

PUBLIC HEARING AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, August 26, 2010 7:00 p.m.

Public Safety Building

3925 W Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

NOTICE is hereby given that the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, will hold a Public Hearing in connection with their Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Thursday, August 26, 2010, beginning at 7:00 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on agenda items. (Comments limited to 3 minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Amendments to the City's Annexation Policy Plan
4. Amendments to the City Code, Title 10, Chapter 2, Definitions, Regarding the Definition of a Family

SCHEDULED ITEMS

5. Approval of Minutes from the July 29, 2010, Regular Planning Commission Meeting
6. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City's Annexation Policy Plan
7. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code, Title 10, Chapter 2, Definitions, Regarding the Definition of a Family
8. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City's General Plan
9. Committee Assignments and Reports

ADJOURNMENT

10. Adjourn

Posted this 24th day of August, 2010.

Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder

- Supporting documentation for this agenda is posted on the City's Web Site at www.cedarhills.org.
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Cedar Hills will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to be held.
- The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the Planning Commission and the staff.



CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

TO:	Planning Commission
FROM:	Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
DATE:	8/26/2010

Planning Commission Agenda Item

SUBJECT:	Review Annexation Policy Plan
APPLICANT PRESENTATION:	N/A
STAFF PRESENTATION:	Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS: This item has been continued from our previous meeting. Since that time we have only received one (1) written response to our proposed changes, from Utah Valley Dispatch. The district was in favor of the proposed changes. This meeting is to allow for public comment and to make any further changes to the plan in necessary.	
PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION: Reviewed 2003	
FISCAL IMPACT: N/A	
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: Annexation Policy Plan & Map	
RECOMMENDATION: Review the current annexation plan. Make recommendations to staff on what, if anything, needs to be altered.	
MOTION: To recommend/not recommend approval of the Annexation Policy Plan.	

ANNEXATION POLICY PLAN



City of Cedar Hills Utah County, State of Utah

INTRODUCTION

This Annexation Policy Plan has been composed by the City of Cedar Hills to guide decision-making regarding future annexations and to facilitate coordination with nearby jurisdictions regarding mutually adjacent lands. This plan has been completed in response to HB 155, "Annexation Amendments," enacted by the Utah State Legislature in its 2001 General Session. The plan is intended to facilitate communication between political entities and to establish the City of Cedar Hills overall growth intentions and position on annexable parcels. It is a tool to direct annexations with regards to logical servicing and manageable timing. But, due to the natural uncertainty of the future, it is not a definitive statement on what will and will not be annexed. In some cases, decisions will be left to future leaders to judge based on current conditions. In developing this plan, the Planning Commission and City Council considered:

1. Attempting to avoid gaps between or overlaps with expansion areas of other municipalities.
2. Population growth projections for the municipality and adjoining areas for the next 20 years.
3. In conjunction with the municipality's General Plan, the need over the next 20 years for additional land suitable for residential, commercial, and industrial development.
4. Reasons for including agricultural lands, forests, recreational areas, and wildlife management areas in the municipality.
5. The following principles regarding each proposed annexation. If practicable and feasible, the boundaries of an area proposed for annexation shall be drawn:
 - A. along the boundaries of existing special districts for sewer, water, and other services,
 - B. along the boundaries of school districts whose boundaries follow city boundaries, and along the boundaries of other taxing districts.
 - C. to eliminate islands and peninsulas of territory not receiving municipal-type services.
 - D. to facilitate the consolidation of overlapping functions of local government.
 - E. to promote the efficient delivery of service.
 - F. encourage the equitable distribution of community resources and obligations.

PURPOSE

The provisions of 10-2-400, Utah Code Annotated require each Policy Plan to provide all of the following, and this plan is organized according to these requirements:

1. Map of the expansion area that may include territory located outside the county in which the municipality is located.
2. Statement of the specific criteria that will guide the municipality's decision whether or not to grant future annexation petitions, addressing matters relevant to those criteria including:
 - A. the character of the community,
 - B. the need for municipal services in developed and undeveloped unincorporated areas,
 - C. the municipality's plans for extension of municipal services,
 - D. how the services will be financed,
 - E. an estimate of the tax consequences to residents both currently within the municipal boundaries and in the expansion area,
 - F. the interests of all affected entities.
3. Justification for excluding from the expansion area any area containing urban development within ½ mile of the municipality's boundary; and
4. Statement addressing any comments made by affected entities at or within ten (10) days after the public meeting required by the act.

