



1
2
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
5 August 25, 2022
6

7 **PRESENT:** Chair Jeffrey Butler, Tim Clyde, Jim Martineau, Karla Patten, Dustin Phillips, Todd
8 Fugal
9

10 **STAFF:** Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Jacob Hawkins, City Planner;
11 Aaron Wilson, City Engineer; Kara Kresser, Planning Tech; Barbara Johnson, Building Tech
12

13 **EXCUSED:** Peter Steele, Lindsey Hargett, Wendy Shirley
14

15 Chair Jeffrey Butler called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
16

17 **Commission Business:**
18

19 1. **Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Patten led the Pledge of
20 Allegiance. Commissioner Clyde offered the opening remarks.
21

22 2. **Agenda Approval.**
23

24 Chair Butler announced that Item 4 was continued indefinitely.
25

- 26 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to APPROVE the agenda with Item 4
27 being continued indefinitely. Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The
28 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
29

30 3. **Staff Reports:**
31

- 32 • **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports.
33 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted
34 "Aye". The motion carried.
35

36 4. **Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.**
37

38 There were no declarations or abstentions.

1
2 **ITEM 1 - Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-14-19-G:**
3 **(City Wide)**

4 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 10-
5 14-19G: Multiple-Family Residential Development Requirements, by Modifying the Provisions
6 and Requirements for Multi-Family Developments within The Grove Zone. ****CONTINUED**
7 **FROM AUGUST 11, 2022.**

8
9 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the staff report and stated that the
10 proposal is from staff to amend the City Code to require individual driveways for any future multi-
11 family development in the City. The size of the driveway and garage are each to be, at minimum,
12 22' x 20' resulting in four potential parking spaces per unit with two in the garage and two in the
13 driveway. The amendment also reduces the visitor-parking ratio from 0.5 to 0.33 per unit resulting
14 in one visitor parking for every three units rather than two. Director Cardenas stated that the
15 requirement already applies to the CS-2 (Commercial Sales) Zone but will now cover all the mixed
16 housing areas in The Grove Zone.

17
18 Commissioner Phillips asked about the feedback from developers about the requirement. Director
19 Cardenas stated that when implemented for the CS-2 (Commercial Sales-2) Zone, it was
20 determined not to be their favorite change but was seen as good for residents. Visitor parking was
21 identified as more available because of the four spaces for each unit. He clarified, however, that
22 the driveways and garages were not to be considered as part of the minimum parking requirements.
23 He also clarified that the green space percentage would remain the same. Developers would need
24 to be more creative in terms of design as it was likely that a couple of potential units would be lost
25 as a result of the increased parking space requirement.

26
27 Chair Butler opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the
28 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or
29 he would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

30
31 There was discussion regarding the impact of reducing the number of parking spaces per
32 residential unit, parking alternatives for visitors, and the typical use of garage space by residents.

33
34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City
35 Council APPROVE the request of Pleasant Grove City for the proposed amendments to City Code
36 Section 10-14-19G: OFF-STREET PARKING-Multi-Family Structures in the Grove Zone; and
37 adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report, and as modified by the condition
38 below:

- 39
40 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
41

1 Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The
2 motion carried.

3
4 **ITEM 2 - Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at approx. 1475 West 1100**
5 **North.**

6 **(Mud Hole Neighborhood)**

7 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Mike Camberlango for a 34-Lot Preliminary
8 Subdivision Plat, called Grove Acres Plat 'A', on 11.81 Acres of Land located at approx. 1475 West
9 1100 North in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

10
11 City Planner, Jacob Hawkins, presented the staff report and stated that this item is a request from
12 Mike Camberlango for a 34-lot Preliminary Subdivision Plat located at 1475 West 1100 North
13 consisting of 11.81 acres in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. On an aerial map and site
14 plan, he identified the property, which is surrounded by residences. Minimum lot size, frontages,
15 width, and setback requirements were identified as being met with the exception of Lot 1. The
16 corner lot, which is 6,696 square feet in size, does not meet the required minimum lot size of 8,000
17 square feet. In addition, the width of 71 feet on one side and 94 feet on the other does not meet
18 the minimum width requirement for a corner lot, which is 85 feet on one side and 95 feet on the
19 other. Planner Hawkins stated that normally this difference would be an issue; however, the
20 applicant obtained a variance for the property because the configuration of the 1600 West and
21 1060 North intersect necessitates the lot be smaller. He stated that the required setback and lot
22 coverage requirements remain in place for the property.

