

ELK RIDGE  
CITY COUNCIL  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2022

**TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING**

This regularly scheduled meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council was scheduled for **Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 7:00 PM.** The meeting was held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah. Notice of the time, place, and Agenda of this Meeting was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E. Utah Ave, Payson, Utah, and to the members of the Governing Body on September 12, 2022.

**ROLL CALL**

Mayor Pro Temp Nelson Abbott Absent - Mayor Haddock  
Council Members: Nelson Abbott, Jared Peterson, Tanya Willis Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson  
Others: Royce Swensen, *City Recorder*, Laura Oliver, *Deputy Recorder*, Fire Chief Waite  
Public: Katherine Pasker, Sam Ballard, Joe Ballard, Larry Lee, Bob Paxton, Bob Strang, Liz Moeller, Melissa Shuler, Brad Shuler, Karl Shuler, Gavin Wright, Justin Hutchins, Lee Pope

**OPENING REMARKS– INVITATION**

Opening remarks were offered by Councilmember Peterson  
Pledge lead by Councilmember Abbott

**APPROVAL/AGENDA TIME FRAME**

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AND TIMEFRAME COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Katherine Pasker, Attorney - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Bob Paxton - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Bob Strang - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Liz Moeller - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Melissa Shuler - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Brad Shuler - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Karl Shuler - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Lee Pope - would like to reserve their comments for item 8, the CE3 zone  
Justin Hutchins - his wife had an experience in needing to use the restroom. The restroom at Shuler Park is locked and she was not able to use the restroom. She asked the city office to either give us the code or unlock the door so they can use them. They could/would not help her. The bathrooms need to be unlocked during park hours.

**REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEMS:**

1. **FIRE CHIEF PRESENTATION ON URBAN INTERFACE ZONE**

Fire Chief Waite stated he has been the fire chief for 20 years. First, anyone whoever says they aren't opposed to development is opposed to development. What I am opposed to is getting stuck in a no-win situation. The fire department deals with 3 things 1. Accessibility 2. Fire flow 3. Defensible space. Accessibility is road width, steepness of grade and the ability to turn around and move equipment in a hurry. These things need to be addressed. A 3,000 sq ft structure, which is a rambler size home with a finished basement, the structure needs roughly 600-700 gallons of water per minute (gpm), at 20 psi from a fire hydrant that is within 100 feet. That is not a straight away, that is by road distance. If there is a situation where there is not enough fire flow for a structure that is larger than can be defended, then the structure cannot be defended in a safe manner for the firefighters. Fire hydrants are tested around the city every year. One reason for this is for the ISO which is an insurance rating. Elk Ridge has pretty good insurance rates across the city because of the city's ISO rating, with the current fire flow between 600 and 1100 gpm at different locations around the city. As the city starts going up the hill, be advised that the fire flow is going to change. That will require some different things to happen such as requiring tanks to be built higher on the hill and additional water supply to make the fire flow what it needs to be for the size of structures that will be built in that area. Next is defensible space. When you look at all the federal and state guidelines on defensible space, it goes out to 100 feet around each individual structure which includes side buildings, main structure, sheds etc. That 100 sq ft may overlap into someone else's property. You cannot go onto someone else's private property and clear the defensible space if the neighboring landowner chooses not to clear it. A homeowner needs that 100 feet in order to protect their home. In the video that is playing, these houses are built in the trees. Because of the situation the city is in we cannot allow that: you cannot put firefighters into a place they cannot get out of. There are options that can be looked at such as automated sprinkler

