



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

PLEASANT GROVE CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
June 28, 2018

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Peter Steele (Presiding), Bobby Jo Blake, Jon Hawkins, Dustin Phillips, Jeffrey Butler

**EXCUSED:** Chair Lisa Coombs, Vice Chair Sam Sanderson, Commissioner Matt Nydegger, Commissioner Tamara Oborn

**STAFF:** Community Development Director Daniel Cardenas, City Planner Julie Henry, Public Works Director Marty Beaumont, Planning Assistant Kelly Evans

**MOTION:** Commissioner Hawkins moved to elect Peter Steele as Chair Pro Tempore for the meeting. Council Member Blake seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

**Commission Business:**

**1. Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Blake led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Hawkins gave the opening remarks.

**3. Agenda Approval:**

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to APPROVE the agenda as part of public record. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioner unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

1       **4. Staff Reports:**  
2

- 3           • **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports as part of  
4           the public record. Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The  
5           Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.  
6

7       **5. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members:** There were  
8       none.  
9

10 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Tom Hamann Jr. for a Conditional Use**  
11 **Permit to Allow an Alteration to a Nonconforming Detached Garage on Property Located at**  
12 **Approximately 1213 East 200 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. BATTLE**  
13 **CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD**  
14

15 City Planner, Julie Henry, presented the staff report regarding the requested Conditional Use  
16 Permit to allow for alterations to a non-conforming detached garage at the property listed above.  
17 The Hamann family were identified as the owners of two adjacent parcels for decades who had  
18 treated the parcel as if it were one property. The existing detached garage straddles the property  
19 line between parcels. The family now desires to sell the second parcel and proposed to demolish  
20 the eastern portion of the garage to accommodate that. The remainder of the garage would be kept  
21 on the property to accommodate parking for the existing residential dwelling. Ms. Henry  
22 confirmed that the application meets all of the Code requirements for altering a non-conforming  
23 structure and staff recommended approval. She clarified that the building was non-conforming  
24 because it does not meet the setback requirements.  
25

26 The applicant, Nicole Barnes, explained that the garage was originally built on the property line in  
27 the 1960s and was expanded eight years later. The proposal was to remove the addition and return  
28 the garage to the condition it was in when it was originally constructed. She provided photographs  
29 of the original structure and location.  
30

31 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Pro  
32 Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.  
33

34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request  
35 of Tom Hamann Jr. for a Conditional Use Permit for alteration of a non-conforming building on  
36 property located at approximately 1213 East 200 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential)  
37 Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified  
38 by the conditions below:  
39

- 40       1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.  
41

- 1           2. Materials used to build the garage shall be of equal or greater quality than what existed  
2           previously.

3  
4 Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
5 motion carried.

6  
7 **ITEM 2** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Artisan Construction for a Conditional Use  
8 Permit for Approval of a Proposed Cul-De-Sac, Greater than 400 Feet in Length, as Regulated by  
9 City Code Section 11-3-4:B “Street Standards”, as part of a New Subdivision called Hawkes  
10 Landing Plat “A” on Property at Approximately 2793 North Canyon Road in the R-R (Rural  
11 Residential) Zone. **MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD**

12  
13 *NOTE: Items 2 and 3 were discussed simultaneously.*

14  
15 Ms. Henry presented the staff reports for Items 2 and 3 together and identified the subject property  
16 on an aerial map displayed. She then presented the proposed 11-lot subdivision, totaling seven  
17 acres in size. There were three existing homes within the subdivision, and two will continue to  
18 front Canyon Road. The lot with an existing home was simply gaining some square footage to the  
19 backyard. Ms. Henry then addressed the Conditional Use Permit request, which specifically  
20 addresses the length of the cul-de-sac at 580 feet. Currently, the City Code requires that any cul-  
21 de-sac with a length greater than 400 feet obtain a Conditional Use Permit and approval from the  
22 Fire Marshal. Ms. Henry explained that this situation is unique in that the cul-de-sac will be  
23 unfinished and could eventually connect to the road above. The owner of the property between  
24 the cul-de-sac and the existing road was unwilling to develop at this time.

