



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
October 13, 2022

PRESENT: Chair Jeffrey Butler, Jim Martineau, Dustin Phillips, Todd Fugal, Peter Steele

STAFF: Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Jacob Hawkins, City Planner; Kara Kresser, Planning Assistant; Kirsten Haggard, Planning Tech, Paul Douglass, Permit Tech

EXCUSED: City Engineer Aaron Wilson; Lindsey Hargett, Wendy Shirley, Karla Patten, Tim Clyde

Chair Jeffrey Butler called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

1. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks: Commissioner Peter Steele led the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Dustin Phillips offered the opening remarks.

2. Agenda Approval.

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, requested that Item 1 be continued to the October 27, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Jim Martineau moved to APPROVE the agenda, with the modification that Item 1 be continued to the October 27, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

3. Staff Reports:

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports. Commissioner Todd Fugal seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

1 **4. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.**

2 There were no declarations or abstentions.

3
4 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing: General Plan Update**
5 **(City Wide)**

6 Public Hearing for the Adoption of a Moderate-Income Housing Chapter for the General Plan.
7 This Chapter Contains New Strategies to Guide Present and Future Policies Regarding Moderate-
8 Income Housing within the City. *Continued to October 27, 2022.*

9
10 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas reported that this important proposed
11 provision addresses the gap in affordable senior housing. He requested additional realistic data to
12 support the parking policies being put in place in this regard. He described that they were able to
13 increase the affordable housing units by 15 in Grovecrest Villas by reducing the parking
14 requirements. The data, however, was unavailable because those changes were made before the
15 Parking Code Amendments were put into place. He reported that parking requirements for the
16 new project near the Water Gardens have been reduced. For future projects, parking requirements
17 may be reduced further on condition that the project is affordable for seniors. Future tracking
18 requirements will further assist in data collection. It was noted that American Fork has senior
19 housing with one parking stall per resident, which more than meets the needs.

20
21 There was discussion regarding the use of and requirements for State Tax Credit Allowances for
22 more affordable housing as well as requirements for moderate-income housing sites. Director
23 Cardenas asked for Planning Commission input on the modification over the next week. In
24 response to a question regarding how to foster public support for affordable housing, Director
25 Cardenas reported that the public seldom comments on the issue of affordable housing.

26
27 **ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-14-24-3-D-1**
28 **(City Wide)**

29 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of St. John Properties to Amend City Code Section 10-14-
30 24-3-D-1, by Modifying the Provisions and Requirements for Permitted Principal Uses within The
31 Grove Interchange Subdistrict, to Permit Use # 6297 (Athletic Clubs, Body-Building Studios,
32 Spas, Health Clubs, Aerobic Centers, etc.), Excluding Gymnasiums, as a Permitted Use.

33
34 City Planner, Jacob Hawkins, presented the Staff Report and stated that the request is to amend
35 City Code Section 10-14-24-3-D-1 to include Use #6297 in The Grove Interchange Subdistrict.
36 The use category includes gyms, body-building studios, spas, health clubs, aerobic centers, etc.
37 The applicant specifically requested that gymnasiums be excluded.

38
39 Planner Hawkins stated that for code text amendments, the Commission needs to consider the
40 district's primary purposes, the intensity of the use, the City's desired image for the area, and how
41 the use might alter the future of the zone or the City. He reviewed the purpose of the Interchange
42 Subdistrict Zone, which was to provide an attractive gateway from I-15 into the City by promoting

1 the development of a regional center containing high-quality architectural buildings for retail,
2 hotel, or professional office uses. He noted that using architectural features such as glass panes
3 and brick will create a unique signature image for visitors when turning onto Pleasant Grove
4 Boulevard from the freeway. The visitor is left with the overall impression of the uniqueness of
5 the City. The General Plan, likewise, echoes the purpose of the zone to meet the community
6 objectives of economic development and regional commercial needs in the area.