PART 1: Expansion Area

The City shall adopt and maintain an *Expansion Area Map*, as shown in Exhibit A, which identifies the following two areas.

1. Annexation Areas.
These areas are outside the current city limits and may be considered by the City for annexation, but are not guaranteed approval. Requests for annexation must follow existing requirements to petition for annexation, in addition to being included within the annexation area.
2. Proposed Boundary Adjustment Areas.
These areas include territory that has been heretofore annexed by an adjacent municipality but boundary adjustments may be favored in accordance to Utah Code Annotated 10-2-419. Any territory proposed for boundary adjustment would require the active agreement of the respective community through the boundary adjustment process. The City of Cedar Hills acknowledges that these areas are located in another municipality.

The City of Cedar Hills supports annexation agreements, inter-local agreements, and boundary line agreements that meet these criteria and achieve the community vision.

Development should be encouraged to occur within the existing City boundaries as a first priority. Annexations should only be approved when they can be shown to have a net positive benefit to the community as a whole, based on evidence that they will not jeopardize the health of thriving

neighborhoods or business areas. The City should zone all future annexed properties with the lowest density zoning permitted upon annexation until a suitable plan for development is approved to discourage annexations for purely speculative reasons.

PART II: Annexation Criteria

The following criteria has been established to guide the granting of future annexation petition decisions.

Criteria 1: Community Character.

The City of Cedar Hills is located at the base of the central portion of the Wasatch Mountain Range. Directly east of the City is 9,001 foot high Mahogany Mountain, flanked by the majestic Mt. Timpanogos reaching 11,750 feet above sea level. The City is located roughly 15 miles from the Provo/Orem urbanized area. It is close enough to both these cities and Salt Lake City to be an easy commute and residents are employed outside the city limits. Similarly, the majority of shopping and entertainment opportunities also lie outside the city, but leaders hope this will change as the population grows. Growth will likely generate more residential, greater demand for retail and a small amount of commercial and business operations. The City of Cedar Hills still considers itself a small town and prides itself on keeping its historic core healthy and vibrant. It also prides itself on a planned free-flowing street network that will handle the traffic and support the build-out population. Finally, the community has begun to develop an open space and trail network that connects to the regional network. Future annexations should respect these connections and be opportunistic in acquiring or leveraging additional resources as annexations occur.

Future administrations should consider all these factors before deciding to annex. They must also consider the Land Use Element and Transportation Element of the General Plan to understand how new areas will fit into the fabric of the community.

Criteria 2: Need for Municipal Services in developed and undeveloped unincorporated areas.

The City of Cedar Hills has culinary water and a sanitary sewer system for a total of 2,700 households. At present, the City is able to adequately serve all properties within its current boundaries. As new annexations are processed, the City will review each application for its impact on municipal services and applicants will be expected to mitigate any negative impacts on the City's systems. Mitigation efforts may include but not be limited to: paying for utility extensions, dedication of water shares, payment of on- and off-site fees, payment of impact fees, land dedications, exactions, and annexation agreements.

Criteria 3: Municipal plans for extension of municipal services.

The City of Cedar Hills has developed a *Capital Facilities Master Plan* for water, sewer, storm water, and streets. The plan currently extends to all areas included within the City boundaries

as well as the expansion area proposed within the *Annexation Policy Plan*. Line capacities should consider the future expansion areas to determine appropriate sizing. The City currently intends to expand its municipal services to the newly annexed areas as needed, but typically at the expense of the party developing the parcel.

Criteria 4: Financing future Municipal Services.

Future municipal services will be financed by the developer installing the improvements and will be funded by impact fees as outlined in the City impact fees schedule. Additional funding may be sought from enterprise funds, grants, bonding and tax increment financing on a case-by-case basis.

Criteria 5: Tax Consequences to residents currently within the municipal boundaries and in the expansion area.

Future annexations will likely include areas that are suitable for residential as well as areas with commercial and retail potential. While taxes on commercial and retail enterprises will increase the City's revenues, taxes on new residential properties are often insufficient to fully cover the extension of new services. Collecting impact fees assures that newly annexed properties pay a proportionate share of their impact on municipal services. Impact fees also reduce the chance of increasing taxes or reducing municipal services to existing residents, but legally they must be properly calculated to fairly represent the financial burden of new services. In addition, property owners in the expansion area will be subject to the City's municipal levee of .002142 (based on 2001 tax data). This translates into a tax increase of about \$312 per year for every \$100,000 of value of an assessed residential property. Overall, if residential and business uses grow in tandem, and appropriate impact fees are assessed, existing residents of the community should see negligible or possible net positive tax consequences.