25  
26 One of the requirements of the Fire Department was a secondary access for emergency vehicles.  
27 To meet that requirement, the applicant proposed to dedicate a temporary access easement through  
28 some of the lots. The easement would need to be surfaced with some sort of all-weather material,  
29 but it did not necessarily need to be paved. The Fire Marshal approved of the proposal. With  
30 regard to the subdivision, Ms. Henry noted that the applicant used lot size averaging, so two of the  
31 lots were slightly smaller than the minimum square footage required in the zone.

32  
33 Ms. Henry noted that Mr. Renshaw, owner of an undeveloped adjacent property, was not in favor  
34 of the street layout and provided an alternative, which was included in the staff report. The City  
35 previously adopted a vicinity plan for the area, and the proposed subdivision conformed to that  
36 plan.

37  
38 Commissioner Blake asked if there were any safety concerns with the secondary access. Public  
39 Works Director and City Engineer, Marty Beaumont, responded that the cul-de-sac and the  
40 proposed secondary access meet the requirements of the Fire Department. He commented that the  
41 secondary access is temporary and will be removed when the road connects to 450 West.  
42 Commissioner Blake asked if there were any safety concerns with construction of the homes.

1  
2 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing.

3  
4 Jeff Samos, owner of the property south of the Renshaw property, was concerned that this was the  
5 first time he had seen this proposal. The City previously adopted a vicinity plan for the area, but  
6 he was never notified. Mr. Samos was not opposed to development but wanted to be informed of  
7 the changes being proposed.

8  
9 Brad Wilson, a local homeowner, expressed concerns about traffic and sight conditions at the  
10 entrance of the proposed cul-de-sac. If the road were to connect through, eventually traffic and  
11 speed would become a serious issue. He urged the City to enforce the existing vicinity plan.

12  
13 Sandy Carter was concerned about the safety of children in the neighborhood if the road were to  
14 connect through. She agreed that the entrance to the cul-de-sac is a blind turn that is dangerous  
15 for drivers and pedestrians. She was in favor of the cul-de-sac remaining as-is.

16  
17 There were no further public comments. Chair Pro Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.

18  
19 Chair Pro Tempore Steele briefly addressed noticing requirements and the application process for  
20 the Conditional Use Permit and the preliminary subdivision plat.

21  
22 There was a brief discussion regarding whether the cul-de-sac would be paved. Director Beaumont  
23 clarified that the applicant would be responsible to pave all of the roads within the subdivision.  
24 He also noted that there would be a stop sign installed outside of the subdivision and a few other  
25 locations in the neighborhood.

26  
27 In response to a question from Commissioner Blake, Director Beaumont confirmed that the  
28 proposed secondary access meets all requirements of the Fire Department.

29  
30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request of  
31 Artisan Construction for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a cul-de-sac with a length of 580 feet  
32 on property located at approximately 2793 North Canyon Road in the R-R (Rural Residential)  
33 Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified  
34 by the condition below:

- 35  
36 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department Requirements are met.

37  
38 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".  
39 The motion carried.

40  
41 **ITEM 3** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Artisan Construction for an 11-Lot  
42 Preliminary Subdivision Plat called Hawkes Landing Plat "A" on Property Located at

1 Approximately 2793 North Canyon Road in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. **MANILA**  
2 **NEIGHBORHOOD**

3  
4 *NOTE: Items 2 and 3 were discussed simultaneously.*

5  
6 **MOTION:** Commissioner Butler moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
7 recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the request of Artisan Construction, for  
8 the subdivision plat called Hawkes Landing Plat “A” on property located at approximately 2793  
9 North Canyon Road, in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and  
10 findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 11  
12 1. All final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

13  
14 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
15 motion carried.

