



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

PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
February 8, 2018

PRESENT: Vice Chair Drew Armstrong, Commissioners Sam Sanderson, Jon Hawkins, Lisa Coombs, Jennifer Baptista, Matt Nydegger, and Dustin Phillips

EXCUSED: Chair Peter Steele and Commissioner Garth Lovell

STAFF: Community Development Director Daniel Cardenas, City Planner Julie Henry, Staff Engineer Mario Gonzalez, and Planning Tech Barbara Johnson

In the absence of Chair Steele, Vice Chair Armstrong opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

1. Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Coombs led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Opening Remarks: Commissioner Sanderson gave the opening remarks.

3. Agenda Approval:

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

4. Staff Reports:

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

5. Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from Commission Members: There were none.

1 **ITEM 1** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Ryan Litke for a Preliminary Subdivision
2 Plat called Clear Lake Warehouse Condominiums Plat A Amended that Includes 12 Commercial
3 Lots within Two Buildings, on Property Located at 564 West 700 South in the M-D
4 (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**

5
6 *NOTE: Items 1 and 2 were discussed simultaneously.*
7

8 City Planner, Julie Henry, presented the staff reports for Items 1 and 2 together since they involved
9 the same applicant and overall development. She displayed an aerial photograph of the property
10 and identified the locations of the proposed buildings. The entire property is roughly 8.2 acres in
11 size. Ms. Henry explained that Plat A had already been approved and recorded, but there was a
12 mistake in the recorded language. The amended plat would correct the language, but no other
13 changes would be made. She noted that the site plan for the Plat was approved in 2016 and found
14 to meet all requirements of the zone. Ms. Henry then presented Plat B and explained that the plat
15 had not yet been recorded, although the site plan was also previously approved. Staff
16 recommended approval of both plats.
17

18 Dustin Cutler, the applicant from Skyline Holdings Group, gave the business address as 90 East
19 Main Street in Lehi. Mr. Cutler reported that the first two buildings in the development had already
20 been sold. He identified the owners and how they would be using their units.
21

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

25 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission forward a
26 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Ryan Litke, for the Subdivision Plat called
27 Clear Lake Warehouse Condominiums Plat A Amended on property at 564 West 700 South, in the
28 M-D (Manufacturing Distribution) zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained
29 in the staff report and as modified by the conditions below:
30

- 31 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
32

33 Commissioner Sanderson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
34 The motion carried.
35

36 **ITEM 2** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Ryan Litke for a Preliminary Subdivision
37 Plat called Clear Lake Warehouse Condominiums Plat B that Includes 12 Commercial Lots within
38 Two Buildings, on Property Located at 500 West 700 South in the M-D (Manufacturing
39 Distribution) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD**
40

41 *NOTE: Items 1 and 2 were discussed simultaneously.*
42

43 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission forward a
44 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Ryan Litke, for the Subdivision Plat called
45 Clear Lake Warehouse Condominiums Plat B on property at approximately 550 West 700 South,

1 in the M-D (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings
2 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 Nydegger seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
7 The motion carried.
8

9 **ITEM 3 – Public Hearing to Consider a Request of Evergreen Development for a Proposed Site**
10 **Plan for a New Multi-Tenant Retail Building, on Property Located at 855 West State Street in the**
11 **CS-2 (Commercial Sales-2) Zone. SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
12

13 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding a proposed site plan for a multi-tenant retail building
14 at the address listed above. The subject property currently houses a vacant Sonic building, which
15 would be demolished to make way for the proposed building. Ms. Henry presented the elevations
16 and designs for the proposed building, even though there weren’t any design guidelines for the
17 CS-2 zone. The applicant had already contracted two tenants for the three-tenant building: Beans
18 and Brews (with drive thru) and Mo’ Bettahs Hawaiian Style barbeque restaurant. Ms. Henry then
19 explained how parking was calculated and stated that the Code requires 35 stalls for the
20 development. The applicant would be providing 39 parking stalls. Staff recommended approval
21 of the application.
22

23 The applicant, Erica Baster from Evergreen Development, stated that they were excited to develop
24 in Utah. Previously, the company developed property in Arizona, Colorado, and Southern
25 California. This would be their first project in Utah. Ms. Baster reported that they had been
26 working in closer partnership with 4 Foods Group and the Amsource, the owner of the shopping
27 mall and Walgreens. Their design and material of their building would be consistent with the
28 surrounding developments. Ms. Baster also reported that they have a Cross Parking Agreement
29 with the surrounding shopping areas, so parking will not be an issue. They plan to begin
30 construction in April.
31