Criteria 6: Interests of all affected entities.

There are a number of possible affected entities for annexations surrounding the City of Cedar Hills. These entities may submit comments up to ten (10) days following the public hearing on the *Annexation Policy Plan*. Their comments will be listed in Part IV below. The affected entities include:

Highland City. Highland City and the City of Cedar Hills share a common boundary.

Pleasant Grove City. Pleasant Grove City and the City of Cedar Hills share a common boundary. A boundary line agreement is currently being developed for where future services will be extended respectively.

American Fork City. American Fork City and the City of Cedar Hills share a common boundary.

Utah County. Utah County has maintained a policy of encouraging development to take place within municipal boundaries. All lands currently under the jurisdiction of Utah County within

the expansion areas will be annexed into the City before urban development densities and services are considered.

Alpine School District. The City of Cedar Hills' expansion areas are entirely within Alpine School District and it is anticipated that they will provide school service to the area.

Timpanogos Special Services District. The City of Cedar Hills' sewer services are provided by the Timpanogos Special Services District. It is anticipated that they will service the expansion areas as well. Additional capacity to support new development has been assured for the expansion areas.

Central Utah Water Conservancy District. This agency is responsible for the development of water resources through much of the State of Utah including Utah County. The City of Cedar Hills has contracted for the purchase of water from the District.

North Utah County Water Conservancy District. This agency is responsible for improving the agricultural water supply for North Utah County.


PART III: Justification for excluding from the expansion area any area containing urban development within ½ mile of the City's boundary.

The City of Cedar Hills does not intend to exclude any area containing urban development within ½ mile of its current municipal boundary. FEMA floodplains and areas of excessive slope (>25%) have been excluded from the expansion area because current planning policy discourages building in such areas due to servicing difficulties and concerns related to environmental hazards. These excluded areas do not currently contain any urban development.

PART IV: Comments made by affected entities at or within ten (10) days after the public meeting.

Letter received from Highland City dated February 12, 2003, stating: *The Highland City Council, in its February 4, 2003 meeting, went on record as opposing any annexation policy for Cedar Hills which involves property which is currently within the incorporated city limits of Highland City, without at least some preliminary discussion.*

CITY OF CEDAR HILLS Annexation Policy Plan Updated: June 2010



- Proposed Annexation Areas
- Proposed Boundary Adjustment Areas
- Completed Adjustment Areas
- New Proposed Annexation Areas
- New Proposed Boundary Adjustment Areas

SCALE
1" = 400'



CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

TO: Planning Commission and Staff
FROM: Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder
DATE: August 23, 2010

Planning Commission Memorandum

SUBJECT: City Code Amendments Regarding the Definition of a Family
APPLICANT PRESENTATION:
STAFF PRESENTATION: Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager

BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:

Recently the State changed its limit on single family designation to read as follows:

10-9a-505.5 Limit on single family designation.

- (1) As used in this section, "single-family limit" means the number of unrelated individuals allowed to occupy a unit in a zone permitting occupancy by a single family.
- (2) A municipality may not adopt a single-family limit that is less than:
 - (a) three, if the municipality has within its boundary:
 - (i) a state university; or
 - (ii) a private university with a student population of at least 20,000; or
 - (b) four, for each other municipality.

The City Code currently defines a family as follows:

FAMILY: An individual or two (2) or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption, living together in a single-dwelling unit and maintaining a common household. A family may include two (2), but not more than two (2), nonrelated persons living with the residing family. The term "family" shall not be construed to mean a group of nonrelated individuals, a fraternity, club or institutional group.