16  
17 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Seth Gomm for a Two-Lot Preliminary**  
18 **Subdivision Plat called Manila Heights Plat “E” on Property Located at Approximately 1576 West**  
19 **3600 North in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD**

20  
21 Ms. Henry presented the staff report and oriented the Planning Commission on the location of the  
22 subject property. She explained that both properties included in the two-lot preliminary  
23 subdivision currently exist in adjacent subdivisions. The property owners approached the LDS  
24 Church, who owns the property behind them, and asked if they could each purchase land to expand  
25 their backyards. In order to change a lot line, the applicants had to create a new subdivision or  
26 amend the existing ones, so they chose to create a new one. Staff recommended approval of the  
27 application.

28  
29 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Pro  
30 Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.

31  
32 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
33 recommendation of APPROVAL to the Public Works Director for the request of Seth Gomm for  
34 the subdivision plat called Manila Heights Plat “E”, on property located at approximately 1576  
35 West 3600 North, in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and  
36 findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 37  
38 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

39  
40 Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioner unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
41 motion carried.

1 **ITEM 5 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of LeGrand Woolstenholme for a Two-Lot**  
2 **Preliminary Subdivision Plat called Dana Point Plat “D” on Property Located at Approximately**  
3 **439 S. Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. SAM**  
4 **WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**

5  
6 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding a two-lot subdivision plat in the Commercial Sales  
7 Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. The property owner approached the City with the idea of splitting  
8 their property and selling the vacant portion to Alphagraphics. The existing buildings would  
9 remain on Lot 6. The plat meets all requirements of the zone. Staff recommended approval of the  
10 request.

11  
12 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Pro  
13 Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.

14  
15 **MOTION:** Commissioner Hawkins moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
16 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of LeGrand Woolstenholme, for the subdivision  
17 plat called Dana Point Subdivision Plat “D”, on property located at approximately 439 South  
18 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, in The Grove Zone – Commercial Sales Subdistrict; and adopt the  
19 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition  
20 below:

- 21  
22 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

23  
24 Commissioner Blake seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
25 motion carried.

26  
27 **ITEM 6 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Noelle Livingston for a Two-Lot Preliminary**  
28 **Subdivision Plat called Emily’s Place Plat “A” on Property Located at Approximately 800 East**  
29 **1000 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. SCRATCH GRAVEL**  
30 **NEIGHBORHOOD**

31  
32 Ms. Henry presented the staff report and presented the proposed subdivision plat. She reported  
33 that both lots will exceed the minimum square footage and all other requirements of the R1-9 zone.  
34 Staff recommended approval of the request.

35  
36 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Pro  
37 Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.

38  
39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
40 recommendation of APPROVAL to the Public Works Director for the request of Noelle Livingston  
41 for the subdivision plat called Emily’s Place Plat “A” on property located at approximately 800

1 East 1000 South, in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions,  
2 and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 3  
4 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

5  
6 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.  
7 The motion carried.

8  
9 **ITEM 7 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Joey Davies for a Two-Lot Preliminary**  
10 **Subdivision Plat called Radmall Estates Subdivision Plat “A” on Property Located at**  
11 **Approximately 511 East 100 North in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. MONKEY**  
12 **TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD**

13  
14 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding a two-lot preliminary subdivision located at the  
15 address listed above. There was an existing home and garage on the lot that would remain, and  
16 the second lot would be vacant. Both lots meet the requirements of the zone and staff  
17 recommended approval.

18  
19 Chair Pro Tempore Steele opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Pro  
20 Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.

21  
22 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive  
23 recommendation of APPROVAL to the Public Works Director for the request of Joey Davies for  
24 the subdivision plat called Radmall Estates Subdivision Plat “A” on property located at  
25 approximately 511 East 100 North, in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the  
26 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition  
27 below:

- 28  
29 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

30  
31 Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
32 motion carried.

33  
34 **ITEM 8 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of McKay Christensen to Create an Overlay**  
35 **Zone that Provides for Flexibility in Creating Master-Planned Communities that Incorporate**  
36 **Commercial, Office, and Mixed-Use Buildings as well as a Variety of Housing Types. THE**  
37 **GROVE ZONE**

38  
39 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the proposed Code amendment.  
40 Staff had been working with the applicant on the amendment for several weeks but the request was  
41 coming from the applicant rather than the City. Since the last presentation of the application, the  
42 applicant had taken comments from the Planning Commission and staff and incorporated them

1 into the proposal.

