



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

PLEASANT GROVE CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
November 8, 2018

**PRESENT:** Chair Lisa Coombs, Vice Chair Sam Sanderson, Commissioners Peter Steele, Tamara Oborn, Dustin Phillips, and Jeffery Butler

**EXCUSED:** Commissioner Bobbi Jo Blake

**STAFF:** Community Development Director Daniel Cardenas, City Planner Julie Henry, Staff Engineer Shaun Hilton, Planning Assistant Kelly Evans

**Work Session**

Chair Coombs opened the Work Session at 6:30 p.m.

*NOTE: The audio began at 6:45 p.m.*

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, led a discussion regarding the recent request to allow a distillery use in the MD Zone. The Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the use, but not the tasting room. Director Cardenas noted that the City Council will likely request more qualifying provisions for the use, and then the item will come back to the Planning Commission for review. The applicant would also address the tasting room with the City Council.

Director Cardenas briefly addressed Item 2 on the agenda regarding side yard setbacks. He explained that the current ordinance requires a side yard setback of at least 10 feet for all residential homes. In the past, some homes were built with much smaller setbacks, which are now considered non-conforming structures. When an owner wants to add to a non-conforming structure, the petition needs to be heard by the Planning Commission and the addition needs to meet the same setback as the non-conforming home.

**Regular Session**

Chair Coombs opened the Regular Session at 7:00 p.m.

1  
2 **Commission Business:**

3  
4 **1. Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Oborn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

5  
6 **2. Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Phillips gave the opening remarks.

7  
8 **3. Agenda Approval:**

- 9  
10 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Sanderson moved to APPROVE the agenda as part of  
11 public record. Commissioner Oborn seconded the motion. The Commissioners  
12 unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

13  
14 **4. Staff Reports:**

- 15  
16 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to APPROVE the staff reports as part of  
17 the public record. Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The  
18 Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

19  
20 **5. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members:** Commissioner  
21 Phillips declared a conflict with Item 2.

22  
23 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing to Consider a Request of Karen Aland for a Conditional Use Permit to**  
24 **Allow a Fence, Eight Feet in Height, Along the North and East Property Lines of a Property**  
25 **Located at 75 South 500 East in the R1-7 (Single-Family Residential Zone. SCRATCH**  
26 **GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD**

27  
28 City Planner, Julie Henry, presented the staff report regarding a Conditional Use Permit request  
29 for an eight-foot fence to be placed along the north and east property lines. The applicant was  
30 proposing a field fence to keep the deer out of her yard. With a Conditional Use Permit, the  
31 Planning Commission could allow a fence of up to 10 feet in height. Staff recommended approval  
32 of the request.

33  
34 Commissioner Sanderson asked if the applicant would need a building permit for the eight-foot  
35 fence. Ms. Henry stated that the International Building Code requires any fence over seven feet  
36 have a building permit.

37  
38 The applicant, Karen Aland, described the problems she has had with deer in her yard. Her  
39 concerns were the number of deer and the threat they pose to her dog and grandchildren. She was  
40 proposing to replace the fencing on the north property line and put up a new fence along the east  
41 property line to screen the irrigation ditch.

1 Commissioner Butler asked why she was only replacing part of her fence. Mrs. Aland stated that  
2 she cannot afford to replace all of the fencing at this time.

3  
4 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed  
5 the public hearing.

6  
7 **MOTION:** Commissioner Oborn moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request  
8 of Karen Aland for a Conditional Use Permit to allow field fencing, eight feet in height, along the  
9 north and east property lines of a property located at 75 South 500 East in the R1-7 (Single-Family  
10 Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report,  
11 and as modified by the conditions below:

12  
13 1. A building permit for the eight-foot sections of fence shall be obtained before any  
14 construction takes place.

15  
16 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

17  
18 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
19 motion carried.

20  
21 **ITEM 2** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Michelle Miller for a Conditional Use Permit  
22 to Allow the Expansion of a Nonconforming Single-Family Dwelling on Property Located at 1243  
23 West 1800 North in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. **NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD**

24  
25 *NOTE: Commissioner Phillips was excused from the meeting.*

26  
27 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding the Conditional Use Permit request to allow the  
28 expansion of a non-conforming single-family dwelling at the address listed above. When the home  
29 was built in 1990, the Code required that the two side yard setbacks combined equal 20 feet. In  
30 this case, the side yard setback on one side is 8.5 feet. The applicant wanted to add an addition  
31 that would square up the building and the addition would follow the existing side yard setback.  
32 Ms. Henry presented the five standards that must be met in order to grant an addition for a non-  
33 conforming structure. It was noted that the application meets them all. Staff recommended  
34 approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

35  
36 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed  
37 the public hearing.

