



**PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 22, 2024**

PRESENT: Chair Karla Patten, Commissioners Dustin Phillips, Todd Fugal, Alicia Redding, Kenna Nelson, Denise Trickler

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

EXCUSED: Commissioners Jeffrey Butler, Jim Martineau, Wendy Shirley

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

REGULAR SESSION

Commission Business:

1. **Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Kenna Nelson led the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Denise Trickler offered the opening remarks.

2. **Agenda Approval.**

Chair Patten announced that Items 2 and 3 should be described as public meetings.

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Dustin Phillips moved to APPROVE the agenda with that modification. Commissioner Alicia Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

3. **Staff Reports:**

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Todd Fugal moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports. Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

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

There were no declarations or abstentions.

1 **ITEM 1 - Public Hearing: Rezone--Located at 1330 North 100 East**
2 **(Big Spring Neighborhood)**

3 Public Hearing to consider a request from Pleasant Grove City for a zone change from the R1-10
4 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to the RR (Rural Residential) Zone, on two pieces of land equaling
5 a total of approximately 0.28 acres, located at 1330 North 100 East. (Legislative Item)

6
7 City Planner, Jacob Hawkins, presented the Staff Report and stated that Items 1 and 2 are addressed
8 separately but involve the same property located at 1330 North 100 East. He identified the subject
9 property on an aerial map and stated that a few months earlier an applicant requested a zone change
10 in this area from Rural Residential (RR) Zone to the R1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. It
11 matched a subdivision request that had been under staff review for some time. Staff recommended
12 approval at that time because the request conformed with the General Plan and the subdivision plat
13 was moving forward as described. As staff continued its review, the applicant reached out to Utah
14 County to discuss access from 100 East for the proposed lot. Additional challenges were identified
15 and the applicant decided to forego this lot in favor of getting the other lots ready to build sooner.
16 This decision resulted in a new subdivision layout which includes a split zone as addressed in Item 2.
17 To resolve the issues, staff worked with the applicant to revert the zone back to what it was previously
18 and fix a panhandle area to ensure that each lot is associated with only one zone. Overall, staff
19 recommended approval of the zone change, which places the identified property in the Rural
20 Residential (RR) Zone.

21
22 The applicant was not present for comment.

23
24 Chair Patten opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was
25 closed. The Chair then invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the
26 item or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

27
28 **MOTION:** Commissioner Redding moved that the Planning Commission forward a
29 recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the request of Pleasant Grove City for the
30 rezone of two pieces of land equaling a total of approximately 0.28 acres located at 1330 North 100
31 East from the R1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to the Rural Residential (RR) Zone; and
32 adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report. Commissioner Nelson seconded
33 the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

34
35 **ITEM 2 - Public Meeting: Preliminary Subdivision Plat--Located at 1330 North 100 East**
36 **(Big Spring Neighborhood)**

37 Public Meeting to consider the request from Jill Bigelow for a 4-lot preliminary subdivision plat,
38 called Bigelow Acres Plat 'B' on approximately 3.23 acres, located at 1330 North 100 East in the
39 Rural Residential (RR) and R1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zones. (Administrative Item)

40 ****ITEM CONTINUED FROM 8/8****

41
42 Planner Hawkins presented the Staff Report and identified the four-lot preliminary subdivision plat
43 on a Zoning Map displayed. The surrounding area is zoned as R1-10 (Single-Family Residential)
44 with the exception of some land within the subdivision previously identified as Rural Residential
45 (RR) Zone and smaller surrounding sections. An aerial map shows that the entire area is primarily
46 single-family homes. The proposed subdivision plat shows that Lots 3 and 4 will be in the Rural
47 Residential (RR) Zone, and Lots 5 and 6 will be in the R1-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The

1 zoning requirements vary according to size with the Rural Residential (RR) Zone requiring at least a
2 ½ acre for each lot and a minimum width requirement of 110 feet; and the R1-10 (Single-Family
3 Residential) Zone requiring 10,000 square feet for each lot and a minimum width of 90 feet. Each of
4 these lots met the requisite requirements. Staff recommended approval.

5
6 The applicant was not present for comment.