2

3 The applicant was proposing to create a new overlay zone that could be applied to properties along  
4 Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. The overlay  
5 could be applied to properties of five acres or larger. Director Cardenas confirmed that there was  
6 only one property that the overlay could be applied to under these conditions. Staff recommended  
7 that they open up the restrictions slightly so that the overlay could be applied elsewhere in the City.

8

9 Director Cardenas explained that there are four areas of the Code that would need to be greatly  
10 amended to accommodate the applicant's intended product, which was to add the residential use,  
11 decrease setbacks, alter open space requirements; and address parking. Currently, residential uses  
12 are not allowed in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict. With regard to setbacks, Director Cardenas  
13 stated that the applicant proposed reducing the setback to 10 feet along 220 South, which would  
14 be developed as part of the project. The current open space requirements in The Grove Zone were  
15 30% for commercial developments and 10% for residential. The applicant was proposing to  
16 require 20% open space over the entire project. Director Cardenas commented that staff had issues  
17 with the applicant's proposal for open space, including the statement that open space includes the  
18 space between buildings and within required setbacks. Staff recommended that only active open  
19 spaces be counted toward the open space percentage. Although staff could work with the  
20 developer on this specific plan regarding open space, the overlay could be utilized by other  
21 developers, so they wanted to ensure that the proposed language is sufficient.

22

23 Director Cardenas explained that staff's biggest concern was parking. The current ordinance  
24 requires two stalls for every residential unit, regardless of the size or number of bedrooms. Since  
25 the previous meeting, the applicant had proposed to increase the parking ratios to two stalls for  
26 two and three-bedroom units, and 1.5 stalls for one-bedroom units. Although this was an increase,  
27 staff still felt it may be insufficient. As a result, they were proposing to increase the one-bedroom  
28 parking ratio to 1.75 stalls per unit. The applicant had proposed no requirement for visitor parking.  
29 Director Cardenas noted that the applicant had been working on tentative parking schedules for  
30 the commercial and retail uses and some joint parking agreements.

31

32 Director Cardenas briefly addressed height, which the applicant has proposed to increase. Staff  
33 was not overly concerned about the request.

34

35 The applicant, McKay Christensen, offered to make a presentation addressing the concerns from  
36 the previous meeting, or the Planning Commission could ask their questions and he could answer  
37 them individually.

38

39 Commissioner Butler asked if the road included in the development would meet up with the  
40 existing 220 South. Mr. Christensen answered affirmatively. He confirmed that they had spent a  
41 lot of time with the City Engineer discussing this road.

42



1 In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Christensen clarified that they included the  
2 five-acre minimum requirement because anything smaller than that would be too dense. Staff  
3 stated that they would work with the applicant to make the language clearer.  
4

5 Commissioner Phillips asked if an impact study had been done for the intersection at 100 South  
6 and 1300 West. Director Beaumont explained that the Transportation Masterplan for Pleasant  
7 Grove City shows 220 South as a minor arterial road. There is no question as to the value of the  
8 road once it reaches Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Including this road in the development would still  
9 require a modification to the Transportation Masterplan to make it a local road cross section rather  
10 than a full arterial road cross section. He noted that this intersection will be signalized eventually.  
11 This would all be addressed during the site plan approval process.  
12

13 Mr. Christensen briefly went through his presentation, addressing growth projections in Utah  
14 County, increasing employment opportunities, their target demographic, and how the proposed  
15 project will be a financial benefit to Pleasant Grove City. He presented the concept site plan and  
16 explained the work-live-play environment they will create with this community. With regard to  
17 the decreased setback along 220 South, Mr. Christensen commented that this would make the street  
18 feel more like a local road, and potentially mitigate traffic speeds. They do not anticipate having  
19 much of an impact on the school system. With regard to parking, Mr. Christensen stated that the  
20 retail and office parking will meet current City Code requirements and they were only asking to  
21 lower the requirement for one-bedroom units. Their target demographic was young, single,  
22 working professionals. He also had plans to create joint parking agreements so that residents and  
23 visitors could park in the commercial and retail stalls. Mr. Christensen also addressed open space,  
24 stating that the current concept plan was at 22% across the site, and that percentage did not include  
25 spaces between buildings and setbacks.  
26