38  
39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request  
40 of Michelle Miller for a Conditional Use Permit for an addition to a non-conforming building  
41 located at 1243 West 1800 North in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the

1 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions  
2 below:

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

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

8  
9 *NOTE: Commissioner Phillips rejoined the meeting.*

10  
11 **ITEM 3** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Mark Johnson for a One-Lot Consolidated  
12 Preliminary Subdivision Plat called Grovecrest Business Plat “A” on Property Located at 844  
13 South 800 West in the Business and Manufacturing Park (BMP) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE**  
14 **NEIGHBORHOOD**

15  
16 *NOTE: Items 3 and 4 were discussed simultaneously.*

17  
18 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding the preliminary subdivision plat and site plan for  
19 the property at the address listed above. the property is 5.96 acres in size and is located on the  
20 border between Pleasant Grove and Lindon in the BMP Zone. The proposed lot meets the Code  
21 requirements for size and frontage. The BMP zone did not require an exact measurement for lot  
22 width, but requires there be enough space to fit the building, a driveway access to the rear of the  
23 property, and a landscape strip next to the drive access. The subject property is 750 feet wide,  
24 which is more than sufficient to accommodate the requirements. Ms. Henry presented the  
25 proposed site plan and identified the building and driveway. The 98,400 square-foot building will  
26 be a warehouse/office use and meets all of the requirements of the zone. With regard to parking,  
27 Ms. Henry stated that the proposal far exceeds any requirement she was aware of. They would be  
28 providing 200 stalls. She presented the landscaping plan and noted that they will be providing  
29 17% landscaping, 74 trees, two picnic tables, and four benches. Staff recommended approval of  
30 the application.

31  
32 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed  
33 the public hearing.

34  
35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission forward a  
36 recommendation of APPROVAL to the Public Works Director for the request of Mark Johnson  
37 for a one-lot commercial subdivision plat called Grovecrest Business Park Plat “A”, on property  
38 located at 844 South 800 West, in the Business and Manufacturing Park Zone; and adopt the  
39 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition  
40 below:

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

1  
2 Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.  
3 The motion carried.  
4

5 **ITEM 4** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Mark Johnson for Approval of a Proposed  
6 Site Plan for a New Office/Warehouse Building on Property Located at 844 South 800 West in the  
7 Business and Manufacturing Park (BMP) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**  
8

9 *NOTE: Items 3 and 4 were discussed simultaneously.*  
10

11 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the proposed  
12 site plan for Grovecrest Business Park on property located at 844 South 800 West, in the Business  
13 and Manufacturing Park Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the  
14 staff report, and as modified by the condition below:  
15

- 16 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.  
17

18 Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.  
19 The motion carried.  
20

21 **ITEM 5** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Patricio Hinojosa for a One-Lot Consolidated  
22 Preliminary Subdivision Plat called Pleasant Grove Town Center Plat “C”, on Property Located at  
23 172 S. Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the Commercial Sales – 2 (CS-2) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S**  
24 **LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**  
25

26 *NOTE: Items 5 and 6 were discussed simultaneously.*  
27

28 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding the preliminary subdivision and site plan for the  
29 property located at the address above. The subject property is 0.676 acres in size and is located  
30 primarily in the CS-2 Zone. The current plat consists of three lots. The proposal would vacate  
31 one lot and consolidate the other two with a few smaller parcels. The new plat would also remove  
32 a utility easement that currently runs through the middle of the property and replace it with the  
33 standard public utility easement of 10 feet around all property lines. The proposed subdivision  
34 was determined to meet or exceed all zone requirements. Staff recommended approval. Ms. Henry  
35 noted that a variance was granted for the property for the front setback earlier this year.  
36

37 Ms. Henry presented that proposed site plan depicting two buildings. The larger building will  
38 serve as a sales office and it will have three vehicle bays. The second building will have two bays.  
39 Most of the parking area will remain unstriped because the owner intends to have a car dealership  
40 and park the cars in tandem. A portion of striped parking will be reserved for customer parking  
41 and they will meet ADA requirements. Ms. Henry explained that the access shown on the site plan

1 is 17 feet wide, but staff determined that the access should be 28 feet wide. Staff recommended  
2 approval of the site plan.