7
8 Chair Patten opened the public meeting up to the public for comments. There were no public
9 comments. The public hearing was closed. The Chair then invited the Commissioners to either
10 continue the discussion regarding the item or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

11
12 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive
13 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Jill Bigelow for a subdivision plat called Bigelow
14 Acres Plat 'B' on property located at 1330 North 100 East on property zoned Rural Residential (RR)
15 and R1-10 (Single-Family Residential); and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff
16 report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 17
18 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

19
20 Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The
21 motion carried.

22
23 **ITEM 3 - Public Meeting: Preliminary Subdivision Plat--Located at 997 West 1930 North**
24 **(North Field Neighborhood)**

25 Public Meeting to consider the request of Ronald Nordhagen for a 2-lot preliminary subdivision plat,
26 called Northfield Estates Plat 'C', on approximately 1.5 acres, located at 980 West 1800 North in the
27 Rural Residential (RR) and R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zones. (Administrative Item)

28
29 Planner Hawkins presented the Staff Report and stated that the above item pertains to a preliminary
30 subdivision plat called Northfield Estates Plat 'C' located at 980 West 1800 North. The two properties
31 are located within a formed subdivision but neither property has been through the subdivision process
32 as they were split off from the same lot in April 2010. The preliminary subdivision plat was created
33 to establish the property lines for both properties and ensure that the north property (Lot 32) is
34 buildable.

35
36 The north property is in the R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone, and the southern property is in
37 the Rural Residential (RR) Zone. The original lot, which is proposed Lot 33, has been developed with
38 a single-family home. The surrounding properties also have all been developed with single-family
39 homes as shown on an aerial map. The proposed subdivision plat was displayed. The north property,
40 which is zoned R1-20 (Single-Family Residential), requires a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet
41 and a minimum width of 100 feet; however, when measured, the lot width is about 97 feet. The
42 applicant, in working through the subdivision process, sought and received approval of a variance to
43 reduce the width by three feet, on September 20, 2012, by the Board of Adjustment. The approved
44 variance allows the lot to meet the requirements of the zone. The other property to the south meets
45 the area and width requirements. Other changes on the plat involved the applicant opting to increase
46 the side-yard setbacks to 15-feet instead of meeting the typical 10-foot minimum requirement. Staff
47 recommended approval.

1
2 The applicant was not present for comment.

3
4 Chair Patten opened the public meeting up to the public for comments. There were no public
5 comments. The public hearing was closed. The Chair invited the Commissioners to either continue
6 the discussion regarding the item or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

7
8 **MOTION:** Commissioner Trickler moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive
9 recommendation of APPROVAL for the request of Ronald Nordhagen for a subdivision plat called
10 Northfield Estates Plat 'C', located at approximately 980 West 1800 North on property zoned Rural
11 Residential (RR) and R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zones; and adopting the exhibits, conditions,
12 and findings of the staff report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 13
14 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

15
16 Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The
17 motion carried.

18
19 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment–Section 10-15-14: Flag Lots**
20 **(City Wide)**

21 Public Hearing to consider a request from Pleasant Grove City to amend City Code Section 10-15-
22 14, Flag Lots. The City is proposing to make changes to the zoning requirements for the potential
23 development of interior lots with the intent to facilitate the development of infill areas in an orderly
24 and reasonable manner. (Legislative Item)

25 ****ITEM CONTINUED FROM 8/8****

26
27 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the Staff Report and stated that the
28 above item is a Code Text Amendment to revise the law regarding flag lot requirements. A standard
29 lot has both frontage on the public right-of-way and meets the width requirement of the zone; while
30 a flag lot has no frontage and the width can be less than what is required by the zone. A drawing of
31 a flag lot was displayed and noted to have a stem driveway, which gives the lot a flag-like appearance.
32 A flag-lot subdivision requires at minimum, two lots, one of which must have frontage.