27 Commissioner Blake asked the applicant if he was willing to increase to 1.75 parking stalls for  
28 one-bedroom units. Mr. Christensen answered affirmatively. He noted that this would create  
29 roughly 30 additional stalls. He confirmed that there was no designated parking for visitors.  
30

31 Director Cardenas noted that City Code already contains language about joint and shared parking  
32 agreements, so there was no need to include that language in this overlay. He did not expect  
33 anyone to park across the street on the doTERRA campus and walk over to this development  
34 because Pleasant Grove Boulevard has such heavy traffic.  
35

36 There was brief discussion between Director Cardenas and Mr. Christensen about the language  
37 involving the spaces between buildings. Mr. Christensen clarified that his intention was to include  
38 any spaces exceeding 10 feet in width as open space. Director Cardenas stated that staff would  
39 clarify that in the language.  
40

41 Chair Pro Tempore opened the public hearing and reminded the public that the Planning  
42 Commission would be making a decision regarding the proposed overlay and not the site plan.

1  
2 Jim Miller, from Karma Holdings, LLC, stated that the overlay was being sold to the City by  
3 promoting the potential tax revenue. At the previous meeting, it was stated that there were no  
4 other plausible uses for the property, but Mr. Miller disagreed. He stated that the overlay is all  
5 about density and economics, and he was opposed to it. Mr. Miller also feared that parking would  
6 be insufficient, and it would greatly affect surrounding businesses.

7  
8 Gordon Jacobsen, a resident, reported that he works for Collier Commercial as a realtor. He  
9 compared this area of Pleasant Grove to other development tech hubs in the County, and he  
10 encouraged the City to welcome this kind of development. Other communities are providing  
11 walkable, mixed-used developments, with great success. Mr. Jacobsen felt that the proposed  
12 density of 25 units per acre was actually quite low. During the presentation, Mr. Christensen  
13 indicated that all of the office uses in The Grove Zone were bringing in 11,000 people every day,  
14 which means that the businesses are bringing in that many cars every day. This kind of  
15 development could help capture some of that traffic and reduce the need for employees to drive  
16 in. He remarked that it would be foolish to overlook this opportunity.

17  
18 Rick Radley gave his address as 1458 East 300 South and stated that he owns a number of  
19 commercial properties in the area. He noted that parking is always their biggest issue because uses  
20 change. He emphasized the need to retain green open space, which is a community asset.  
21 Mr. Radley's greatest concerns were parking, green space, and the allowed height.

22  
23 Kevin Crawford did not object to the overlay except for the parking. He worked with emergency  
24 services for 35 years and tight roads and overparking always cause problems for them. The reality  
25 is that people will end up parking on the street if it is closer to their destination. Although there  
26 was a need for housing in the community, they should reduce parking to accommodate it.

27  
28 Craig Yuzon gave his address as 210 South 1300 West and commented that a former Pleasant  
29 Grove Mayor intended for the City to be a bedroom community and now they are behind in  
30 developing projects that generate tax revenue. Mr. Yuzon was not in favor of developing valuable  
31 commercial property into something that does not produce tax revenue, including this potential  
32 project. He also had concerns about parking and the high water table.

33  
34 Director Cardenas commented that under the current zoning, the property could be developed into  
35 office buildings, which generate no revenue for the City. The proposal would require any  
36 development to have retail uses.