7
8 Planner Hawkins next addressed typical gyms and provided a range of sizes and resulting issues
9 with respect to parking requirements due to the scarcity of land. He noted that gyms are already
10 permitted in several other zones that border the two main corridors into the City. In this case, the
11 applicant proposes to provide a small 3,000-square-foot gym in an office building. The athletic
12 club customers will sign-up for classes with personal trainers to achieve better health. It was noted
13 that each class will accommodate approximately five students. The service is unlike a gymnasium
14 where customers come and go on their own schedules.

15
16 Staff found that the wording of the proposed amendment submitted by the applicant has created
17 the potential for difficulty in differentiating between types of facilities such as what constitutes a
18 health club versus an athletic club, regardless of size. Further, he noted there could be challenges
19 with various professional services listed in Use #6500. Because the language did not provide
20 adequate guidance between the associated uses that share similar traits, staff recommended denial
21 of the request, as written. It was noted that there are many other areas in the City where gyms or
22 spas are permitted. Staff did not believe that the Code Text Amendment as written conforms to
23 the purposes of the zone or the General Plan. If adopted, it would be necessary to add definitions
24 to delineate between each of the various uses listed in Use #6297. That way, if any use has
25 qualifying or excluding exceptions, then those definitions could be applied as required.

26
27 Planner Hawkins provided information about the parking requirements for office space as
28 compared to private clubs. There was general discussion regarding:

- 29
30
- What constitutes the definition of “Professional Services”.
 - What types of services would apply such as massage, yoga, physical therapy, personal training, health club, etc.
 - What type of personal trainers would be allowed.
- 31
32
33
34

35 Planner Hawkins stated that he would need to review Uses #6500 and #7000 to provide more
36 detail. The terms used were determined to be very subjective. He explained that options available
37 for the Commission were to approve the amendment as submitted, deny it, or approve with
38 modifications.

39
40 The applicant, Marty Beaumont, was present on behalf of St. John Properties. He stated that in
41 the process of leasing space, one available option was a fitness center. He mentioned that St. John
42 Properties is currently in discussions with the City Council regarding general guidelines. He stated

1 that the request before the Commission is unrelated and separate from the City Council
2 discussions. In this case, they are trying to fill a small space in a commercial building with an
3 applicant who is proposing to do fitness and health-related training. Mr. Beaumont stated that
4 inclusion of such a business would be good for the area as people who work in the office building
5 could take advantage of its closeness. If there was concern with a large gym coming to the area, a
6 better restriction would be to the size. The requirements for the general appearance of the
7 neighborhood would be adhered to. He estimated that such a facility could not be any larger than
8 7,000 to 10,000 square feet due to the parking requirements.

9
10 There was discussion regarding size restrictions of the facility, its use, the impact on traffic, and
11 possible loss of tax revenue. It was noted that St. John Properties was considering inclusion of
12 this type of business within a multi-story office space versus a one-story retail building.
13 Mr. Beaumont also stated that variety in what is being offered could contribute to growth. Concern
14 was expressed about the increasing number of uses being allowed in the zone considering its
15 signature gateway appearance.

16
17 Chair Butler opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the
18 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or
19 he would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

20
21 The Commissioners discussed the possibility of losing the overall concept of the area with
22 expanding development, the potential expansion of uses allowed in the area, limitations on the size
23 of the development, which would give more control, and whether there was a need for a precise
24 description of what would be covered in the use.

25
26 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission forward a
27 recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the proposed amendments to City Code
28 Section 10-14-24-3-D-1, Permitted Uses, by adding Use # 6297 (athletic clubs, body-building
29 studios, spas, health clubs, aerobic centers, etc.), with the exception of gymnasiums, to the list of
30 permitted uses in The Grove Interchange Subdistrict; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and
31 findings of the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:

- 32
33 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
34
35 2. A limitation of 10,000 square feet in size for this use.
36

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

1 **ITEM 3 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the September 22, 2022, Planning**
2 **Commission Meeting.**

3
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 22, 2022,
5 as printed. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted
6 “Aye”. The motion carried.

7
8 **MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved to ADJOURN the meeting at 7:45 p.m. Commissioner
9 Fugal seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

10
11
12 
13 _____
14 Planning Commission Chair

15 
16 _____
17 Kara Kresser, Planning Tech

18 10/7/27
19 _____
Date Approved