33
34 Currently, City Code Section 10-15-14 governs flag lots. In determining what would work for
35 Pleasant Grove, staff reviewed the practices of other nearby cities to identify their approach. They
36 found that some do not allow flag lots. The cities that do allow flag lots vary in approach. The
37 practices of other cities were displayed and the details were described from Lehi, American Fork,
38 Lindon, Orem, Highland, and Provo. From that review, staff presented a draft proposal and requested
39 feedback. Director Cardenas commented that for every city flag lots are not to be considered as the
40 first choice or option but as an available resource. Developers favor flag lots because they are less
41 expensive. The City's concern is connectivity, which is an important City goal that impacts roads,
42 sewers, water connections, and utilities. Development should be done in the best possible way to
43 preserve that goal with key attention to road connectivity using the Vicinity Plan, which has been
44 carefully engineered to ensure future development of large parcels of land address connectivity. If a
45 developer wants to do something different than what is provided in the City's Vicinity Plan, then they
46 need to apply for a vicinity plan amendment for a legislative decision. The City always looks at the

1 Vicinity Plan first when reviewing a proposed subdivision. If it is determined that development is
2 not possible without the use of a flag lot then it will be considered.

3
4 Director Cardenas displayed the proposed Code language, which contains a few updates to the
5 definitions for the various elements including "standard lots" (aka base lots) and "stems". Currently,
6 the Code requires that the flag lot meet the area requirement or lot size for the zone where the lot is
7 located. Issues have arisen because the back, or interior, lot is more constrained on the properties
8 with smaller lots (R1-7 to R1-12). In some cases, because the current Code allows stems to be
9 included in the total lot area for private flag lots, the portion of the flag lot remaining is smaller than
10 other lots in the zone, which restricts the buildable area and sometimes makes the lot unbuildable.
11 The City is trying to prevent this type of problem by requiring larger flag lots in zones with smaller
12 lot sizes. Further, there have been issues with setbacks involving neighbors where the homes are
13 considered too close, which has also resulted in numerous complaints. The City's goal is to be clear
14 on what is required for a flag lot.

15
16 The following language is being proposed:

- 17 • For smaller lots (R1-7; R1-8; R1-9; R1-10 and R1-12), the minimum size of the flag lot must
18 be 1.5 times the minimum required size of the front lot counting the stem. For example, a flag
19 lot in R1-8, which requires the front lot to be 8,000, must have a back lot that is 12,000 square
20 feet in size including the stem.
- 21 • On larger lots (R1-15; R1-20 and RR), the standard lot and the flag lot are to be the same size,
22 but the stem square footage is not counted toward the minimum lot size.
- 23 • The width requirement for lots requires both the standard lot and the narrowest part of the flag
24 lot width to meet the minimum required width for the zone. This requirement prevents
25 situations where someone finds they bought an unbuildable narrow lot.
- 26 • The required setback for interior flag lots shall be a minimum of 30 feet from the front property
27 line, a minimum of 20 feet from both sides, and a minimum of 25 feet from the rear property
28 line. In particular, the 30-foot front setback requirement allows for better emergency access.
- 29 • Currently, the requirements for stems and common stems address the maximum number of
30 flag lots in a subdivision where a common stem is used. The current Code does not specify
31 how many flag lots can be in a subdivision. On reviewing the language addressing the stem
32 and common stem situations, Director Cardenas advised that the code can be interpreted to
33 suggest that up to five flag lots can be in a subdivision; however, two of the five lots must
34 have frontage, which means that only three flag lots can be served by a common stem. He
35 noted there have been many problems with common stems involving Community
36 Development, Public Works, Engineering, the Fire Department (fire hydrant placement and
37 emergency access), and the Legal Department so the City does not want common stems
38 anymore. The only case where a common stem would be permitted is when a standard lot
39 fronts a busy road, in which the flag lot development may have a shared common stem to
40 minimize the number of access points onto a busy road; to avoid accidents. The goal is to have
41 one flag lot in the interior and the maximum number of lots that may share a common stem
42 will be limited to three, being one flag lot and up to two standard lots.
- 43 • There is additional language regarding slopes, drainage, and turn-around requirements for the
44 Fire Department. He then showed some examples of flag lot subdivisions (including Gordon
45 Grove Plat B, Walnut Grove Plat B, and Ashlyn Lane Plat A) which identify various issues.
46 He stated that the City is not proposing to take away flag lots, but rather to approach them in
47 a better way that we can service them properly and avoid problems in the future.

