations like this happen in the future. Mr. Tingey overviewed the other locations where the City owns the land but where there is a private drive in place. This included Milne Lane, Timberline Drive, Siesta Drive, Wasatch Boulevard, and 3500 East, which is a Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) right-of-way, and East Golden Hills Canyon. Mayor Weichers noted that on Timberline Drive, there are six homes. One resident refused to pay anything toward the road. As a result, it was supported by the other five residents. Since the City owns the land beneath the road, it made sense to improve the road and make it accessible for emergency services. He did not believe the issue would be resolved tonight and acknowledged that additional study was needed.

Mr. Tingey reported that the memo also included information about Public Works staffing and tree maintenance issues. The City Project Priorities Discussion Memo would be brought back to the Council for further discussion at a later date. The Council directed staff to move forward with a plan to address the unwarranted stop signs and the bulb out on Bengal Boulevard.

c. **Discussion on Mixed-Use Zoning – Community and Economic Development**
Director, Mike Johnson.

Mr. Johnson reported that staff had been working on a contract for a Consultant to run General Plan open houses. However, there was interest in holding off on that and having another Work Session discussion with the Council. The proposed discussion would include a more in-depth comparison of the current General Plan land use designation, a summary of future land uses proposed in various adopted master plans and a recommendation for context-sensitive mixed-use zoning designation with form-based Code elements. He was not prepared to have that discussion tonight but suggested it take place at the next Council Meeting. This could be done before open houses and town hall meetings are scheduled.

Council Member Birrell noted that the town hall meetings with district-by-district input would still take place. Before those meetings take place, a more context-sensitive mixed-use zoning

designation would be discussed. She thought that was an excellent idea. Mr. Johnson explained that land use was one element of the General Plan but what was written there would also impact transportation and how attainable and affordable housing is addressed. There was a desire to improve definitions and acknowledge that mixed-use areas required context.

Mr. Johnson reported that there was interest in modifying the mixed-use zoning designation. Currently, the mixed-use ordinance requires a mix of uses. For instance, if there was a 10-acre site and two uses on the property, it would be considered a mixture of use. There was interest in pursuing a Code Amendment that would require vertical mixed-use in redevelopment projects. That could be changed through the General Plan process but he wanted to hear feedback from the Council. If that was initiated, there would need to be a formal zoning text amendment. It would be considered by the Planning Commission before coming back to the City Council for further consideration and adoption. Mr. Johnson stated that vertical mixed-use is common in other cities. Additionally, other cities have context-sensitive mixed-use zoning districts.

Council Member Birrell looked forward to the town hall meetings. She wanted to understand whether residents wanted to see more detail in the form-based codes. The proposal was an exciting step forward. Council Member Bracken pointed out that it was important to be cautious with form-based codes. Mr. Johnson stated that part of the General Plan process is the creation of a context-sensitive ordinance. There was a subconsultant for that. The Consultant could come to the Council and present information about form-based code. Mr. Johnson wondered if there was support for the interim measure of a formal text amendment that would require vertical mixed-use. Mayor Weichers stated that he was in favor of that addition.

d. General Plan Process Discussion - Community and Economic Development Director, Mike Johnson.

The General Plan Process was not discussed further.

5. REVIEW OF CALENDARS AND UPCOMING EVENTS.

- a. Bark in the Park will be on September 17 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Mountview Park (1651 Fort Union Boulevard.)**
- b. Future City Council Meetings will be held on September 6 and 20, October 4, and 18, November 1 and 15, and December 6 and 20, 2022, at City Hall Starting at 4:00 p.m. Unless Otherwise Noticed.**

Mayor Weichers reviewed the calendar items and upcoming events.