Staff proposes changing the definition of family to read as follows:

FAMILY: One (1) of the following groups of individuals, but not more than one (1) at the same time: 1) an individual living alone; or 2) two or more people all of whom are related to one designated occupant of the dwelling by blood, marriage, adoption, or legal guardianship and their foster children and up to two other unrelated persons who do not pay rent or give other consideration for the privilege of staying with the family; or 3) up to four (4) unrelated individuals who live together as a single housekeeping unit; or 4) two (2) unrelated individuals and any children of either of them living as a single housekeeping unit. A guest under this section is defined as a person who stays with a family for a period of less than thirty (30) days within any rolling one-year period and does not utilize the dwelling as a legal address for any purpose. For purposes of the definition of family, the term "related" shall mean a spouse, parent, child, grandparent, grandchild, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, great-grandparent, and

great-grandchild. The term “related” does not include other, more distant relationships such as cousins.

PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

RECOMMENDATION

To recommend to the Council the new definition of family.

MOTION

To recommend to the Council the new definition of family (as amended).



CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

TO:	Planning Commission
FROM:	Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
DATE:	7/29/2010

Planning Commission Agenda Item

SUBJECT:	Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the General Plan
APPLICANT PRESENTATION:	N/A
STAFF PRESENTATION:	Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS: We will again be reviewing the Parks Element of the General Plan. As we have taken a tour of a few of the parks in the City, I would like to focus on connectivity and inventory of our parks and trails system. Please come prepared to discuss those things that you would like to see added, modified, or eliminated from our current plan.	
PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION: Continued from the July Planning Commission Meeting	
FISCAL IMPACT: N/A	
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: Parks General Plan Section	
RECOMMENDATION: Review the Parks Element in our General Plan.	
MOTION: To recommend that staff make the following changes to the parks element in our General Plan... ...and to continue this item to the September Planning Commission Meeting.	

X. Non-Motorized, Intermodal Transportation

During 1995 the ~~Cedar Hills Town~~ Non Motorized Trails Master Plan was adopted by the ~~Cedar Hills Town~~ **City**, ~~Cedar Hills Town~~ Council. It was produced for decision makers and advisory boards, such as the Planning Commission, the ~~City Town~~ **City** Council, Mayor, recreation oriented task forces, residents, Home Owners Associations and trail oriented groups. The Trails Master Plan is intended to facilitate the development of not only a recreational amenity, but also an alternative transportation system for all non-motorized forms of transportation. The plan is primarily a document for planning and securing a city-wide trail system and should be referred to for specifics regarding trail planning, acquisition and development.

The trails master plan includes a map and text document which is divided into three sections and several appendices including: *Objectives and Policy Section, Trail Construction and Standards Section* and a *Maintenance and Operation Section*. Appendices include: *Public Input, Construction Standards Drawings, Sign Standards Drawings* and *Federal Highway Administration Traffic Control For Bicycle Facilities*. The ~~City Town~~ **City** Planning Staff is responsible for interpreting the master plan document and map.

1. Assumptions

Cedar Hills trail use has increased dramatically in recent years. As ~~the City Cedar Hills Town~~ **the City** grows and new development occurs, there will be an increasing demand for multi-use trails to provide safe access for children commuting to schools, provide/retain recreational opportunities, and create an alternative transportation system to lessen the impacts of development and convert motorized trips to non-motorized trips.

There is a desire in the community to better identify and preserve existing trails, and strong support for trail development. The Utah County Trails Coalition, The United States Forest Service, Mountainland Association of Governments, the Bonneville Rim Trail Association and other groups have expressed an interest in developing joint utility, fire access, and trail corridors.

2. Objectives

1. To provide the following benefits and opportunities to the Cedar Hills Community:
 - a. Improve the general quality of life in the community.
 - b. Provide a more aesthetic and multiple-use experience than traditional sidewalks.
 - c. Provide non-motorized routes for pedestrians, equestrians, and bicyclists.
 - d. Provide handicap access in portions where access is appropriate and reasonable.
 - e. Anticipate and design an interconnecting trail system.
 - f. Preserve access to existing trails within and outside of the city limits.
 - g. Tie to present and future trails in Utah County and surrounding areas.

Field Code Changed

Deleted:

Deleted:


- h. Provide trail diversity. Various user activities include: hiking, walking, bicycling, jogging, roller blade, horseback riding, etc. The trail system should accommodate these multiple uses and users.
- i. Provide an alternative transportation system - The trail system should create a non-motorized commuter system to lessen vehicular traffic within ~~the City Cedar Hills Town~~.
- j. Consider school bus stops when developing the trails master plan map with the objective of developing improved pedestrian access to these areas.
- k. Connect important open space and recreation oriented landscape parcels.