systems that cover 250 sq ft (per a question asked) to mitigate fire but again, where is the water coming from and is that going to take away from the firefighters. Personal self-contained tanks are an option but what if the power gets cut which happens in fires. There are options to mitigate the risk. Cisterns can be built, 10,000-gallon tanks can be put in the home which can be accessed by the fire department. Terrain features also play a part, cutting terrain can cause further issues after the fact. When it comes down to it the residents are the ones paying the costs. How is the city going to defend/maintain open space? The city has problems in maintaining the parks it has now, how is the city going to deal with open space. The picture shown (on screen) is from the Bald Mountain Fire from 2018. The picture on the right is what is now Miracle Mountain. The fire crested Miracle Mountain and came up and burned into Loafer Canyon. The bowl at the top (full of huge flames) all happened within 30 minutes. The trees in the bowl are 70-80 feet tall if you do the math, the flames are about 300 feet tall. Embers can jump very easily; we were getting embers in the city. The city dodged a bullet this time, it may not next time. Wildfires create their own weather. Fires can do strange things, this fire did things I had never seen before. Typically, the oak brush and lower brush burns a lot faster, in this fire the big pines burned faster than anything. There was a study done on the period during the fire and after the fire. The moisture content in the pines was lower than the lumber that can be purchased at Home Depot. The pines were timber dry. We are in a drought; the potential is here, and I would not like to have a resident live in these conditions without knowing the risks and what they can do to help protect themselves by mitigating what they can on their property. Question from the audience- Was anyone allowed to go in and take the dry timber out? Fire Chief Waite- No that is Forest Service land. They may be letting some people up there, but you have to go through the forest service. Comment from Audience- they have seen documentaries that the forest service wants to clear timber, but they get sued by the environmentalists. He hikes a lot, and it is dangerous not only here but almost everywhere you go. Question from audience- From the experience of the Pole Creek and Bald Mountain fire mountain- how important is the evacuation path and having 2 roads and how realistic is it that a fire can be managed? Fire Chief Waite- during an evacuation there are double lanes going out. The city has 2 lane roads. With all lanes going down how do you get fire fighters up those streets in the middle of an evacuation. Luckily the fire apparatus for this station was already on the hill and when the big trucks started coming in 2 days after the evacuation the roads were clear. When you have oak brush that is 20 feet high, and flames that are 50 feet high, it's not hard for fire to reach across firebreaks if you have a good wind. If the fire is coming from one direction you don't want to have to go towards it to evacuate, there has to be another way out. During the fire the smoke would settle down into the city at night and anyone with respiratory problems would have had problems. Question from audience - The way the CE3 code is written, a lot of the oak brush would be undisturbed, especially if you do 4 acre lots and all of that open space would make the problem worse, wouldn't it? Fire Chief Waite- I cannot make the landowner or anybody do what they need to do. He can only advise them. If you have a 4-acre lot, then you can make defensible space around the structures. In a 1/2 acre lot there is going to be overlap and all that does is put fire in one big place. A house is considered fire load. If you have a 4-acre lot, then the landowner can keep their area clean. Comment/ Question from audience - in areas where the town has 1/2 acre lots there is probably less potential fire hazard then there would be with undisturbed oak brush left in its natural state as is stated in the CE3 code right now. It seems that it would be better to have some roads and some places where you can get around and places where landowners can keep the undergrowth cleaned out. If you have a 4-acre lot that is 200 feet wide, it's 800 feet deep; that is a lot for a person to keep clean. Whereas if the homes are clustered or with a smaller lot, they would be more defensible than relying on someone with an 800-foot depth lot to try keep their portion clean. Councilmember Willis stated the city has already adopted the international fire code and the wildland urban interface. Fire Chief Waite- a wildfire will burn from treetop to treetop to building to treetop and burn everything in its path if you don't have defensible space to stop and or slow the fire. If you put in a lot of open space who is going to maintain it? He doesn't have time to do it, does anyone? Audience member- he imagines the landowner will do it since there is an ordinance. Fire Chief Waite- do you know how many people actually adhere to the code -- Zero, not one. Audience - if it's in our code couldn't the city require them? Fire Chief Waite- agrees but it is impossible to enforce it. It would be a full-time job to go around and tell people to cut their trees down and that is what it is going to take. I am not against any of this, but these are the things that landowners need to be thinking about: are landowners going to get upset that they will be required to put sprinkler systems in. There isn't one developer that will get the call that there is a problem; residents call the city. The city has to deal with it on the tail end. That is why the city has codes; to try to get it right the first time so the city doesn't have to deal with this mess down the road. During the development process I deal with fire hydrants and fire flow. After that I deal with structures, fire sprinklers in the house etc. There are things that help mitigate the risk, so the city doesn't get the questions of "why did you allow me to build here?" I don't want to lose one firefighter because they were put into an unwinnable situation. Thank you. Councilmember Abbott stated being in the fire department he understands it as well as Councilmember Willis due to her father being a fire chief. Not everyone has that background, and some things may not be that obvious. Fire Chief Waite - people want to build in places that they just cannot defend. Question from audience: how does Woodland Hills, Mapleton etc. deal with this issue? Fire Chief Waite - he spoke with Woodland Hills fire chief a couple months ago and asked him what ISO (insurance) rating is and the answer was 4 b. and I wondered how they got that rating since they don't have defensible space. They do however have some other things in place such as a full-time fire department paid for by grants. Some city's bought the land and have segregated that land and doesn't let anyone go on it at all. Every city that has mountain land has done urban