Council Member Birrell discussed mature pine trees in the City. She noted that there are mature pine trees within Golden Hills Park that her constituents want to see preserved. She wanted to see the trees along the eastern edge watered. After meeting with the Arborist, City Staff, and Cottonwood Heights Recreation Center (“CHRC”) representative, she had some comfort there. However, there are seven or eight mature pine trees south of Golden Hills Park that are not inside the park area that are showing signs of dying from the top down. She wondered how the Council felt about spending some money to address this issue. The trees are on the eastern edge, just south

of Kings Hill Drive, and are sprinkled in amongst healthy pine trees. Council Member Birrell wanted to see something done before the trees are lost. Mr. Tingey explained that certain areas were being watered by an adjacent resident. It would be beneficial for them to visit the area in person. Council Member Birrell noted that it may also be a matter of applying something to slow the beetles down because at least seven trees are dying from the top down.

Council Member Petersen reported that seven large pine trees on his side of the creek were removed. Once the beetles start at the top of the tree it is difficult to save it. The Council determined that it was worthwhile to look into the issue further to try and save the trees.

6. POSSIBLE CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS LITIGATION, PROPERTY ACQUISITION, AND/OR THE CHARACTER AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL.

There was no Closed Meeting.

7. ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to ADJOURN the City Council Work Session. The motion was seconded by Council Member Bracken. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The Work Session adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2022, AT 6:30 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL
BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Weichers, Council Member Douglas Petersen, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Shawn E. Newell, Council Member Ellen Birrell

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Records, Culture, and Human Resources Director/City Recorder Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Police Chief Robby Russo, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Finance and Administrative Services Director Scott Jurges, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, Systems Administrator Alex Earl

1.0 WELCOME – Mayor Weichers.

Mayor Mike Weichers called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

The Pledge was led by Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges.

3.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

3.1 Police Department New Officers Introduction – Police Chief, Robby Russo.

Police Chief, Robby Russo introduced new Police Department Officers to the Council. Four new officers had been hired since the last City Council introduction but the Council was already familiar with two of them. Chief Russo introduced the other two officers. Officers Alec Novakovic and Evan Hawksley were presented. Officer Novakovic was born in Bosnia and his family immigrated to the United States via Germany. Officer Novakovic recently graduated from the Police Academy and is now in the Field Training process. He will be a wonderful addition to the City. Officer Hawksley just started the Police Academy and stood out amongst the rest. He has the character and tools that will make him a valuable asset to the City.

Officer Novakovic introduced himself and stated that both he and his wife were born in Yugoslavia prior to the war. Their families had the opportunity to come to the United States. His family went through Germany and then relocated to Utah. He has been in law enforcement since he was 21 years of age. Officer Novakovic had worked as a Dispatcher and a Dispatch Supervisor for the last 12 years. He decided to attend the Police Academy and make a change.

Officer Hawksley reported that he was in the third week of SFO and will graduate on December 8, 2022. He introduced his wife and baby boy to the Council. Officer Hawksley grew up in Los Angeles and was previously in the music industry. He was signed to Universal Music Group. He

was raised primarily by his grandfather, who served in the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Officer Hawksley was in the army for four years, studied finance, and eventually decided to pursue a career in law enforcement.

4.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS

Chanel Stewart expressed her gratitude for the Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”). Approximately one month ago, she was able to assist an 89-year-old man who fell on his head. UFA arrived quickly and was able to provide the man with proper medical attention. Ms. Stewart stated that she represents 400 residents in District 3. The power in the area had gone out almost every other night for the last eight days. She spent over an hour on hold with Rocky Mountain Power only to receive no response and no real recognition of the issue. Ms. Stewart asked that the City step in. Temperatures are extremely high and she was worried about safety and food waste. She wondered if there was a way for the City to assist the residents of District 3.

Mr. Tingey offered to contact Rocky Mountain Power the following day to address the issue. Mayor Weichers wondered if the power outages were happening at certain times of the day. Ms. Stewart reported that the first two nights there were power outages in the middle of the night. The next three nights, the outages happened at approximately 10:30 p.m. The last time, she heard a boom, which she assumed was the transformer. The power also had gone out that afternoon. She was not sure if the transformer was the issue since Rocky Mountain Power did not give her a proper answer. Mayor Weichers asked for her contact information so Staff could reach out to Ms. Stewart with updates on the situation.

