



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
August 23, 2018

PRESENT: Chair Lisa Coombs, Vice Chair Sam Sanderson, Commissioners Peter Steele, Bobbi Jo Blake, Tamara Oborn, Jeffrey Butler, and Jon Hawkins

ABSENT: Commissioners Matt Nydegger and Dustin Phillips

STAFF: Community Development Director Daniel Cardenas, City Planner Julie Henry, Staff Engineer Shaun Hilton, Planning Tech Barbara Johnson

Chair Coombs opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

1. Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Butler 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 Sanderson seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

4. Staff Reports:

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to APPROVE the staff reports as part of the public record. Commissioner Blake 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 Bryn Smith for a Conditional Use Permit to
2 Construct an Accessory Structure with a Footprint Exceeding 900 square feet. The Applicant is
3 Proposing a Garage in the Rear yard with a Maximum Footprint of 1,350 square feet on the
4 Property Located at 925 North Mahogany Drive in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone.
5 **MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD** *Continued from the August 9, 2018 Meeting.
6

7 *NOTE: Items 1 and 2 were discussed simultaneously.*
8

9 City Planner, Julie Henry, presented two Conditional Use Permit requests submitted by Bryn Smith
10 for an accessory garage. She displayed the site plan and identified the location of the proposed
11 garage. The proposed height of the structure was 21'6". It was noted that any accessory structure
12 in excess of 18 feet in height requires a Conditional Use Permit. Ms. Henry then showed the floor
13 plan of the proposed structure and addressed the second conditional use request. She explained
14 that accessory structures are limited to 10% of the lot area of the zone but can go up to 15% with
15 a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed structure will be 1,320 square feet, which is just under
16 15% of the lot area of the R1-9 zone. The application was determined to meet all requirements of
17 the zone, with the exception of the requirement that 30% of each wall must be covered with a
18 material that matches the existing home. Staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use
19 Permit request.
20

21 Commissioner Blake noted that the staff report specifies that the structure must be incidental to
22 the footprint of the primary dwelling. She asked if the proposal meets that requirement. Ms. Henry
23 explained that the footprint of the home, minus the attached garage, exceeds the size of the
24 proposed structure.
25

26 The applicant, Bryn Smith, noted that there were many accessory structures in the neighborhood
27 that he could see from his back yard. None of them matched the materials of the primary dwelling.
28 He presented photographs of what the structure would look like.
29

30 Commissioner Butler asked about the elevation difference between the home and the location of
31 the proposed garage. Mr. Smith explained that there is a 17.5-foot slope from the front curb to the
32 back of the property. The top of the garage will be substantially lower than the top of the home.
33

34 Commissioner Blake asked the applicant why he was not complying with the requirement to match
35 exterior materials. Mr. Smith explained that he did not have a problem with matching materials,
36 but he intends to change the siding of the home eventually because it is out dated. If he were to
37 match the materials that are currently on the home, the accessory structure would not look very
38 good.
39

40 Commissioner Steele remarked that the Code does not require the materials be exactly the same,
41 but it is important to match the colors and tone of the building. This requirement was mostly
42 intended to rule out corrugated metal siding.

1
2 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed
3 the public hearing.
4

5 After a brief discussion regarding the motion, the Commission decided to allow the Community
6 Development Director to review the proposed exterior materials and ensure compliance with City
7 Code.
8

9 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request
10 of Bryn Smith for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an accessory structure with an area of 1,320
11 square feet on property located at 925 North Mahogany Drive in the R1-9 (Single-Family
12 Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report,
13 and as modified by the conditions below:
14

- 15 1. At the time of the building permit, staff will review the building material to ensure that it
16 complies with City Code.
17
- 18 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
19

20 Commissioner Blake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted “Aye”. The
21 motion carried.
22

23 **ITEM 2** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Bryn Smith for a Conditional Use Permit to
24 Allow an Accessory Structure Taller than 18 Feet, on Property Located at 925 North Mahogany
25 Drive in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD**
26 ****Continued from the August 9, 2018 Meeting.***
27