interface with their city code, so they don't have these problems. Councilmember Willis stated there are cities such as Draper and Sandy that do not allow any structures in the highest areas, they allow equestrian parks and such but no residential homes. Fire Chief Waite stated on the night of Sep 13, 2018, there were winds that were 40 mph blowing north. The fire was moving 5 miles an hour. The fire was a mile and a quarter away and had a straight line towards Elk Ridge. The fire turned and went on the backside of Miracle Mountain. He's never seen anything like that before and it likely will never do that again. He is not opposed to people living on the south end of the city, but he does not want to put his people in a no-win situation. If that happens the house will burn to the ground because he cannot replace a firefighter, a house can be replaced. Structures conduct heat. If you have a house fire it starts the trees on fire which starts structures on fire and so on. There was a time his department was not allowed to go to Woodland Hills because of this type of situation because of putting firefighters at risk. Councilmember Willis stated lots with smaller frontages have structures closer together and then add an accessor apartment and you have a fuel load next to the property line. Fire Chief Waite stated there was a garage fire a few years ago that was so intense it melted the siding of the house next door 50 feet away. He had a crew on that house and the other home that was melting that was 50 -75 feet away. The Fire Chief does an annual report for the city and in 2019 the call volume doubled, and it is only going up. The higher the population the higher the call volume. The fire department is seeing a decrease in volunteers.

2. General Plan Amendment/Zone Change; Asay Acres Subdivision Plat A

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT/ZONE CHANGE; ASAY ACRES SUBDIVISION PLAT A COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED.

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

3. FULLMER SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE FULLMER SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

4. PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, DEVELOPMENT CODE 10-12-37-D 2-3 PARCEL SUBDIVISION

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE PROPOSED ORDINANCE 22-06, DEVELOPMENT CODE 10-12-37-D COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

Councilmember Willis AYE

Councilmember Peterson AYE

Councilmember Abbott AYE

5. CLARIFY STREET SIGNS

North Rocky Mountain Way- says replace pole should say – Put a new sign on north and south  
Elk Ridge Drive– take the sign at the top and put it where the blinky sign is and put the blinky sign just below the round about  
Hudson Drive east bound – saying there is a sign there already. Rotate the sign 90° to east west  
North of Bridger says replace a speed limit sign. Until this road is in Highlands is completed just leave as is.  
Escalante and Magellan says remove stop sign and replace with yield signs – put yield on both sides.  
Replace 25 in front of the office - leaving as 25  
Remove speed limit sign on Park – just leave it  
Yield sign on top of Artist - leave as is

6. RESOLUTION, AMENDMENT TO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT 2016-620 BETWEEN UTAH COUNTY AND ELK RIDGE CITY

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION 22-09-13-1R, AMENDMENT TO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT 2016-620 BETWEEN UTAH COUNTY AND ELK RIDGE CITY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

7. CE 3

Councilmember Abbott turned the time over to those who as requested to speak before the discussion CE3.

Karl Shuler - stated during a previous meeting that the CE3 code is the most restrictive code along the Wasatch Front, and it was refuted that there were other cities with restrictive codes. He created a matrix using 4 areas using lot size or density, slope restrictions, road grades, sensitive areas restrictions, and then on clustering, trails, and amenities. He used Elk Ridge, Woodland Hills, Payson, and Draper. The area in Draper is very well thought out and very similar to Elk Ridge terrain and Elk Ridge is the most restrictive. When he talked to Draper, they have several zones which are all smaller lots and did not mention larger lots. If you look at the zone map the larger, agricultural lots are all on the backside of Traverse Mountain.