23
24 Planner Hawkins reported that staff's only other concern pertained to the street access for the
25 homes along 1100 North excluding Lot 34, which has an existing access from 1100 North. Those
26 homes would be required to use 1060 North to prevent double frontage and reduce the risks
27 involved in backing out into traffic. Staff recommended approval of the plat with the condition
28 that all Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

29
30 When asked what went into the approval of the variance, Director Cardenas stated that the request
31 for the variance involved the lot size and width but not the coverage. When asked about what went
32 into the determination that this smaller lot should be in the plat, Director Cardenas stated that they
33 considered that the lots surrounding the one smaller lot were also as small, if not smaller. He
34 pointed out that the applicant has the right to seek and was granted a variance. In relation to the
35 issue of access to 1100 North, a note on the site plan confirmed that Lots 2 through 5 and Lot 33
36 would not have access to 1100 North.

37
38 The property owner/applicant, Mike Camberlango, stated that they obtained a variance for Lot 1
39 that was granted in August. He was currently working with staff on the other accesses and
40 complies with the Code.

41
42 Chair Butler opened the public hearing.

1 *Angie Day*, asked about size or height restrictions on the homes to be built. She commented that
2 the existing surrounding homes are single-level. She requested that the proposed home sizes and
3 height be limited in that same manner. Commissioner Clyde reported that setbacks and height
4 requirements are set by City Code for the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone for all
5 developments. Upon further questioning, Ms. Day was advised that the roads shown were what
6 was being proposed and that notice was not required for the variance application. It was clarified
7 that Mr. Camberlango was the property owner who was making the request.

8
9 *Connie Baker* expressed concern that a home a large would be built on the other 8,000 square-foot
10 minimum-sized lots would be built on this smaller lot with the variance. She was advised that any
11 home built there would need to be smaller because of the lot size and that the setback requirements
12 would still have to comply with the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone Code requirements.

13
14 *Kelly Johnson*, was concerned about the busy roadway and the impact of the development on
15 traffic. She was shown on the aerial map where the housing access sites will be and was advised
16 that the entrance to the neighborhood from the east was at a distance sufficient to meet the traffic
17 requirements.

18
19 *Ryan Hansen*, wanted to confirm that both he and his father-in-law, who lives on Lot 33, have cul-
20 de-sac access. Mr. Hansen acknowledged that his lot has access to both the cul-de-sac and 1100
21 North.

22
23 *Michael Holman* asked if there was any City requirement for developers to provide green spaces
24 in residential developments. He was advised by Chair Butler that generally residential
25 developments do not have any such requirement. It was noted that there likely would be spacing
26 based on lot size in the R1-8 Zone. Mr. Holman remarked that he would like more parks developed
27 in the city.

28
29 There were no further public comments. The Chair closed the public hearing and invited the
30 Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item or he would entertain a motion
31 if no further discussion was necessary.

32
33 Commissioner Martineau asked if a Traffic Impact Study had been conducted as part of the
34 development. City Engineer, Aaron Wilson, stated that based on the number of lots and the design
35 of the development, it was felt that the Master Traffic Plan was sufficient to address any issues
36 without the need for a specific Traffic Study. He acknowledged that the prior Traffic Plan did not
37 match this Development Plan exactly but developers had leeway to revise plans based on lot size.