28 *NOTE: Items 1 and 2 were discussed simultaneously.*
29

30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
31 Conditional Use Permit to allow an accessory structure that is 21’6” in height on property located
32 at 925 N Mahogany Drive in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits,
33 conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:
34

- 35 1. At the time of the building permit, staff will review the building material to ensure that it
36 complies with City Code.
37
- 38 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
39

40 Commissioner Oborn seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted “Aye”. The
41 motion carried.
42

1 **ITEM 3 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Lychelle Day for a Conditional Use Permit**
2 **to Allow a Dance Studio on Property Located at 564 West 700 South, Building 1, in the MD**
3 **(Manufacturing Distribution) Zone. SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
4

5 Ms. Henry first presented the site plan for the business property and explained that all four
6 buildings share the same parking lot. The two buildings on the east side were completed and this
7 would be the last tenant improvement going in. The other two buildings were still being
8 constructed. When considering parking requirements for the dance studio, Ms. Henry found that
9 there were no specifications in the Code for this use. Instead, she used the parking requirements
10 for Private Educational Institution, which was one stall per staff member and one stall for every
11 three students, assuming that some students would be dropped off for class. Staff recommended
12 approval of the application.
13

14 The Commission asked if there would be any recitals held at the location. Ms. Henry did not
15 believe so. If the owner want to do something like that, she would have to work with the other
16 owners and the Owners’ Association to work out any parking concerns. Ms. Henry included two
17 conditions of approval for the Conditional Use Permit. The first limited parking to three employee
18 stalls and 18 stalls for students and their parents. The second condition ensured that the conditional
19 use only applied to this unit.
20

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

24 The Commission next discussed occupancy and parking. They were concerned that the proposed
25 conditions would limit how many students the owner could teach, and thus limit her profitability.
26 Ms. Henry discussed this condition with the applicant and they were in agreement. The condition
27 would limit the business to 18 students for now, but the applicant intended to come back before
28 the Commission with a Joint Parking Agreement with the neighboring use. Once that agreement
29 is approved, the owner could expand the number of students.
30

31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the request of
32 Lychelle Day for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a dancing school (#6835) on property located
33 564 West 700 South, Building 1, in the MD (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone; and adopt the
34 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions
35 below:
36

- 37 1. Parking stalls are limited to a total of 15 stalls, which limits the business to three staff and
38 18 students, or equivalent combination.
- 39
- 40 2. The conditional use applies only to the unit with parcel number 65:526:0103.
- 41
- 42 3. 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 Pleasant Grove City for a Preliminary
6 Subdivision Plat called Close to My Heart Plat “A” with One Lot and One Parcel on Property
7 Located at Approximately 1199 West 700 South in the BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park)
8 Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
9

10 Ms. Henry presented the staff report and explained that the entire property is nearly 50 acres in
11 size and owned by the scrapbooking company Close To My Heart. The proposed subdivision
12 would create one lot for future development and one parcel, which the City intended to purchase,
13 to create a regional detention pond for the City. She noted that Close To My Heart will be required
14 to install street improvements along their property when it further subdivides.
15

16 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed
17 the public hearing.
18

19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Oborn moved that the Planning Commission forward a
20 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Pleasant Grove City for the preliminary plat
21 called Close To My Heart Plat “A” on property located at approximately 1199 West 700 South, in
22 the BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings
23 contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:
24

- 25 1. Street improvements will be required upon further development of the property.
- 26
- 27 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
28

29 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted “Aye”. The
30 motion carried.
31

32 **ITEM 5** – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Bill Fairbanks for a Proposed Site Plan for
33 the Expansion of an Existing Office/Warehouse Building, on Property Located at 345 West 700
34 South, in the MD (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone. **SAM WHITE’S LANE**
35 **NEIGHBORHOOD.**
36

37 Ms. Henry presented the staff report regarding a proposed site plan to expand an existing
38 office/warehouse building in the MD Zone. She presented the proposed site plan and identified
39 the existing building. The expansion would increase the existing office space to 2,500 square feet
40 and the warehouse to 13,890 square feet. The proposal was determined to meet all requirements
41 for landscaping and parking. Staff recommended approval.
42