37  
38 Steven Christensen, father of the applicant, reported that he had been in the business of commercial  
39 and retail building for over 40 years. The shape of the subject property was not easy to develop  
40 and the cost of including the road was a large burden for any developer. Mr. Christensen  
41 commented on the structured parking the applicant would be providing, which is unlike anything  
42 else in the City. He remarked that The Grove Zone is a treasure and this development will fit in

1 well there. If the property were to develop with just office uses, the traffic problem would only  
2 increase. He commented that the master-planned villages could be really beautiful places to live,  
3 work, and play, and will take the pressure off the parking.  
4

5 There were no further public comments. Chair Pro Tempore Steele closed the public hearing.  
6

7 Chair Pro Tempore Steele addressed some of his concerns, beginning with the applicability of the  
8 ordinance. The current proposal limited the overlay to the properties over five acres in size along  
9 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, which really limited it to this one property. He asked if there was value  
10 in opening that up to properties along North County Boulevard as well.  
11

12 Commissioner Blake thought they should not limit the overlay just to Pleasant Grove Boulevard,  
13 particularly because she felt that this kind of development may not be appropriate for the subject  
14 property. She was concerned about the traffic problems that already exist.  
15

16 Commissioner Phillips felt there was value in the proposed overlay. While the City needs more  
17 residential development, he certainly would not sacrifice the space to residential without the retail  
18 requirement.  
19

20 Commissioner Hawkins identified the areas of greatest congestion along Pleasant Grove  
21 Boulevard on an aerial map and stated that this development will certainly add to that. He stated  
22 that five acres might be too small for this kind of development and suggested they consider  
23 increasing the minimum acreage requirement. Director Cardenas stated that the subject property  
24 is just over 10 acres in size.  
25

26 Commissioner Blake agreed with Commissioner Phillips' comments about the economic benefit  
27 of this kind of project but stated that that isn't the only element they need to consider. The  
28 population growth is coming, and the City needs to find a way to accommodate it.  
29

30 Director Cardenas presented an image of The Grove Zone and identified potential areas that the  
31 overlay could be applied to if they opened it up to North County Boulevard.  
32

33 Commissioner Phillips commented that only recently did the City make a real attempt to bring  
34 retail into the City. He noted that there are enough rooftops here to support any incoming retail  
35 uses. The City needs to make plans for the growth that could inevitably come to Pleasant Grove,  
36 and he felt that this kind of development made sense.  
37

38 Commissioner Hawkins reiterated that the five-acre minimum is too small and felt that this should  
39 be increased to 10 acres. He could envision two of three developments of this size happening in  
40 The Grove Zone. Increasing the size would give the City more control in terms of where the  
41 overlay could be applied.  
42

1 Commissioner Butler liked the proposal as he did when it was first presented. He spoke of his  
2 experiences with mixed-use developments in other states and stated that they were successful. He  
3 did feel that the ordinance language was incomplete and that they need to better address open  
4 space, parking, and height.

5  
6 Chair Pro Tempore Steele initiated a discussion about setbacks and Director Cardenas clarified  
7 that the setback measurement begins at the back of curb, so it includes the park strip and sidewalk.  
8 Mr. Christensen was under the impression that the measurement started at the back of the sidewalk.  
9 With that clarification, it was determined that the intended project would fit within the current  
10 setback requirements in the Code.

11  
12 There was a discussion regarding usable open space, and Ms. Henry said that the City currently  
13 allows plazas and other hardscape areas to be included in the open space calculation, so the open  
14 space percentage was different from the landscaping percentage. She stated that trails over six feet  
15 wide also count as open space. Director Cardenas commented that staff did not feel that the setback  
16 area should be included in the open space calculation. He confirmed that rooftop amenities could  
17 be counted as open space.

18  
19 Chair Pro Tempore Steele asked the Planning Commission how they felt about the proposed  
20 increase in building height. Director Cardenas explained that there were two different types of  
21 buildings addressed in the ordinance: mixed-use and strictly residential. The applicant was  
22 proposing to increase the limit for residential buildings from 40 feet to 45 feet and staff was not  
23 concerned with that increase. The current Code limitation for mixed-use buildings was three  
24 stories or 40 feet, whichever is less. The applicant was proposing to increase that to four stories  
25 or 56 feet.