Liz Moeller - read a letter that was given to the city by Ken Harris. The city needs density to help pay for any development on the southside without putting the financial burden on the current residents. The amount of open land is too much. A professional planner needs to write code.

Attorney Pasker - stated she renewed the objections that have been previously argued which have not been addressed and would like to state what the actual real measures there would be to mitigate fire risk and a path forward. The Fire Chief stated the specific concerns for fire safety are secondary access, road width and steepness, fire hydrants, defensible space, and water supply. None of the objections the landowners have raised have to do with any of these items. We all recognize fire risk is a real danger, there are many risks that can be in this area but the way to deal with that is not to effectively prohibit development, it is to mitigate risk through measures the fire chief was discussing. Unfortunately, as proposed, CE3 doesn't do anything about the current risk faced by the city; the mountain is already there, the trees are already there and the only way to create secondary access and deal with the road width and actual paved roads to provide the expanded fire hydrants and defensible space, fire breaks, water supply etc. is to permit development. That is the only way funds are going to come in to incorporate those elements that will improve fire safety for all of the community down wind. By not allowing development, like the CE3 effectively does, the mountainside will remain the tinderbox that it is. We would encourage the city to revisit the ordinance; and if the concern is really about fire, with how communities around the country and planning professionals address fire risk and it's not through density, it's through fire mitigation that the fire chief went through. They understand that the city doesn't want to expend resources on Urban interface measures, and the chief said the city can't force people to do any of the things mentioned, you absolutely can, through code enforcement. We encourage the city to take advantage of the tools it has and not just say they city won't allow people up there. You will need a density to support the infrastructure that needs to go on that mountain to create defensible space and the fire breaks. A potential path forward is that they would like some time to prepare a concept plan for the city council to review to actually have an idea of what is possible in that area; where should development patterns be created, where is that defensible open space possible, where should those fire breaks be where should the trails be so that city council can have a real view of what is even possible given sewer lines, ravines, roads that won't be cut in certain places do to the slopes. It will take about 5 weeks to prepare the concept. It's just a planning document to help guide the city council in this process to prepare a CE3 ordinance that deals with the actual terrain and possibilities in this area. We encourage the council to delay action on this ordinance while they prepare the plan at the landowner's expense. Even if other cities are prohibiting development, it is not of the size and degree of this area. This is 400 acres, and no other city is as restrictive as Elk Ridge.

Bob Paxton - stated he agrees with the previous statements. Four years ago, there was a planner that was outside of the city that was promoting 5 acre lots. As the council and planning commission and landowners were discussing this area the city promised to be honest with the landowners with the zoning that was present when they purchased the land, and he would ask the same thing from them. He would ask for the time for a flyover and to prepare a concept that isn't haphazard. He lives and recreates in Draper and goes along the along Bonneville Shoreline trail. This land was purchased and set aside for open space. If the city offered to buy the land from him, he would be done.

Bob Strang - stated in order to make a development up here it needs to be feasible to be developed. He thinks there should be an overlay in order to deal with all the issues.

Lee Pope - stated he has lived here 50 years and he has children and grandchildren who live here. He is concerned about the safety of his family just as everyone else is. Everything seems to revolve around safety. The last meeting with Planning Commission he mentioned that 17 people have died in Utah from a forest fire in the last 50 years. A councilmember, not here today, replied in his response to me that every death was important. Unfortunately, he misunderstood my point. Of course, every death from a forest fire is a tragedy but my point was not going to talk about what is, what could or may happen, but what actually happens and what the real figures are in the state of Utah. The number of fire deaths per year in the last 50 years is 1 person every 4 years and referred to the article which he took the figures. Lightning 1 death from lightening every year, that is 4 times the number of people that died from fire. Magnitudes of 10 or more exist those who participate in hiking cycling etc. We as landowners should be concerned about things that people do every day and ban everyone from hiking or riding bicycles on their property. Hopefully this analogy will help the city see how easy it is to overstate and amplify the emotion of the word safety. People who live in hillside communities should be made aware of the risks and miniscule risk of death and serious injury of living there.