Vera Winn reported that she has lived in Cottonwood Heights for 59 years. The City had grown a great deal during that time. There had been a lot of support from the Police Department with regard to speeding on Kings Hill Drive. The Police Department was very kind and placed meters in the area. Drivers slow down when they see the meter but speed back up after passing. She was concerned about children who live in the area and asked about speed bumps. Mayor Weichers recognized the seriousness of speeding in neighborhoods. The Council and Staff would discuss the matter further and be in touch with Ms. Winn to discuss possible options.

Nichole Omer gave her address as 2085 East La Cresta Drive. She shared comments related to the General Plan. Ms. Omer felt strongly about the General Plan revision. She commented that a wise, well-thought-out revision would have a significant impact on the City. She shared information about aspects of the General Plan that would impact land development and zoning. Most areas of Cottonwood Heights were built before the City was incorporated, so most of the zoning and land development ordinances were outdated. This especially impacts single-family residents. Owners face significant challenges in making structural amendments to their properties. Ms. Omer reported that she recently went through that experience. She rebuilt her home on La Cresta Drive and it took years to create a plan that met the zoning requirements but was also livable. She had to spend a lot of financial resources to reach the approved zoning stage, even before construction began.

Ms. Omer believed that significant changes needed to be considered to prevent these issues in the future. She asked that the issue be addressed at future town hall meetings in each district. For instance, there could be some sort of tiered zoning available for single-family residences.

Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”) could address the moderate-housing shortages, but those were difficult to construct when the zoning is outdated for single-family lots. Additionally, there are large lots in Cottonwood Heights and multi-family units could be appropriate there. Different zoning would need to be considered in those areas as well. Ms. Omer supported the removal of unwarranted stop signs in the City.

Mayor Weichers informed those present that a General Plan update process had begun. The Council decided to take a step back to receive appropriate feedback from residents. He expressed his gratitude for the comments shared by Ms. Omer.

There were no further comments. The Citizen Comment period was closed.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Consideration of Resolution 2022-45 – Awarding a Retiring Police Officer His Badge and Approving His Purchase of a Police Firearm.

Mayor Weichers reported that the above matter was discussed during the Work Session.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-45 – Awarding a Retiring Police Officer His Badge and Approving His Purchase of a Police Firearm. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5.2 Consideration of Resolution 2022-46 – Approving Entry into a Consulting Agreement for an Update of the Moderate-Income/Affordable Housing Plan.

Mayor Weichers reported that the above resolution was discussed during the Work Session.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-46 – Approving Entry into a Consulting Agreement for an Update to the Moderate-Income/Affordable Housing Plan. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5.3 Consideration of Resolution 2022-47 - Declaring Certain Property Surplus.

Mayor Weichers reported that the above resolution was discussed during the Work Session.

MOTION: Council Member Petersen moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-47 - Declaring Certain Property Surplus. The motion was seconded by Council Member Newell. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5.4 Consideration of Resolution 2022-48 - Consenting to an Appointment to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee.

City Manager, Tim Tingey reported that Aline Longstaff was recommended for appointment to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee. Mr. Tingey and Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson had the opportunity to interview Ms. Longstaff. Both felt she would be a beneficial addition to the Committee. Ms. Longstaff lives in District 2 and has a passion for parks, trails, and open space. 15 members of the Committee could be appointed with Ms. Longstaff being the 14th. There was a good representation of all of the districts. One more appointment needed to be made, which would most likely come from District 3.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-48 - Consenting to an Appointment to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee. The motion was seconded by Council Member Birrell. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

6.1 Approval of the City Council and Business Meeting Minutes of August 16, 2022.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes of August 16, 2022. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING.

MOTION: Council Member Birrell moved to ADJOURN. The motion was seconded by Council Member Peterson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Session and Business Meeting held Tuesday, September 6, 2022.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: September 20, 2022