1 Commissioner Blake asked why there would be one additional tree in the front. Ms. Henry said
2 that the landscaping requirement in the zone was very vague. She had discussed landscaping with
3 the property owner and they agreed to this arrangement.
4

5 The applicant, Bill Fairbanks, reported that he had been working closely with the City as they
6 improved 700 South to ensure that his property had the sewer, water, and other utilities needed
7 without cutting into the road after it was finished. He confirmed that he had spoken with Public
8 Works and they would be including the sewer easement on the plat.
9

10 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed
11 the public hearing.
12

13 **MOTION:** Commissioner Sanderson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
14 request of Bill Fairbanks for the proposed site plan on property located at 345 West 700 South in
15 the MD (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings
16 contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:
17

- 18 1. Draft and record a Shared Parking Agreement between the subject property and Pleasant
19 Grove City.
- 20
- 21 2. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
22
- 23 3. Only additional vegetation is required.
24

25 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
26 The motion carried.
27

28 **ITEM 6 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Paul Washburn to Amend City Code Section**
29 **10-12B-7:B: Yard Requirements. The Proposed Amendment Would Allow an Applicant to**
30 **Reduce Side Yard Setbacks, Based on the Provision of Enhanced Landscaping to Another**
31 **Location on the Same Property, in the MD (Manufacturing Distribution) Zone.**
32 **MANUFACTURING DISTRIBUTION ZONE.**
33

34 Director Cardenas presented the staff report regarding the proposed amendment to the City Code
35 regulating yard setbacks in the MD Zone. He explained that there were several lots in the MD
36 zone that were historically agriculture and the lots are deep with small frontages. The current
37 setback requirements of the zone are 25 feet for the front, 20 feet for the rear, and 10 feet for the
38 side yards. It is difficult to develop the deeper lots under those circumstances. The applicant was
39 proposing to amend the City Code to allow a reduction in the side setback if they place additional
40 landscaping in another location on the lot or allow the owner to contribute the value of that
41 landscaping to the City for parks. The City Attorney advised against accepting monetary
42 contributions because it could become a tricky legal situation. Director Cardenas suggested that

1 the Commission discuss other options to amend the Code so that it would be beneficial to all lots
2 in the zone.

3
4 The applicant, Paul Washburn, explained that he wants to develop property in the MD zone, but
5 the lot is narrow. If he were to meet the existing Code requirements, there would only be enough
6 room for a trailer house. He argued that people do not develop in the MD Zone to enjoy beautiful
7 landscaping, so it would be beneficial to the City to take that landscaping and put it somewhere
8 that it could be enjoyed.

9
10 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing.

11
12 Kevin Crawford, a resident, asked if the reallocation of landscaping would be calculated by width
13 or square footage. Director Cardenas was open to either option. Mr. Crawford preferred square
14 footage.

15
16 Julie Smith, a resident, suggested that if they decided to accept money in lieu of landscaping, they
17 should calculate what the bond would be for that landscaped area and use that number.

18
19 Bill Fairbanks, a property owner, expressed his support for the application.

20
21 There were no further public comments. Chair Coombs closed the public hearing.

22
23 Commissioner Blake agreed that they should look at the setback requirements of the zone but she
24 did not think this was the right way to address the issue. She appreciated the applicant's desire to
25 improve the City.

26
27 Commissioner Steele suggested that they figure out the purpose of setback requirements in general,
28 and asked staff to speak with the Public Works Department about possible easements. Director
29 Cardenas stated that very few, if any, of the narrow lots in the MD Zone have easements, but he
30 was willing to speak with Public Works about it. Commissioner Steele suggested that they
31 consider eliminating one side setback.

32
33 Ms. Henry noted that the Code requires seven feet of landscaping if an access drive is included in
34 the side yard.