3. Policy

The ~~City Town~~ Council will direct the Planning Commission and planning staff to update and amend, implement, and administer this element of the general plan. The Planning Commission and planning staff shall interpret the Non-Motorized Trail Plan and map. Any subdivision of property must consult the Non-Motorized trail Plan and address applicable trail alignments. In all existing areas of the community efforts, including financial support, will be made to develop the trails found in the Non-Motorized Trail Plan. Further, it is the intention of Cedar Hills to impose impact fees on future development to aid in trail development.

4. Non-Motorized Trail Location

The map on the following page indicates the location of proposed trails within ~~the City Cedar Hills Town~~. A more precise description of the location and type of trail can be found in the Non-Motorized Trail Plan.



City ~~Town~~ of Cedar Hills • General Plan

PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT

I. Introduction

An open atmosphere has always been an identifying characteristic of the Cedar Hills area. It has perhaps been the primary factor that has drawn people here. A feeling of openness can continue amid residential and other development through the establishment of parks, trails and open space areas. In addition, the population requires ample recreational space. The City's desire is to build a sufficient network of parks, connected by a trail system, that will contribute to the healthy, active lifestyles of the residents, while also contributing to maintaining the historical feeling of openness. A map showing the location of present and future parks, trails and open space can be found herein.

II. Planning Philosophy

It has been said that "recreation facilities and their ability to enhance the quality of life are an essential competitive resource to be managed by communities for their own economic well-being." To this end, the City of Cedar Hills and its Parks and Trails Committee has undertaken this planning effort to give the Community's growing parks and trails system some planning and design direction and to fill the recreation needs of an ever increasing population.

It was decided by the City, at the beginning of the planning and design process, that structured public input throughout the process would facilitate the most effective results. To accomplish this important component of the parks and trails planning, the City conducted a series of structured public input meetings during the design process. The public input process addressed the following key elements:

1. Understanding the character and dynamics of the community, as well as the physical resources of the sites and the need to preserve and enhance them.
2. A firm grasp of community objectives, wants, values and conceptual program desires and how to reaffirm established long-term goals and objectives.
3. Consider the possibility that recreation needs can be met in many different ways, depending on the resources available to the City and how other available facilities can act in support of those needs.
4. How the proposed plans accomplish the community's vision.

III. Park Programming/Park Character


The park programs were determined using City standards, with the national standards as a guide, to determine the different types of park facilities needed in communities, based on population and projected growth. The available recreation resources of the community, both physical (natural) and existing facilities, should be assessed and analyzed based on the needs of the community to identify the uses and time frame of parks and trails. Every park has been considered as to its potential to accommodate community recreation needs. Different park parcels have different roles they will fill in the overall parks and trails system. These roles are identified primarily by site characteristics (size, slope), proximity to other facilities, trails, community needs, and park location.

Deleted: at

IV. Existing Designs

1. Heritage Park

As of 1995 one park existed, Heritage Park, located along Cedar Hills Drive on the east and west sides of Manila Creek. This park contains a pavilion, picnic tables, amphitheater, volleyball court, stream, trees and a trail that extends to Sunset Drive. Its size of 8.5 acres leaves additional room for future facilities.




2. Heiselt's Hollow Park

In the Spring of 2001, Heiselt's Hollow Park was completed adjacent to the Public Safety Building. This park contains a little league baseball/softball field, restrooms, a circular trail, trees, parking and tot-lot. Its size is 2.3 acres.

Deleted: tiny





4.3. Sunset Parcel Park

The Sunset Park parcel is 5 acres and was completed in the spring of 2003. Because of its size and slope it is designed primarily to offer opportunities for passive recreation and limited, informal active areas. The open area in the center of the park can be constructed to handle children’s activities and “games.” The park has been proposed with extensive “natural areas” and landscaping along the creek and is designed to capitalize on the significant views to the mountains. This park will also contain a pavilions, picnic areas, a hard surface trail that extends to Harvey Boulevard, an overlook sitting area adjacent to the creek, a more manicured landscaped area, a playground, and horseshoe pits, and BBQ grills.

V. Proposed Designs

4. Forest Creek Park/Trail

The Forest Creek Park and Trail (5.1 acres) were completed in spring of 2004 and were is contemplated to be constructed in two phases with slightly differing uses.