1
2 Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, provided a one-page summary and noted that Public Works
3 did not create lot sizes which are varied as to size and setbacks. It is important to consider the
4 installation and servicing of all the utilities (i.e., water, sewer, storm drains, irrigation) and their effect
5 on the neighboring properties and existing residents. Development guidelines are established based
6 on need and are supported by specific rationale. The required road width is not for fun or for kids to
7 ride a bike; they are to create separation and access to the utilities underground and to dig, if needed.
8 If a water main breaks or there is a sewer blockage, the trenches for repairs are often 10 to 16 feet
9 deep. Snow removal equipment is also large and the snow needs a place to go. Issues arise when
10 more than one lot is serviced by a flag stem. Responsibility for the utilities (including fire hydrants)
11 varies because the lines are on private, not public property. He raised the issue of whose responsibility
12 it is when equipment breaks or is damaged, when a retaining wall collapses, when a water service line
13 breaks, when storm water drainage causes damage, or when there are parking disputes.

14
15 Commissioner Fugal asked why can't we codify around the issues mentioned. Director Winterton
16 said that the City could try to codify but there is a reason why a number of other cities shy away from
17 their use and good planning principals discourage them. If a lot does not have the required frontage,
18 then why did we require the specific frontage to begin with. Flag lots create an undue burden to the
19 City to provide utility services that is disproportionate to conforming residents. Both lot frontage
20 requirements and public street requirements help keep the water, pressurized irrigation, and sewer
21 properly separated and accessible in a residents lawn as opposed to having to service those lines in a
22 common stem and impact a private driveway. Some issues could be resolved with a Homeowners'
23 Association ("HOA") but it seems excessive to require one with only 2 people.

24
25 Commissioner Fugal continued that he wants to balance the principal to utilize the land, moving away
26 from an agricultural type of society with long and deep lots, versus the City's requirements to
27 reasonably provide adequate public services and resolve the issues that flag lots have created. There
28 are some landowners that did not have the benefit of developing with the Vicinity Plan in place.
29 Director Winterton stated he could only address Public Works related issues and that ultimately the
30 landowner made the choice to develop the land the way that they did. He said if there were a few
31 ideas to codify he would suggest making the stem wider and requiring all utilities to be outside of the
32 hard surface; if you put utilities in a challenging location for the City to service, existing residents are
33 disproportionately affected. Commissioner Fugal asked why the proposal is to allow for only one
34 flag lot. Director Winterton answered that it is clear who is responsible for maintenance and needs if
35 the stem only serves one owner.

36
37 Director Winterton noted that some flag lot subdivisions exist that require easements from their
38 neighbors so that drainage goes across their yard. He asked who would police that in the future. That
39 is a problem that the City is creating by allowing lots that do not have frontage. Director Cardenas
40 pointed out that the few remaining undeveloped lots are addressed by referencing the Vicinity Plan.
41 It is not that easy to just codify the issues. The stem width could be codified with a wider stem if the
42 service is for two or three lots and this could be researched, if desired. He mentioned that the City is
43 already struggling with the interpretation of the existing code at this point.

44
45 Commissioner Fugal wanted clarification on the review of a development against the Vicinity Plan
46 and the determination for including the verbiage "not possible." He felt that standard was too high.
47 Director Cardenas clarified that the physical constraints of the land would be considered when

1 evaluating a development as to whether adherence to the Vicinity Plan is possible. He explained that
2 the process is to allow for either a temporary entrance or a partial building of a public right-of-way
3 with a road dedication to the City when the neighbors are not ready to develop their parcel. Engineer
4 Wilson also mentioned that the City enters into development agreements to only build their portion
5 of the necessary local road; they would have access from a partial road. The main objective of
6 connectivity will still be met in the future when the neighbors develop their lot. Director Cardenas
7 mentioned that the developer could also apply for an amendment to the Vicinity Plan and bring it to
8 the Planning Commission and City Council for a legislative determination. Director Cardenas said
9 that the City desires to exhaust all options before making a consideration for a flag lot subdivision.
10 He reiterated that the City is open to consider any additional language that the commission would like
11 to bring forward for consideration.

12
13 Engineer Wilson was asked if there were any additional issues to cover on the topic. He added that
14 there is a method in place to add some language on the plat itself and record some basic Covenants,
15 Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) with Utah County but this creates a mini-PUD; there is a real
16 reason Pleasant Grove City to get rid of PUDs because they caused a lot of problems. When things
17 go bad and there is shared responsibility for utility repairs, leaking fire hydrants, and damaged roads;
18 what do you do when someone cannot contribute financially and there is no pool of money or HOA
19 in place to service and maintain that infrastructure.