38
39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Clyde moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive
40 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Mike Camberlango for a Subdivision Plat
41 called Grove Acres Plat 'A' on property located at approximately 1475 West 1100 North on

1 property zoned R1-8; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report, and as
2 modified by the condition below:

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

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

8
9 **ITEM 3 - Public Hearing: Rezone – Located at approx. 155 East 500 South**
10 **(String Town Neighborhood)**

11 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Kirk Rogers for Utah Community Federal Credit Union
12 for a Zone Change from Downtown Village – Commercial (DV-C) to Commercial Sales (CS),
13 located at approx. 155 East 500 South.

14
15 Planner Hawkins presented the staff report and stated that it is a request from Utah Community
16 Federal Credit Union for a zone change from DV-C (Downtown Village-Commercial) to CS
17 (Commercial Sales). On an aerial map Planner Hawkins identified the location of the Credit Union
18 and pointed out that it is surrounded by commercial uses and a church building. The zoning was
19 primarily Downtown Village-Commercial (DV-C) with Commercial Sales (CS) to the south and
20 the Downtown Village Transitional (DV-T) where the church was to the east.

21
22 Planner Hawkins stated that the applicant was working with staff on the signage issue. Currently,
23 an existing free-standing sign exists at the old bank location, which is in the Downtown-village
24 (DV-C) Zone. Free-standing signs are prohibited in that zone unless used in conjunction with
25 specific buildings or uses. Because the existing sign is now non-conforming if it fell into disrepair
26 and would need to be torn down. However, if the property were zoned Commercial Sales (CS),
27 the free-standing sign would be allowed and repairs or replacement could go forward. Maximum
28 requirements for signs were noted to be 200 square feet in size with a height of 35 feet.

29
30 Planner Hawkins reported that the primary purpose of the zone change was to change the sign,
31 however, it was important to note what general effect the zone change would have. He pointed
32 out that both zones were intended for commercial uses but each has differences. The Downtown
33 Village-Commercial (DV-C) Zone has slightly less intense uses and is geared toward smaller
34 shops, is considered more walkable, and contains both single and multiple-family residences. The
35 Commercial Sales (CS) Zone was described as having more intense uses with typically commercial
36 uses such as are found along State Street. He provided specific examples of various types of
37 businesses in each zone. Further, he noted that the General Plan designates the property as being
38 in the South State Street District and outlined its objectives as follows:

- 39
40 • To promote the development of mixed-use community shopping centers;
41 • Provide an area for the commercial and service needs of the community;
42 • Require high-quality architecture and site design; and

- Preserve the street’s function as a major traffic carrier with uses suited to a high-volume roadway.

Because the project is located along an arterial street and is directly adjacent to other Commercial Sales (CS) properties, and because it conforms to the objectives as stated in the General Plan, staff recommended approval.

Commissioner Clyde asked if the change affected the electronic sign regulations. Planner Hawkins stated that any sign will need to comply with the Code requirements for signs, including electronic signs (which address size, brightness, and distractibility). The applicant wants to change the existing sign to a smaller size but is prohibited from doing so in the current zone. It was noted that the applicant was not present.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the request of Kirk Rogers for the rezoning of approximately 1.3 acres of property located at 155 East 500 South, from the Downtown Village-Commercial Zone (DV-C) to the Commercial Sales (CS) Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report. Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

**ITEM 4 - Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment
(City Wide)**

Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Pleasant Grove City to Create a City-Wide Ordinance to Regulate Short-Term Rentals within the residential zones in Pleasant Grove City.

**** CONTINUED INDEFINITELY****

ITEM 5 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the August 11, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Fugal moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 11, 2022, as printed. Commissioner Patten seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

MOTION: Commissioner Fugal moved to ADJOURN the meeting at 7:50 p.m. Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

Govt. Man

1 Planning Commission Chair

2 *Barbara Johnson*

3 _____
4 Barbara Johnson, Building Tech

5 *9-8-2022*

6 _____
7 Date Approved