We live in one of the most beautiful, safe, and low crime communities in the United States and in Utah largely because very good family-oriented people and retired people with many common values have moved here. He is not aware of a single death where life threatening injury from violent crime ever occurred in Elk Ridge. Someday it could happen the city could have a forest fire but it's unlikely if you look at the history of Utah and all the communities that have ever been built. He suggests the council and planning commission should calmly step back and take a look at the risks involved based on the history of the state and use a little commonsense when formulating restrictive covenants that may make development in upper Elk Ridge financially infeasible and impossible. The landowners have a right to sell for a reasonable price, developers will only develop if it is financially attractive. Council has stated the city isn't in the business of pleasing developers but really yes you are. If you don't, please the developers then it's never going to get developed and Elk Ridge will own that property. There won't be anyway anyone else can use it. The city has to ensure reasonable community standards while enabling equitable development.

Brad Shuler - stated he has lived here his whole life. He has seen development come and has appreciated the friendships that he has had with residents and happy that Elk Ridge is what it is today. There is a letter that their legal counsel has sent to the city and would like to reiterate that what the safety concerns the fire chief spoke of already exist, High Sierra which borders this land is half acre or smaller lots. Salem Hills Drive Hillside Dr all have homes, which are up against the natural areas that are not developed. By passing the current draft of the CE3 code from his assessment is that it will prevent development and continue being the current risk it already is to the city. The 4 acre lots is not going to allow for development to happen. When there was a fire, the city put a fire break through their land, and they were happy to do that. Putting in development will help manage fire danger risks and help the city. Right now, there isn't any gradation but having smaller lots and clustering will help the city, developers, and landowners to get together and make it a safer city for all of us. If the city is really concerned about wildfires, we need to create a zoning ordinance that will allow for development which is reasonable and safe.

Councilmember Abbott stated that it is on the agenda for discussion but there are several council members missing. He has had a lot of sleepless nights over this and thinks there are somethings which need to be left to people who know what they are doing. He spoke with fish and game, and they are getting ready to do a study on wildlife and come in and tag and track large game. Last night he saw 20 deer in one yard but that doesn't mean that is a wildlife corridor. There are certain issues that haven't been worked out; and none of this even matters until they know where it is identified; where is the tank and well to be located and all the other things that have to come in as part of this process. Based on what was said tonight, the landowners would like to present a concept. With the cost of any litigation and costs to the residents as a result of development, the reality of it is that the city charges impact fees to put in wells and tanks etc. and the new homeowners are not paying 100% of that cost. Existing residents are going to pick up between 30 and 40% of that cost because state code says we get to, not because we agree or because its right or fair, which is different than Mr. Harris indicated in his letter. That is a tough pill to swallow so the city needs to contemplate that as the city moves forward with this and work something out that works for everyone. Other developers have come in and born the cost of infrastructure and the city collected and paid money back as developments came in to cover it so that the city is not making the existing residents pay for that infrastructure. The city has had substantial growth but all of that was paid for upfront. The city had a million-gallon tank put in, a well put in, a well upgrade and that was all paid for before even one lot was built on. If the city can work together then the city and landowners will get a lot farther than if we cram code down everybody's throat. Councilmember Willis stated she doesn't like that the city would let developers come in and dictate the city code and does not think that is how it should be done. Councilmember Abbott stated he didn't think they are dictating code but coming in and showing the city what is possible. Going back to what Councilmember Peterson has said in the past, there are certain parts of this ground that one just can't develop; it is too steep, sewer doesn't flow uphill without things that the city code doesn't allow and so one has to look at other options. There are other physical constraints and limitations that all go into it. There are pieces of ground that are permanently landlocked and will never be able to do anything with it because to get to it you would have to have roads that are over 20%. The city does not have to be the bad guy here, the engineers can tell them what can and cannot be done. Councilmember Willis stated council had some questions and she went to the experts; Drinking water - a fire would impact the city drinking water even if the city does nothing then the risk is still there. There is a report funded by the USDA Forestry Service titled PAS 594 that talks about ravines and drainage for planners to deal with urban interface areas. It talks about slopes which makes a difference with a fire which shows the city should not be building in ravines and drainages. Ridge lines should be protected 30 feet per story, which what the standard is, the city has only 30 feet. Meaning if a home is 2 stories tall then it has to be 60 feet off the ridgeline, 3 story home- 90 feet off the ridgeline. These are the standards. One of the attorneys in this room sent us the same report only an older addition. The city code needs to say 30 feet per story off a ridgeline. Open space – Sandy City has a very detailed plan of what can and cannot be in the urban interface it is called the OS zone. Overall, slopes and ridgelines are protected because of fire. Accessory buildings need to have a greater setback and not in an ignition zone and putting a fuel load in someone's defensible space. Councilmember Peterson stated he is remaining firm on his stance of density; what the city has defined is way too big. 4 acres is a big lot; that is the size of the stake center. His house, being where it, is safer than if it were on High Sierra. Having more roads in the CE3 area helps break it up. There is a fine balance; the urban interface and the fire codes will provide avenues to get that balance. If the city is doing a code and there is a list of restrictions of what