32 Vice Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Vice Chair
33 Armstrong closed the public hearing.
34

35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request
36 of Evergreen Development for the proposed site plan on property located at 855 W State Street in
37 the CS-2 (Commercial Sales-2) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained
38 in the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:
39

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

42 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
43 The motion carried.
44

1 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of David Runnells to Create an Overlay Zone**
2 **that Provides for Flexibility in Creating Master-Planned Communities that Incorporate**
3 **Commercial and Mixed Use Buildings as well as a Variety of Housing Types. CITY WIDE**
4 ****Continued from the January 25, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting.***
5

6 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, explained that the proposed amendment will
7 create a new overlay that can be applied City wide. He reminded the Planning Commission that
8 the discussion should not be about the applicant’s potential development. Mr. Cardenas gave a
9 background of the issue and explained that the Grove Zone has three subdistricts: the Interchange
10 Subdistrict, the Commercial Sale Subdistrict, and the Mixed Housing Subdistrict. Residential was
11 only allowed in the Mixed Housing Subdistrict. Mr. Cardenas explained that the applicant owns
12 21.67 acres of land in both the Mixed Housing Subdistrict and the Commercial Sale Subdistrict.
13 The applicant intends to apply the new overlay to the entire property so that the project can be
14 developed with a mix of uses and housing types. He noted that the overlay would not increase the
15 density already allowed in the Mixed Housing Subdistrict.
16

17 Mr. Cardenas reported that the application was presented to the Planning Commission previously,
18 and they requested a greater requirement for open space. The new language would require 10%
19 landscaping in the residential areas and 30% in commercial areas. The applicant was also
20 proposing new percentages for different uses and housing types allowed in the overlay. The
21 overlay, as written, would allow the applicant to have 260 residential units on the property.
22

23 Mr. Cardenas noted that a project was approved for the subject property in 2007, known as Copper
24 Leaf. The project would have followed the existing zoning and would have contained 168
25 residential units.
26

27 Commissioner Baptista was concerned that the proposal allowed for office spaces to have 50%
28 warehouse use.
29

30 Commissioner Phillips asked where the overlay could be applied elsewhere in the City.
31 Mr. Cardenas stated that the overlay could only be applied to properties of 20 acres or more, and
32 there weren’t many developable properties of that size left in Pleasant Grove. If the Commission
33 preferred to limit the overlay to The Grove Zone, they could add language to the ordinance.
34

35 Vice Chair Armstrong commented that the purpose of the Grove Zone was to bring commercial,
36 and a sales tax base into the City. They incentivized that by allowing mixed use projects in the
37 Downtown area. He was concerned that this project did not meet that purpose.
38

39 The applicant, Larry Myler was present representing David Runnell and gave his address as 1077
40 South Rippling Bay, in South Jordan.
41

42 Commissioner Hawkins was concerned about the number of residential units being proposed,
43 which was a significant increase from the Copper Leaf project. He asked the applicant what the
44 economic benefit was for him in increasing the units.
45

1 Mr. Myler stated that they would do more retail on the property if they felt that retail would be
2 successful. Retail tenants do not want to have space without visibility from State Street. The plan
3 was to have two rows of retail along State Street, but potential tenants were not willing to take the
4 second row of retail units.

5
6 Vice Chair Armstrong was not concerned about the benefit to the developer because the City
7 wanted to see development on the property and they need people who are willing to invest in it.
8 His concern was that The Grove Zone was built to bring in a commercial tax base and this plan
9 had a major reduction in retail even from the previously approved development. He had no
10 problem with the number of residential units as long as there is enough retail to balance that. He
11 also had a difficult time accepting that they cannot have retail off of State Street.

12
13 Mr. Myler stated that they had spoken to a lot of retailers and there was no interest in that. To
14 create more retail space, they included a section of live-work units. They felt that live-work
15 situations would be the right intensity for that section of the development.

16
17 Vice Chair Armstrong liked the potential development but realized that many of the City Council
18 Members were not amenable to high-density projects. They need to provide a larger amount of
19 retail to compensate for the increased residential. Commissioner Phillips added that the citizenry
20 was adamant about having more commercial in the City for the tax base, and the City Council was
21 feeling that pressure.