3  
4 Commissioner Butler inquired about the hours of operation for the sales use. Ms. Henry stated  
5 that they had not discussed that as part of this application. Commissioner Butler stated that there  
6 was a school bus stop on the corner and he was concerned about the safety of the students. He  
7 was also concerned that the proposed fencing was not sufficient.

8  
9 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed  
10 the public hearing.

11  
12 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission forward a  
13 recommendation of APPROVAL to the Public Works Director for the request of Patricio Hinojosa  
14 for a one-lot commercial subdivision plat called Pleasant Grove Town Center Plat “C”, on property  
15 located at 172 S. Pleasant Grove Boulevard, in the Commercial Sales – 2 Zone; and adopt the  
16 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the condition  
17 below:

- 18  
19 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

20  
21 Commissioner Oborn seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
22 motion carried.

23  
24 **ITEM 6 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Patricio Hinojosa for Approval of a Proposed**  
25 **Site Plan for Two New Buildings Associated with Automobile Sales and Repair on Property**  
26 **Located at 172 S. Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the Commercial Sales – 2 (CS-2) Zone. SAM**  
27 **WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**

28  
29 *NOTE: Items 5 and 6 were discussed simultaneously.*

30  
31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Oborn moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request  
32 of Patricio Hinojosa for the proposed site plan on property located at 172 South Pleasant Grove  
33 Boulevard in the Commercial Sales – 2 Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings  
34 contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:

- 35  
36 1. The width of the access driveway meets the minimum requirement of City Code of 28 feet.  
37  
38 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

39  
40 Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioners Steele, Phillips,  
41 Oborn, Sanderson, and Chair Coombs voted Aye; Commissioner Butler voted Nay. The motion  
42 carried, 5-to-1.

1  
2 **ITEM 7** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Lance Miller to Amend the Vicinity Plan for  
3 the Future Local Road Layout Affecting Properties on the East Side of 600 West from 2124 North  
4 to 1800 North in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. **NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD**  
5

6 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding the proposal for an amended vicinity plan and  
7 identified the affected area on an aerial map. The applicant owns a portion of property that is 3.7  
8 acres in size. All of the properties in the area are zoned R-R, and they have large animal rights.  
9 Ms. Henry explained that a vicinity plan was put in place to ensure that development does not  
10 negatively impact a neighbors' ability to develop their land in the future. She presented the current  
11 vicinity plan and the proposed vicinity plan, which contain three cul-de-sacs. In City Code, cul-  
12 de-sacs are the exception rather than the norm. Cul-de-sacs should only be used where there are  
13 unusual drainage situations or land ownership configurations that make thru-streets difficult. Staff  
14 was not aware of any unusual drainage considerations in this area or land ownership issues. The  
15 applicant submitted a concept subdivision with six lots. Under the current vicinity plan, they could  
16 get five lots in a subdivision. Staff recommended denial of the application.  
17

18 Staff Engineer, Shaun Hilton, noted that maintenance of cul-de-sacs are more difficult than thru  
19 streets. When a water line needs to be repaired, it is difficult to keep all of the neighbors in service  
20 while repairs were being made.  
21

22 Ms. Henry stated that thru-streets also encourage connectivity and a sense of community.  
23

24 Commissioner Butler asked if a cul-de-sac is more costly for the City. Engineer Hilton responded  
25 that cost is not much of an issue.  
26

27 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing.  
28

29 Rue Nelson gave his address as 2124 North 600 West and asked how the subdivision will affect  
30 irrigation to the surrounding properties. He also asked if they addressed the exiting storm drain  
31 on the site. Engineer Hilton explained that these issues will be addressed during the site plan  
32 process. Staff will work closely with the Pleasant Grove Irrigation Company to ensure that  
33 everything works properly.  
34