35
36 Commissioner Blake suggested denying the proposal and having staff come back with a proposal
37 in a different form. Commissioner Oborn agreed.

38
39 Director Cardenas stated that the Commission could recommend denial or approval of the
40 application, and it would be heard before the City Council, or they could continue the item and
41 allow staff and the applicant to work out a different proposal.

42

1 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission CONTINUE the request
2 of Paul Washburn for the proposed amendments to City Code Section 10-12B-7:B: Yard
3 Requirements, until the September 27, 2018 meeting, so that staff can look into options for
4 reducing or eliminating side yard setback requirements in the MD (Manufacturing Distribution)
5 Zone. Commissioner Blake seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
6 The motion carried.

7
8 **ITEM 7 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Logan Johnson to Amend City Code Section**
9 **10-14: The Grove Zoning District by Altering Section 10-14-24-1: The Grove Commercial Sales**
10 **Subdistrict. The Amendment Would Allow Climate-Controlled, Indoor Storage Units as a**
11 **Permitted Use in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. SAM WHITE’S LANE**
12 **NEIGHBORHOOD.**

13
14 Director Cardenas presented the staff report regarding a proposal to add Climate-Controlled Indoor
15 Storage Units as a permitted use in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. When
16 the Code was adopted, the City Council had a vision for the subdistrict that did not include specific
17 uses, including storage units. In 2015, a proposal for indoor storage units in the zone were brought
18 to the Planning Commission who forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council, but it
19 was denied. Director Cardenas noted that the market is good for storage units, and it may be
20 beneficial to the surrounding residences and businesses, but it still did not fit with the City’s vision
21 of the area.

22
23 Commissioner Butler asked how much revenue would be generated for the City from storage units.
24 Ms. Henry stated that the City would only receive property tax.

25
26 The applicant, Logan Johnson, gave background on the subject property and stated that retail
27 developers were not interested in the property. They had considered extending residential, but
28 they received a resounding “no” from the residents. In considering other alternative uses for the
29 property, they found that there was a demand for indoor climate-controlled storage units.

30
31 Commissioner Sanderson asked for a description of the product. Mr. Johnson stated that they
32 intend to do a multi-story building with both air conditioning and heating.

33
34 Commissioner Butler asked why the property was not desirable to retail users. Mr. Johnson said
35 that their concerns were with limited access and visibility from high traffic roads. He noted that
36 the property has been on the market for four years.

37
38 Chair Coombs opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Coombs closed
39 the public hearing.

1 Commissioner Blake understood that the owner needs to make money on their property, but she
2 did not think that justified the Code amendment. The City was in need of retail and storage units
3 don't fit the area.

4
5 Commissioner Oborn agreed and stated that this was not a good area for storage uses, although
6 she was not opposed to storage units elsewhere in the City.

7
8 Commissioner Hawkins commented that the City was hungry for revenue generating businesses.

9
10 Commissioner Sanderson felt that allowing the use in the entire subdistrict was too broad. He was
11 concerned that other property owners would also want to develop storage units. Commissioner
12 Butler agreed and stated that the market would change, and retail opportunities may come up in
13 the future.

14
15 Director Cardenas noted that it was difficult to retrofit storage units to future retail and office uses.

16
17 **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved that the Planning Commission recommend DENIAL of
18 the request of Logan Johnson for the proposed amendments to City Code Chapter 14: The Grove
19 Zoning District, based on the following findings:

- 20
21 1. The proposed use doesn't meet the vision of the zone.
22
23 2. The use could be applied to broadly throughout the zone.
24
25 3. The proposed use could not be easily adapted to other uses in the future.
26
27 4. Developing this use could limit future retail opportunities for that area.

28
29 Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
30 The motion carried.

31
32 **ITEM 8** – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the August 9, 2018 Planning Commission
33 Meeting.

34
35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to APPROVE the minutes from the August 9, 2018
36 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Oborn seconded the motion. The Commissioners
37 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

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

41
42 The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

1
2 _____
3 Planning Commission Chair
4
5 _____
6 Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech
7
8 _____
9 Date Approved