



**PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 8, 2024**

PRESENT: Chair Karla Patten, Commissioners Jeffrey Butler, Todd Fugal, Jim Martineau, Wendy Shirley, Alicia Redding, Kenna Nelson

STAFF: Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Jacob Hawkins, City Planner; Aaron Wilson, City Engineer, Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant; Magali Acevedo, Administrative Assistant

EXCUSED: Commissioners Dustin Phillips, Denise Trickler

REGULAR SESSION

Chair Karla Patten called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

1. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks: Commissioner Fugal led the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Shirley offered the opening remarks.

2. Agenda Approval.

- MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to APPROVE the agenda with a continuation of Items 1 and 2 to receive final approvals at the next session. Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

3. Staff Reports: No Staff Reports were needed since both items were continued.

4. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.

There were no declarations or abstentions made since no action was to made in this meeting.

ITEM 1 – Public Meeting: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at 1330 N 100 E
(Big Spring Neighborhood)

Public Meeting to consider a request from Jill Bigelow for a 4-lot preliminary subdivision plat, called Bigelow Acres Plat “B” on 3.29 acres, located at 1330 North 100 East in the Rural Residential (RR) and Single-Family Residential (R1-10) Zones. (Administrative Item)

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, explained that the agenda was not posted with the adequate 24 hours needed so that is why this meeting will be held as an extended work session.

City Planner, Jacob Hawkins, presented the zoning map and proposed subdivision plat. The applicant originally submitted a 5-lot plat with one of the proposed lots having frontage to 100 East. After taking the plat to Utah County, the applicant discovered they would have difficulty receiving approval from the county to access the proposed flag lot off of 100 East. Due to lack of access, the applicant decided to not move forward with the proposed flag lot at this time. Since the applicant had already received approval from the Planning Commission for their rezone on 5/9/24, their decision to not proceed with the 5th lot is causing the plat to have split zoning issue on a single parcel with the proposed subdivision. To remedy this issue, the City will be bringing a new rezone application to the Planning Commission in the next meeting to resolve any split zoning on the proposed subdivision. If the applicant chooses to proceed with the flag lot at some future date, the applicant can bring the rezone back with that future application.

Director Cardenas presented the aerial map showing a blue outline around the area of the proposed subdivision and stated that the applicant owns the property as outlined. The existing property consists of 3 parcels. The largest of the 3 parcels is 35:808:0001. The applicant applied for the plat and rezone at the same time with the idea of creating a flag lot in front of the existing home on the largest parcel. As the applicant discovered upon working with the county on the subdivision plat, the county said there were issues with access coming off 100 East; which is a county road. Since the county did not want the creation of a new lot to have access off 100 East, the applicant decided not to proceed with the creation of a new parcel along 100 East at this moment. Therefore, the City has agreed to reverse the rezone from R1-10 back to Rural Residential so that the applicant can retain their animal rights. The reverse rezone application will be run by the City so it does not cause any constraints on the applicant. The applicant and the City have been working together in good faith and it was never the intent of either party to create a chunk of land in a different zone without any specific boundaries. The applicant is now proposing a 4-lot subdivision plat.

Planner Hawkins presented the revised subdivision plat along with the RR and R1-10 lot requirements. A Rural Residential lot is required to have a half-acre per lot where the R1-10 lot size is a minimum of 10,000 square feet per lot. Both lot width and frontage requirements have been met with the proposed subdivision. The setback requirements are similar with 30-foot front and rear setbacks in RR and 25-foot front and rear setbacks in R1-10; both requiring 10 feet from the side property lines. The property lines for lot 6 are being adjusted with a bump out so lots 3 and 4 will lose a little bit of property to accommodate this adjustment. Lot 4 is also taking a little bit of land from the back of lot 5 which will be used for gardening or other small uses since the remaining land does not provide room for any other uses. Overall, the proposed subdivision will comply with the existing requirements of the Rural Residential and R1-10 Zones.

Commissioner Martineau asked if the rezone gets reversed, will all the lots be designated Rural Residential. Planner Hawkins clarified that lot 5 will remain R1-10 but lots 3 and 4, including the pan handle in lot 4 will revert back to Rural Residential. The zoning of each parcel will follow the property lines so that will eliminate any split zoning caused by the already approved rezone.

Director Cardenas shared that the reason for the panhandle is because the grandmother does not want to do the weeding in the rear of the lot. He clarified that the motion will be made at the next meeting for this item.

ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-15-14: Flag Lots (City Wide)

Public Hearing to consider a request from Pleasant Grove City to amend City Code Section 10-15-14, Flag Lots. The city is proposing to make changes to the zoning requirements for the potential development of interior lots with the intent to facilitate the development of infill areas in an orderly and reasonable manner. (Legislative Item)

Director Cardenas continued that both items will be renoticed for the next meeting. After meeting with the City Planner earlier in the day, they still have not come to agreement on the language. The ideas are clear but they are still hammering out the verbiage. He displayed the draft language for the flag lot code text amendment and explained the process for reviewing an ordinance. For a code text amendment, Director Cardenas runs those types of applications but he filters the draft ordinance through multiple people at a time. He does this to generate ideas. Each person that makes comments to his draft does so in a different font color. He then takes it to the legal department for their review and comments. He then brings it back to his staff and has a realization that some of the ideas are not solid. He then repeats the process until he has a purified version of the draft ordinance.

The purpose of this ordinance is to reduce the number of flag lots to one flag lot per subdivision. You have a flag lot and a standard lot (aka a base lot) that has the frontage to the road. The flag lot has a stem and then the lot which makes the flag. When a standard lot is facing a busy road, such as 1100 North, you already have access to the lot. Now you need to create another access for the lot in the back through the stem. It is in the best interest of the City and its residents to allow for only one point of access to avoid accidents. The concept being reviewed is if the standard lot fronts a busy road, the standard lot will also need to have access through the stem to create a common stem shared with the flag lot. The City would like to force a flag lot applicant, if the two lots are created at the same time, to create access for both lots through the stem. We had to consider a condition where the base lot already has a garage that is on the opposite side of the lot and not adjacent to the stem or how we will handle a corner lot. We also wanted to provide some latitude to the engineer if the road is just a local road but it makes more sense for it to only have one access. Daniel wrote as an idea that “a common stem and a common driveway shall be used to access both lots in the case where the stem and the access to the standard lot is from a collector or arterial road.” Then we had to say this is for a brand new subdivision of both lots. It is clear on the end result of what the City wants to do but it is more difficult to draft it into language. He read from the draft language that “the access to the standard lot may be granted from a common stem when they front a local road if approved by the Engineering Department.” It is important to communicate

1 in a way that an elderly resident and a young resident to both be able to understand what is written
2 in our code. He wants to ensure that the code he is drafting is easy to understand and simple. The
3 City is changing the purpose of the flag lots along with the definitions and the requirements. It is
4 taking a little bit longer since it is a more complicated city code amendment. The work he is doing
5 is to change the entire chapter of the flag lot code. All of his ideas are there, he just needs to make
6 certain that the language is pure. The final version will be ready for the next Planning Commission
7 meeting.

8
9 **MOTION:** Commissioner Shirley moved to ADJOURN. The Commissioners unanimously voted
10 "Yes". The motion carried.

11
12 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:20 p.m.

13
14
15 
16 Planning Commission Chair

17
18
19 
20 Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant

21
22 8-22-2024
23 Date Approved