35 Mary Nelson, who resides at 2124 North 600 West, asked how the subdivision will impact her  
36 property. Currently, they do not have curb and gutter along their frontage. Ms. Henry stated that  
37 this application is only for a proposed vicinity plan. If the applicant were to advance to the  
38 subdivision process, they would be required to install curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the entire  
39 frontage of the property. The subdivision will not affect Mrs. Nelson's property in that way. In  
40 the proposed vicinity plan, the Nelson property would be developed into a cul-de-sac instead of  
41 the current thru-street design.  
42

1 Ms. Nelson stated that she would prefer the existing vicinity plan.

2

3 Max Blackham gave his address as 2024 North 600 West and asked for clarification on the term  
4 “unusual drainage”. Engineer Hilton explained that there may be drainage issues that warrant a  
5 cul-de-sac rather than at thru-street. There were no unusual drainage issues on the property, so  
6 staff did not feel that the cul-de-sac plan was the best option for the area. After continued  
7 explanations and discussion, Mr. Blackham stated that he likes cul-de-sacs because they are clean,  
8 quiet, and safe. He was in favor of the cul-de-sac design.

9

10 Mr. Nelson asked if the road has to be straight. Commissioner Steele responded that it does not.  
11 He explained that the vicinity plan lays out a general plan for the roadways, but the exact location  
12 of the roads is not set in stone.

13

14 Larry Miller, the father of the applicant, explained that their intention is to create a subdivision  
15 that is reasonably priced. The six-lot configuration made the best use of the land and keeps their  
16 costs low by not having to create stub streets to connect into neighboring properties. If they follow  
17 the current vicinity plan, their costs will increase by 30% to 40%, making their product  
18 unaffordable. If the City would entertain smaller lots, they may be able to come up with something  
19 even more feasible.

20

21 Ms. Henry stated that the General Plan designation for the area would allow them to rezone down  
22 to R1-20 zoning. Commissioner Steele noted that the City Council suggested they keep everything  
23 north of 2600 North as a rural designation. Mr. Miller was invited to speak with staff after the  
24 meeting.

25

26 There were no further public comments. Chair Coombs closed the public hearing.

27

28 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the  
29 City Council DENY the request of Lance Miller for a Vicinity Plan Amendment on property  
30 located at approximately 2024 North 600 West in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone, based on the  
31 following finding:

32

- 33 1. It is not impossible to maintain the current vicinity plan, and there are not unusual drainage  
34 problems to consider.

35

36 Commissioner Oborn seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
37 motion carried.

38

1 **ITEM 8** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Paul Washburn to Amend City Code Section  
2 10-12B-7: Yard Requirements. The Proposed Amendment Aims to Reduce Side Yard Setbacks  
3 for Narrow Lots in the Manufacturing Distribution (MD) Zone. **MANUFACTURING**  
4 **DISTRIBUTION ZONE**

5  
6 Director Cardenas stated that the Commission discussed the application at the previous meeting,  
7 and staff had made adjustments to the applicant’s proposed language addressing side yard setbacks  
8 for narrow lots. The new language would read:

9  
10 (f) Narrow Lots: Lots that are legally established and have an average width of less than  
11 110 feet may be eligible for a side yard setback reduction. Such lots may be granted a  
12 minimum setback of eight (8) feet on one side and zero (0) foot setback on the opposite  
13 side, front and rear yard setbacks will remain unchanged. In order to obtain the side yard  
14 reduction, the developer shall provide enhanced landscaping by increasing the number of  
15 trees and shrubs by at least 50% over the existing landscaping requirements.

16  
17 Director Cardenas was unable to properly address Commissioner Steele’s concern about creating  
18 narrow alleyway between the narrow lots, because some of the properties were already developed.

19  
20 The applicant, Paul Washburn, expressed appreciation for Director Cardenas in working with him  
21 on this application. He was comfortable with the changes proposed by staff.

22  
23 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed  
24 the public hearing.

25  
26 **MOTION:** Commissioner Oborn moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City  
27 Council APPROVE the request of Paul Washburn for the proposed amendments to City Code  
28 Section 10-12B-7: Yard Requirements; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained  
29 in the staff report. Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The Commissioners  
30 unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion passed.

31  
32 **ITEM 9** – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the October 25, 2018 Planning Commission  
33 Meeting.

34  
35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to APPROVE the minutes from the October 25, 2018  
36 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The  
37 Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

38  
39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved to adjourn. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion.  
40 The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

1 The meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

2

3

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

5

6

7 \_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

8

9

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