20
21 Commissioner Fugal asked for clarification on the minimum lot width requirements and inclusion of
22 the stem. Director Cardenas said that he will revise the language to make it clear that the minimum
23 lot width excludes the stem.

24
25 Commissioner Fugal also wanted to understand how the City determines the front, back, and sides of
26 a flag lot. Planner Hawkins explained that the narrowest width of the lot and the location of the stem
27 would determine where the front of the home would be placed. Director Cardenas clarified that
28 regardless of the proposed orientation of the flag lot developer, the proposed increase to the setback
29 requirements will protect the surrounding neighbors with the closest home being at 30 feet away.

30
31 Chair Patten opened the public hearing.

32
33 *Meghan Walker* thanked the Commission and she appreciates Director Cardenas taking additional
34 public input. She stated that this issue impacts the lives of many and spoke on the following points:

- 35 • Pleasant Grove has submitted five state-mandated strategies to increase moderate-income
36 housing as a part of their General Plan. She wants to address two of the five strategies
37 submitted by Pleasant Grove. The first involves regulations regarding Accessory Dwelling
38 Units (“ADUs”), which is an excellent strategy; however, the benefit of flag lots, in contrast
39 with ADUs, is that they create actual homeowners; provide property tax revenue, and more
40 clearly identify who is responsible for issues or repairs. The second strategy pertains to
41 regulations related to multi-family residential dwellings located in walkable areas or mixed
42 zones (Strategy W). Limiting access to flag lots by creating more stringent requirements
43 appears to conflict with the City’s move to increase access to moderate-income housing. This
44 move will impact the ability of current and future families to live in Pleasant Grove.
- 45 • With regard to Pleasant Grove’s flag lot requirements as compared to other cities, she wanted
46 to make sure that the surrounding cities’ differences from Pleasant Grove are considered.
47 Pleasant Grove is an older community with lot divisions created long ago. The City has

multiple lots that are long, deep, and skinny; which will benefit from less stringent regulations. Flag lots create an opportunity for moderate-income housing.

- With regard to property rights and values, she asserted that the amendment will take millions of dollars away from Pleasant Grove citizens. In the past, developers may have caused problems with flag lots and the change in the law will affect Pleasant Grove residents who currently own their land and hire the developers, which will be affected. These restrictions will limit their opportunity to subdivide their property. Many property owners rely on their property for retirement, as they do not have 401K plans or pensions. The Commission needs to consider how all these changes affect the residents and look for a more balanced approach.
- She lastly states that the process had been rushed and asked them to consider all the ways that these changes can affect the citizens and look for a more balanced, comprehensive approach to avoid any potential negative impact on the property owners. She wonders if the issue has been fully explored.

Commissioner Redding noted, from her experience, that the process has not been rushed.

Brooke Alexander stated that she saw this topic on the agenda and was interested to hear what was going on. She wants them to know that she can stay in Pleasant Grove because she lives on a flag lot. The cost of housing is an issue for her, and she can afford to purchase a flag lot, but not the entire piece of property. She is a tenant but has an option to purchase the one smaller flag lot.

Brian Bullock, a real estate broker who works with first-time homebuyers, states that flag lots provide an opportunity to help first-time homes buyers who often do not have the money required to purchase a full-sized lot. Flag lots are more economically feasible. A comment was made that smaller or flag lots may be less expensive but there are responsibilities and repair issues with some of the common elements of flag lots which can be complicated and expensive. The issue is trying to help people get into homes. What needs to be done is to look to see what requirements would be helpful. He wanted them to be able to use the land.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed. The Chair invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the item or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

Commissioner Phillips said that being creative and finding solutions is a great principal that he puts in practice. He commented that there does not appear to be a practical solution and a small HOA does not seem to be the solution. Chair Patten said that small HOAs are often disbanded. There was discussion about what types of requirements would be helpful. It is unknown how many lots would be potentially affected. Director Cardenas stated that he does not have a specific number of residents that would be impacted. There was discussion about the ratios of flag lots to standard lots and Director Cardenas clarified that the concept of any five-to-one ratio is misleading. He further added that they have no data to support that a flag lot creates moderate-income housing. Pleasant Grove was one of the first Cities in the State to adopt ADUs. Commissioner Fugal noted that flag lots in a subdivision typically sell in the high \$600,000s. Commissioner Phillips stated that Pleasant Grove is known to be a leader in pushing affordability incentives. Director Cardenas stated that the City has strategies in place to increase affordable housing.