someone can do on their property, just as I would not want someone defining what I can do or not do on my property without just cause, every line in that code needs to be justified. As councilmember Abbott stated on the wildlife corridors, who is defining that? The experts need to define that, currently there are no wildlife corridors. Council can reference State code "as per state". Regulations need to be listed. A lot of this code has been dictated on what someone thinks should go in there. He has changes and doesn't like the code and thinks the city should throw it out and start over. If the council wants to continue to make this something the city adopts, there are a lot of changes which he has, that need to be made. If the landowners have something that is feasible and wants to bring something to show what can be done. The landowners have the biggest skin in the game. He lives where he does because someone subdivided and developed it so he could have his home in a place he loves. There needs to be limits but they need to be justified and not opinion. Councilmember Willis stated council has gotten a lot of facts and when the experts don't match what people want to hear then we don't want to hear the expert opinions. Most of the code is from the HR1 and the General plan. The city paid a lot of money to have this plan and HR1 done and there are people who view it the same way who are not here tonight. Councilmember Abbott stated and those people knew when this meeting was and chose not to be here tonight. They were elected to represent the people and made the decision not to be here tonight. Councilmember Willis stated the fire chief is very uncomfortable with clustering on cul-de-sacs. Councilmember Abbott agreed that this is a concern. In the original Elk Haven plan, there are no cul-de-sacs and it allowed for defensible space. He spoke with the individual for over an hour and half who is over all of Utah County fire fighting specifically about this and right now the city has no way to deal with any of this. Councilmember Willis stated and that is why there were so many restrictions on the HR1 code which is one acre. Discussion ensued on having the gradation of lots and going from 1/2 acre lots to 4 acre lots. Councilmember Willis stated allowing a concept to come in is backwards. The city sets the zone, and the code and concepts are planned around that. Councilmember Peterson stated if this reverts back to the HR1 with the Hillside Cluster overlay which allows 1/2 acre lots with restrictions. Councilmember Willis stated but the city did not feel that was adequate when they did the general plan. Councilmember Peterson stated jumping to four acres was too much. 1/3 of the city is up there and does not see a good reason for 4 acres. He does not personally want the city to pay for it as well as any of the residents. There has to be a balance in density. Discussion ensued on fire, urban interface, lot, and home sizes.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO LET THE LANDOWNERS BRING A PLAN FORTH AND IMPLEMENT SOME OF THOSE IDEAS AND NOT VOTE ON IT UNTIL THAT HAPPENS COUNCILMEMBER ABBOTT SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (2) NAY (1) Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

Motion did not pass, there has to be a council majority vote even if there is a quorum.

8. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES FOR AUGUST 9, 2022

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES FOR AUGUST 9, 2022, COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO ADJOURN COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE: AYE (3) NAY (0) APPROVED Absent –Tricia Thomas, Cory, Thompson

---

Laura Oliver, Deputy Recorder