22
23 Commissioner Hawkins disagreed and felt there were too many residential units. He asked the
24 applicant if he had shown the site plan to the potential retail tenants. He wondered if they would
25 receive a better response if they were presented with a plan that is more open, like the Copper Leaf
26 project. Mr. Myler commented that there were a few issues with the Copper Leaf design, and he
27 did not think it would have been successful then or now. One of the biggest problems they faced
28 was that they could not get a large anchor tenant to come into the development because of the
29 Walmart across the street. That plan would have struggled to maintain retail tenants in the smaller
30 units as well. The current design would invite restaurants and small, inline businesses, which is
31 more feasible for the property and the area.

32
33 Mr. Cardenas reminded the Planning Commission that the proposal was not for the project, but for
34 the overlay ordinance.

35
36 Commissioner Sanderson asked if there was some flexibility with the proposal to allow office
37 space to have 50% warehouse use. Mr. Myler stated that traditionally, uses with a large percentage
38 of warehouse were light manufacturing uses. They were, however, seeing a rise in the need for
39 small stores with large online sales. They needed a place to store their products before shipping
40 them, but there was no manufacturing involved.

41
42 Vice Chair Armstrong confirmed that there was an extremely high demand for that kind of space.
43 There was brief discussion about the economic feasibility of these types of uses. The discussion
44 then turned to live-work units. Vice Chair Armstrong stated that there was a development down
45 the street that sold 10 live work units within a few weeks. People are looking for small spaces for
46 their businesses.

1 Vice Chair Armstrong asked if it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to have a
2 special work session with the applicant to discuss the application. He wanted to be sure the
3 applicant presents something that the City Council would be amenable to. Commissioner Coombs
4 agreed. Mr. Cardenas stated that the Planning Commission could have a special meeting to hear
5 the application again, but they would not be allowed to sit down with the applicant and work on
6 his application.

7
8 Commissioner Baptista stated that they need to discuss the overlay proposal rather than the site
9 plan. Vice Chair Armstrong agreed but stated that this is likely the only property in the City that
10 the overlay could be applied to. It was important to help the applicant, so they do not have to keep
11 coming back and running out of time. He asked staff to draft their own version of the overlay
12 ordinance. Another concern was that staff would recommend 50% retail and 50% residential for
13 the site, which is not what the applicant wants to do. Vice Chair Armstrong agreed that 50/50
14 would not be feasible for the applicant. He commented that as the zoning currently stands, the
15 applicant could go in and legally develop all office buildings and residential, and the City would
16 have no power to enforce retail uses. Mr. Cardenas commented that staff would feel more
17 comfortable if the ordinance required 35% retail.

18
19 Commissioner Sanderson noted that the language specifies the retail percentage as a minimum and
20 the residential percentages as maximums. He asked if that language would allow enough
21 flexibility for the City. Mr. Cardenas stated that it allows the flexibility, but it is not enforceable.

22
23 Mr. Myler requested that the Planning Commission vote on the overlay ordinance to move things
24 forward. They could recommend approval subject to certain language changes, if they were
25 comfortable with that. With regard to an increase in retail percentage, Mr. Myler stated that they
26 could remove some of the residential units and increase the number of live-work units. Mr. Myler
27 wanted the opportunity to present the application to the City Council, even if they denied it.

28
29 Vice Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Vice Chair
30 Armstrong closed the public hearing.

31
32 Commissioner Baptista still was not completely comfortable with the warehouse percentage
33 proposed. There was discussion of limiting the size of the units so that the warehouse section is
34 small, which would eliminate the possibility of manufacturing. They decided to limit the size of
35 the retail space to 3,000 square feet total.

36
37 The Planning Commission discussed the appropriate retail percentage. It was determined that 50%
38 of the project needs to be commercial and 50% must be retail. Essentially, 25% of the overall
39 development needs to be retail.

40
41 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the
42 City Council APPROVE the request of David Runnells for the proposed amendments to City Code
43 Chapter 14: The Grove Zoning District; and the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the
44 staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:

1 1. A minimum of 50% of the area be commercial, and a minimum of 25% of the total area
2 shall be retail.

3
4 2. Office warehouse space: a maximum of 50% could be warehouse if the individual unit
5 does not exceed 3,000 square feet total.

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

9
10 **ITEM 5** – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the January 25, 2018 Planning Commission
11 Meetings.

12
13 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the minutes
14 from the January 25, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Coombs seconded the
15 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

16
17 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved to adjourn. Commissioner Coombs seconded the
18 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

19
20
21 The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

22
23 _____
24 Planning Commission Chair

25
26 _____
27 Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

28
29 _____
30 Date Approved