Director Winterton stated that some support putting more lots in an area but he receives complaints

1 that arise out of flag lots and this proposal is based on what has been learned from resident feedback.
2 Commissioner Fugal stated that in this process of balancing all the rights involved, flag lots infringe
3 on the property rights of the surrounding property owners because of the closeness of the buildings.
4 Although they try to assist development by getting creative and expanding the roads, the Vicinity
5 Plan should be used to provide the necessary guidance.

6
7 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation
8 of APPROVAL to the City Council for the request of Pleasant Grove City for the proposed
9 amendments to City Code Section 10-15-14: Flag Lots. Commissioner Redding seconded the motion.
10 The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

11
12 Director Cardenas reported that this is a recommendation to the City Council. It will be put into final
13 form and the Commission will have an opportunity to review the document and comment before it is
14 put before the City Council for adoption. If there are comments that change the proposal, it will come
15 back before the Planning Commission.

16
17 **ITEM 5 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the July 11, 2024, Meeting.**

18
19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved to APPROVE the minutes from July 11, 2024.
20 Commissioner Fugal seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The
21 motion carried.

22
23 **ITEM 6 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the July 18, 2024, Meeting.**

24
25 **MOTION:** Commissioner Redding moved to APPROVE the minutes from July 18, 2024.
26 Commissioner Fugal seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The
27 motion carried.

28
29 **ITEM 7 – Review and Approve the Minutes from the August 8, 2024, Meeting.**

30
31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Trickler moved to APPROVE the minutes from August 8, 2024.
32 Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The
33 motion carried.

34
35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved to ADJOURN. The Commissioners unanimously voted
36 "Yes". The motion carried.

37
38 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:39 p.m.

39
40 
41 Planning Commission Chair

42
43 
44 Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant

45
46 9-12-2024
47 Date Approved

Deep lots and/or Flag lots can be a tool for a community to increase home inventory and allow individuals to develop land. Generally, but not always, deep lots are created when, over time, parcels are divided from larger, legacy parcels. Flag lots that have more than one connection to a City street pose increased challenges compared to parcels with required frontage for the zone.

For example, often deep lots require a fire hydrant on the stem. This water infrastructure is deemed private but who, officially, is responsible for repairs and replacement? There are two, or maybe even three, homes that the fire hydrant serves but there is no HOA or covenants to clarify. Furthermore, the City is responsible to protect the fire hydrant and the water quality associated with that. With one flag lot and owner, the responsibilities are clear.

Another challenge with multiple deep lots is servicing 3 different utilities that require separation. For each lot, a private water meter, pressure irrigation meter, and sewer clean out is required. With one owner, the deep lot access is available to install and maintain a sewer lateral. Can you imagine trying to coordinate a 10-foot-deep sewer lateral replacement or repair in a drive access where ownership of the property is not in the name of the lateral owner?

The City is responsible for the water service and PI service to the meter. Placing the meter in places that are hard to access or maintain places an undue burden on existing residents. When more than one lot is served, the meter locations can become overly cumbersome.

Storm water that falls on flag lots should drain to the City right-of-way and not onto adjacent neighbors. Therefore, there should already be no downward sloping deep lots. There may be large retaining walls in some locations to get the deep lot to drain outwardly. When there are multiple lots, the deepest lot must depend on the nearer lots to not deter drainage to the City R/W.

When deep lots are accessed on a stem that is 25' wide, adjusting to adjacent grades becomes challenging and burdensome to the existing lots. When lots have 80' or 100', those challenges are mitigated by one owner. When the stem is part of 2 or 3 different owners, who is responsible if a retaining wall fails or is otherwise compromised is in question.

When multiple deep lots are accessed on a stem, who is responsible for pavement preservation? Who pays for the taxes? Having one owner on a stem solves this challenge.

Sometimes, turnarounds are required on stems. Who is enforcing the parking on the turnaround? Or even the stem? One owner solves this challenge.

Limiting deep lots to one owner (thus creating a true "Flag" lot in the shape of a flag) is in the best interest of Pleasant Grove residents because the challenges associated with long-term maintenance of multiple deep lots are disproportionate to lots with frontage.