26  
27 There was a question raised regarding the wetlands on the property. Director Beaumont stated that  
28 there was only a small section of wetlands, and that would be used as a detention pond and park.  
29 In terms of the ground supporting the building, Director Beaumont said that this would be  
30 mitigated during the site plan approval process. Ms. Henry commented that the current Code  
31 allows commercial buildings to be 65 feet in height, and that can be extended to 100 feet with a  
32 Conditional Use Permit.

33  
34 Chair Pro Tempore Steele addressed parking, which was proposed to be two stalls for two and  
35 three-bedroom units and 1.5 stalls for one-bedroom units. Staff suggested that the one-bedroom  
36 ratio be increased to 1.5 stalls.

37  
38 Commissioner Blake was comfortable with 1.75 stalls per unit, but nothing lower than that. She  
39 also felt that there needed to be some requirement for visitor parking. Director Cardenas  
40 commented that the current Code does not have a specific requirement for visitor parking, but staff  
41 works with each developer on what they should provide. Chair Pro Tempore Steele suggested that

1 staff look at other communities in the area and see how much visitor parking they have, and  
2 whether that number is sufficient.

3  
4 Director Cardenas briefly described joint parking agreements and stated that many office and retail  
5 uses are not open all day, so there would be opportunities for residential parking. He felt that joint  
6 parking agreements would tremendously help this applicant's proposal. He reminded the  
7 Commission that language for joint parking agreements is already in the Code.

8  
9 Commissioner Blake expressed concern that the retail uses will all be late-night uses and possibly  
10 some 24-hour facilities. Director Cardenas explained that staff approves incoming retail based on  
11 available parking for master planned developments like this. If there isn't enough parking for the  
12 use, it is not approved.

13  
14 Chair Pro Tempore Steele suggested that the Commission lay out their concerns and continue the  
15 item to allow staff to incorporate them into the ordinance proposal. Director Cardenas  
16 recommended that they make a recommendation of denial or a recommendation of approval with  
17 conditions addressing their concerns. If the City Council approves the request, staff could sit down  
18 and craft the ordinance language using the suggested changes. If the City Council denies the  
19 request, the ordinance would not continue, and staff would have saved valuable time.

20  
21 Commissioner Blake liked this kind of development but still was not sure it was right for the  
22 subject property. Her underlying concern was adding residential development to Pleasant Grove  
23 Boulevard.

24  
25 Commissioner Butler liked the proposal because it allows for more pedestrian use and has worked  
26 in other areas. This was visionary for Pleasant Grove and may be the highest and best use of the  
27 subject property, which had sat vacant for decades.

28  
29 There was a discussion regarding the Transportation Masterplan, and the most recent study for the  
30 area, which was done nine years ago. Director Beaumont did not feel that this development would  
31 alter that study very much. The study shows that Pleasant Grove Boulevard would become a four-  
32 lane street, and there was only one section that was still two-lanes.

33  
34 After some discussion, the Planning Commission determined that they wanted to open up the  
35 overlay to properties along North County Boulevard, increasing the minimum acreage to 10 acres,  
36 and follow staff's recommendation of 1.75 parking stalls for one-bedroom units. They also wanted  
37 staff to clarify what qualifies as open space.

38  
39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Hawkins moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the  
40 City Council APPROVE the request of McKay Christensen for the proposed amendments to City  
41 Code Chapter 13: Overlay Zones; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the  
42 staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

1. Acreage is a minimum of 10 acres.
2. Applicable to properties with frontage on North County Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
3. Clarify usable open spaces.
4. Follow staff's recommendation for parking at the site, requiring two (2) stalls for two- and three- bedroom units, and 1.75 stalls for one-bedroom units.
5. Proposed height to be accepted.
6. Spaces between buildings must be a minimum of 25 feet to be counted as usable open space.

Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**ITEM 9** – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the June 14, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved to APPROVE the minutes from the June 14, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved to adjourn. Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly Evans, Planning Assistant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved