PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
July 25, 2019

PRESENT: Chair Dustin Phillips, Vice-Chair Tamara Oborn, Commissioners Lisa Coombs, Peter Steele, Bobbie Jo Blake, Jeffrey Butler, Tim Clyde, and Todd Fugal (Alternate)

STAFF: Rylee Hall, City Planner; Shaun Hilton, Staff Engineer; Kara Kresser; Planning Tech

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

Commission Business:

1. **Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Steele led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **Opening Remarks:** Vice-Chair Oborn gave the opening remarks.

3. **Agenda Approval:**

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

4. **Staff Reports:**

   - **MOTION:** Commissioner Blake moved to APPROVE the staff reports as part of the public record. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

5. **Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members:** Commissioner Fugal declared a conflict with Item 1.
ITEM 1 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Deny Farnworth to Amend the Vicinity Plan for Future Local Roads Near 200 South, and Future 825 East, Near Property Located at Approximately 950 East 200 South in the R-1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. SCRATCH

GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTE: Commissioner Fugal recused himself from the discussion.

Rylee Hall, City Planner presented the staff report regarding a vicinity plan amendment at the property listed above. She presented the current vicinity plan that was adopted in 2014, and the proposed vicinity plan. The goal of a vicinity plan was to provide long-range planning for local neighborhood streets in undeveloped areas of Pleasant Grove. For the proposed amendment, the affected properties were zoned R-1-10 and R-1-9. The applicant was requesting the amendment to the vicinity plan to facilitate the development of a subdivision plat. The existing vicinity plan showed an interconnected road with two access points connecting 200 South to 100 South.

The proposed amendment would eliminate these access points in exchange for a single east-west connection ending in a cul-de-sac. This would provide the applicant with the greatest number of lots. In the Pleasant Grove City Code, the maximum length of a block is 1,300 feet. The proposed vicinity plan includes a length of 1,900 feet. Generally, this would not be approved without another north-south connection. The Planning Commission’s role in the request was to consider the relationship to existing and future roadways and developments to ensure that new developments can be adequately serviced, and then make a recommendation to the City Council.

Staff recommended denial of the proposed vicinity plan.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the reasoning behind the regulation for 1,300-foot blocks. Staff Engineer, Shaun Hilton was not sure of the exact science behind the regulation.

The applicant, Deny Farnworth, stated that they have been working on the application since November. In November, they tried to work with the current vicinity plan, but it was not feasible due to engineering constraints regarding the elevation change. He worked with the DRC and with City Engineering and Public Works and had spent thousands of dollars coming up with different plans. He was aware that the neighbors do not want the road to go through because they would see a lot of high school traffic on that road. There was also an existing ditch, piping, and the grade of property to consider. He noted that there was no easement for the ditch and piping, which is why it was not showing up on the map.

Commissioner Clyde asked Mr. Farnworth if he had considered flipping the cul-de-sac to access 100 South instead of 200 South. Mr. Farnworth stated that he had considered it but it worked better for the neighboring property owner this way.
Project Engineer, Mark Greenwood explained that the grade of the property is 10% in the location
where the road is located on the current vicinity plan. He also described issues with the ditch and
the piping.

Commissioner Coombs asked if it was possible for the applicant to conform to the existing vicinity
plan. Mr. Greenwood stated that they could not. Using the map, he identified the area that was
not suited for a roadway.

Engineer Hilton stated that the north-south connection on the existing vicinity plan is not feasible,
but a north-south connection is possible further to the west. They also had to consider that the
length of the block exceeds City standards. The proposed cul-de-sac could be a thru-street, which
would cause the applicant to lose one lot.

Mr. Farnworth described his discussions with other property owners in the area and how he had
considered their future developments.

The Planning Commission discussed other options for connectivity and Mr. Farnworth described
some of the other plans he had come up with.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Planner Hall read a letter staff had received from a resident. The resident expressed their support
for the proposed vicinity plan amendment.

Harry Payne gave his address as 835 East 100 South and stated that any development that occurs
on the subject property will impact his home because they are on the corner. He supported the
new vicinity plan because it will help spread traffic out. Currently, teenagers park up and down
the street during school hours, disregarding the No Parking signs. He noted that the parking
restrictions are not being enforced by the police.

Joann Munk was present representing her parents, Victor and Laurie Hammond, as they were
unable to attend. They own property at 950 East 140 South in Pleasant Grove, although they
currently reside at Ashford Assisted Living in Springville. Mrs. Monk explained that her mother
inherited the property from her parents and over the years had purchased other properties
contiguous to theirs. Mr. and Mrs. Hammond were concerned that their property would be greatly
impacted by the intended development. She read a letter written by Mr. Hammond to the Planning
Commission. He was opposed to any plan that included a road on the northern border of their
property.

Barbara Payne, who resides at 835 East 100 South, stated that if the roadway comes through, it will
run right up to their home. She was worried about teenage drivers causing damage to their property
and the property of the neighbors. She commented that the proposed vicinity plan amendment is probably the best.

Carol Harmer gave her address as 755 East 100 South and indicated that she was a long-time resident of Pleasant Grove and once served on the City Council. She requested that the road not be required to go through. She understood the City’s position on having connectivity, but in this case, she did not support it.

Vice-Chair Oborn stated that the proposed vicinity plan amendment shows 100 South going through, while the existing vicinity plan does not. The applicant presented the Planning Commission with a copy of the first vicinity plan amendment he created, which he felt best suits the neighborhood and the City. He clarified that some of the neighbors expressed support for this vicinity plan. Commissioner Coombs commented that there would be the same concerns with connectivity with this plan. She reminded the Commission and the residents that they could discuss this alternate plan tonight but action can only be taken on the plan that was noticed on the agenda.

Jay Harmer gave his address as 755 East 100 South and was in favor of keeping 100 South from becoming a thru street.

Harry Payne clarified that he supported the plan proposed on the agenda.

Dale Munk supported the alternative vicinity plan that was not noticed. He did not support 100 South going through.

Bob Oscarson, was present on behalf of Margaret Thorne, who is in favor of the cul-de-sac proposal. He was not certain of her position on 100 South. Mr. Oscarson also lives in the area and briefly described his concerns about traffic.

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

Vice-Chair Oborn stated that the proposed vicinity plan is outside of the City’s standard for maximum block length. The role of the Planning Commission is to make sure that the proposal follows the Code.

Commissioner Steele commented that the Planning Commission would be making a recommendation to the City Council on this matter. The existing Code does not provide for any exceptions to the 1,300-foot rule.
Commissioner Coombs assumed that the City Council would still prefer to have connectivity between 200 South and 100 South. If the Planning Commission makes a recommendation of denial, it is possible that the City Council could override that recommendation and approve the request.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Steele moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council DENY the request of Deny Farnsworth for a vicinity plan amendment for property located at approximately 950 East 200 South in the R-1-10 and R-1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zones, based on the following findings:

1. The proposed vicinity plan would include a block length over 1,300 feet.

2. The Planning Commission recommends that the Council consider requiring a north-south connection between 800 East and 850 East, and a provision for a pedestrian access along the alignment of 100 South connecting to Andersen Park and 950 East. [TF3]

Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioner unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

**NOTE:** Prior to the vote on Item 1, Commissioner Blake was excused from the remainder of the meeting. Commissioner Fugal and Commissioner Clyde would both be voting members for the following item.

**ITEM 2 – Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Clare Moon to Amend City Code Section 10-14-24-1-C3: The Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Conditional Uses, by Changing the Conditions and Requirements for the Establishment of Use #6399: Reception Centers, within The Grove Zone and limited to the Commercial Sales Subdistrict. SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD *Continued from the July 11, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.*

Planner Hall gave a brief overview of the request to change the conditional use requirement for Reception Centers in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict of The Grove Zone. The discussion at the last meeting focused on pairing the reception center use to another allowed use that generates sales tax. Staff felt it was important for the reception center use to remain subsidiary to another use and conditional. The applicant proposed the removal of two of the conditions outlined in the Code for the reception center use, but the Planning Commission discussed other options. The item was continued so that the City Attorney could review and recommend language that would adequately tie the reception center use to a sales tax generating use. Planner Hall stated that Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas passed the request onto the City Attorney. However, Planner Hall was provided no feedback from either party prior to the meeting.

The applicant, Clare Moon, stated that it was her understanding that the continuance was requested because the Commission wanted further clarification on the definition of “subsidiary”. She
thought that their concern pertained more to Condition B. She respectfully requested that the
Commission take action tonight rather than continue it again.

Commissioner Coombs stated that the Legal Department would still have to approve any language
proposed by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Steele added that they could include a
condition of approval based on the City Attorney approving the language, which would allow the
item to go to the City Council rather than coming back to the Planning Commission. Staff
confirmed that this was a viable option for the Commission tonight.

Commissioner Butler reported that he believes services for a reception or event are not currently
taxable, however, if the applicant intends to serve drinks there that could be purchased, that would
be taxable. Ms. Moon agreed that that is the case unless drinks are included in the rental price.

Commissioner Clyde stated that the issue pertains more to zoning.

Commissioner Butler commented that one of the purposes of the Commercial Sales Subdistrict is
to create developments that “contribute to the creation of a unique, signature image or the City that
encourages pedestrian activity, social interaction, and a quality shopping experience”. He believed
that a reception center fits into this description. He did not see a need to require a certain
percentage of sales tax uses.

Commissioner Steele reminded the Commission that this amendment will affect more than just the
applicant’s property and they need to consider the entire zone. The Commission discussed the
likelihood of other large reception centers being constructed in the Commercial Sales Subdistrict.
Commissioner Clyde commented that the concerns about development in the zone are different
now than they were four years ago.

Commissioner Butler asked Ms. Moon about the traffic of the existing food truck courts in
Holladay and South Jordan. She stated that both food truck courts have been very successful. The
Holladay location is very walkable and saw a lot of foot traffic. She commented that the food
truck court would be her main intent for the property. The event space would be secondary.

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

There was brief discussion regarding the motion and Commissioner Fugal proposed that they
eliminate all of the existing conditions and create one new condition that would require the
reception center use be secondary to another sales tax generating use.

MOTION: Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City
Council APPROVE the request of Clare Moon for the proposed amendments to City Code Section
10-14-24-1C3: The Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Conditional Uses; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the conditions below:

1. In Use #6399, Subparagraphs A, B, and C be eliminated and replaced with a new subparagraph stating: “shall only be subordinate in the same lot or parcel to a permitted or conditional use that generates sales tax”.

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

3. The proposed amendment language is subject to a legal review and approval from the City Attorney.

Commissioner Clyde seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

ITEM 3 – Review and Approval of the Minutes from the July 11, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Fugal briefly described the redline change he made to the minutes.

MOTION: Vice Chair Oborn moved to APPROVE the minutes from the July 11, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, as amended by Commissioner Fugal. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

MOTION: Commissioner Steele moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

Planning Commission Chair

Kara Kresser, Planning Tech

8/18/2019

Date Approved