Phase I has is designed to have mostly earth mounds and landscaping for screening added to the existing meandering concrete path. At the far eastern end of this phase is a small open lawn area (west of Forest Creek Drive) This area along Cedar Hills Drive plays an important role as a landscaped gateway to the Community in establishing the landscape character for the rest of the community and parks.

Phase II is the trail along the creek. The creek underwent will need some realignment and bank stabilization as a part of this effort. This area was is visualized as primarily being kept in its natural state (cleaned up) with the addition of a paved path with bridges at proposed creek crossings and some benches along the path. The trail should connects to Heritage Park to the south and up at Redwood Drive to the north.



Deleted: was

Deleted: was



Deleted: ¶

Deleted:


Deleted: ¶


¶

Deleted: ¶

7. 5. Hayes Parcel-Doral Park

The ~~Hayes parcel~~, **Doral Park was completed in the fall of 2006.** Because of its small size (**0.2 acres**) and neighborhood location, ~~it is best suited for~~ **used** as a neighborhood tot-lot with lawn and shade trees. The park ~~would also include~~ **some a** picnic tables and/or benches to accommodate sitting and supervising of children. ~~A gazebo to offer some shelter from the elements should also be contemplated and designed to accommodate mostly passive recreation such as trails, picnic facilities and an enhanced natural landscape.~~





5. 6. Canyon Heights Parcel Timpanogos Cove Park

The Canyon Heights parcel Timpanogos Cove Park is 4.7 acres in size and ~~may~~ includes among other things an ~~natural~~ amphitheater, a large play area, ~~and~~ a passive lawn recreation area. ~~and a small storage shed, gazebo tennis courts and picnic tables all set in a "natural setting."~~ Restrooms, one large pavilion, one medium pavilion, and four small pavilions provide areas for picnicking. It also includes ~~an older child's playground and a younger child's~~ a large playground, swing sets, a swing bench, basketball court, picnic tables, and a connection to the Bonneville Shoreline trail. This park was completed in the fall of 2007.

Deleted: will

6. **7. Savage Parcel Mesquite Park**

Mesquite Park—The Savage parcel is approximately 10.4 acres. The upper, flatter 6 acres may include among other things park includes facilities for active recreation, softball fields, soccer fields, flag football fields, a tot-lot, restrooms, picnic tables, trails and parking. The remaining 4 acres is conducive to open space designation and trails. Future plans include a walking path, benches, water fountain, pavilion with tables, and BBQ grill.



V. Proposed Parks

1. Fieldcrest Pocket Park

The Fieldcrest Pocket Park is proposed to include swings, 6 maple trees, 2 benches, grass, and a trail access.

2. Redwood Pocket Park

The Redwood Pocket Park is per the development agreement with Wal-Mart. Plans include shade trees, grass, benches, and a tot-lot if possible.

3. Bayhill Park


Bayhill Park is intended to act as a trail access point with facilities to accommodate both pedestrian and equestrian trail users. The park will serve the surrounding neighborhoods as a local park, with open space and limited park equipment. The parcel includes parts of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and is approximately 7 acres.

4. ~~The Cottages Parcel~~ Cottage Cove Park

The Cottage Cove Park parcel is approximately 2.25 acres in size and is designed to accommodate mostly passive recreation, such as trails and an enhanced natural landscape. Because of its small size and neighborhood location, it is best suited for use as a neighborhood park with a green area and shade trees. It may also include a picnic table and benches. This property was deeded to the City specifically for the purpose of a park. Additionally, All American Development gave the City \$25,000 to be used for the initial development (possibly an irrigation system and seeding to provide a green area). This small park could be a key trail connector for the Bonneville Shoreline Trial and the future trail along the Murdock Canal. ~~Could possibly have access from Canyon Road to serve as trailhead with equestrian access.~~

Deleted: s

5. ~~The Cedars East Townhouse Parcel~~ Sage Vista Park




The ~~Sage Vista Park~~ parcel is a piece of land, because of its small size (approximately ¾ acre) and neighborhood location, is best suited for use as a neighborhood tot-lot with lawn and shade trees. It may also include a pavilion and picnic table and benches to accommodate sitting and supervising children.

Deleted: townhouse

2. 6. Harvey Parcel—Deerfield Park

The ~~Harvey~~ The Deerfield Park parcel, adjacent to Deerfield Elementary, at 12.4 acres is vitally important for accommodating recreation in the City of Cedar Hills. It is the only large piece of flat ground available for recreation. It can easily be connected by trail to Sunset Park and Forest Creek Park/Trail. It has been designed to accommodate one (1) regulation size high school soccer football field, one (1) pony size baseball diamond, two (2) little league baseball/softball diamonds, four (4) tennis courts, ~~three (3)~~ two (2) volleyball courts, ~~two (2)~~ three (3) basketball courts, a passive recreation and picnic area with picnic tables and pavilions, including an indoor pavilion with a small restroom and kitchenette, one (1) large playground, restrooms, snack shack, storage, a jogging loop, and parking. A skate park and splash pad are also proposed for this parcel. Lights on the fields and tennis courts are also being considered.




7. Cemetery

Possible locations could include the hillside northeast of the townhomes or south of the Public Works Facility.

3. 8. Hillside ~~Parcel~~ Park

The Hillside Park parcel is a 5.2 acre piece of open hillside designed to accommodate mostly passive recreation, such as trails, picnic facilities and an enhanced natural landscape. This parcel of land is not currently owned by the City, but could provide a valuable addition to the parks and trails system.



VI. Conclusion

At this time there are a number of deficiencies that need to be addressed. According to the City standards, the total park acreage is deficient by ~~42.6~~ acres (updated after Cottages Parcel, Cedars East Townhouse Parcel are updated). The facilities that are deficient include a multi-recreation/pool facility, basketball courts, a football field, and a skateboard park.

The park plans attached herein are not intended to be specific, detailed park designs, but only to identify how the different park sites might be designed to fill a role in the overall parks and trails system and give direction to future development. These plans communicate visually the community residents' ideas for parks and facilities. The items illustrated could be included toward the goal of meeting community recreation needs as each park is developed. This Parks and Trails Master Plan should be used primarily as a guideline to direct future parks and trails designs and development. It is not intended to be so totally site-specific that it precludes design development efforts or additional community planning when these individual parks and trails are developed. Additional trails connect these parks throughout the City.

The overriding, guiding consideration should be on preserving and enhancing the natural resources and environment whenever possible and carefully integrating man's works with nature's. Trails should meander through and follow the natural terrain while staying away from roads as much as possible. If Cedar Hills can accommodate the resident's recreation needs while protecting the environment and natural resources that make Cedar Hills a desirable community to live in, the recreation planning efforts will truly be successful.

VII. Standards for Recreation Facilities

Existing Cedar Hills Population (approximately 4,500)

	Standard	Existing	Surplus	Current Deficiency
Baseball/Softball	1/5000	1	0	1
Basketball	1/5000	0	0	1
Football	1/20000	0	0	0
Horseshoes	1/5000	0	0	1
Multi-Rec Center	1/10000	0	0	0
Skateboard		0	0	1
Soccer	1/10000	0	0	0
Swimming	1/20000	0	0	0
Tennis	1/2000	0	0	2
Trails	1 svstem	1	0	0
Vollevball/Badminton	1/5000	1	0	0

Projected Buildout Population (approximately 12,000)

Baseball/Softball	1/5000	6	3	0
Basketball	1/5000	2	0	1
Football	1/20000	0	0	1
Horseshoes	1/5000	4	1	0
Multi-Rec Center	1/10000	0	0	1
Skateboard		0	0	1
Soccer	1/10000	2	0	0
Swimming	1/20000	0	0	1
Tennis	1/2000	6	0	0
Trails	1 svstem	1	0	0
Vollevball/Badminton	1/5000	4	1	0

Volleyball/Badminton	2-3	1			3						4
----------------------	-----	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---

IX. Non-Motorized Trails

Non-motorized trails are an important element to the lifestyle enjoyed by the citizens of Cedar Hills. For a graphic representation of trail locations, refer to the map titled Parks and Trails Master Plan in this document. The trail system can serve as a vital and viable transportation system, and connects the parks within the community. Construction details and specific locations of trails can be found in the ~~City Cedar Hills Town~~ Non-Motorized Trail Plan. This General Plan is intended to be consistent with the Trail Plan.

X. Other Recreational Facilities

As population growth warrants, the ~~City town~~ may look at joint ventures with adjoining communities for other recreational facilities. A swimming pool in cooperation with Highland adjacent to the new high school on 4800 and Cedar Hills Drive might be considered along with a general sports complex for that area that is proposed in the Highland City Comprehensive Plan.