

**BRIGHAM CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
Tuesday, 6/3/2025 6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:	Roger Manning Jason Coppieters Kristina Lenderman Donny Constantineau Isaac Herbert Mandi Richens Vince Crane	Commissioner- Chair Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner
----------	---	---

EXCUSED:	Cindy McConkie Kristen Bogue Garl Waldron	Commissioner- Vice Chair Commissioner Commissioner
----------	---	--

ALSO PRESENT:	Mark Bradley Destry Larsen Dave Putnam Mike Jensen Jim Flint	City Planner Administrative Assistant Whitaker Construction Hansen & Associates Hansen & Associates
---------------	--	---

1
2 **AGENDA**

3
4 Pledge of Allegiance

5
6 Approval of Minutes

7
8 Application #25-037 / Permitted Use Permit / New Office Building and Parking Lots / 44 South
9 1050 West / Judd Hamson, Whitaker Construction

10
11 Training: Subdivision Improvement Guarantees

12
13 **REGULAR MEETING**

14
15 Regular session opened at 6:01 p.m. by Commissioner Manning and the Pledge of Allegiance
16 was recited.

17
18 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

19
20 Commissioner Lenderman moved to approve the minutes for May 20, 2025, meeting.
Commissioner Coppieters seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

21
22 **Application #25-037 / Permitted Use Permit / New Office Building and Parking
23 Lots / 44 South 1050 West / Judd Hamson, Whitaker Construction**

25 City Planner Mark Bradley introduced the project proposed by Whitaker Construction
26 Company, located at 44 South 1050 West. He explained that this application was an
27 administrative action, meaning the Planning Commission serves as the land use
28 authority for its approval. Mark noted that Judd Hamson, the company's usual
29 representative, was unable to attend, and that Dave Putnam would be presenting on
30 behalf of Whitaker Construction. Mark also introduced Mike Jensen and Jim Flint from
31 Hansen & Associates, the engineering firm handling the site's design.

32 The proposed development involves the addition of a three-story office building situated
33 west of the current Whitaker campus, near the intersection of 1100 West and 100
34 South. Mark pointed out a stormwater retention pond already on-site, which the
35 applicant intends to preserve and integrate into the project as both a functional
36 stormwater solution and an aesthetic employee amenity.

37 The site plan includes an expansion of parking facilities, organized into three main
38 areas—Parking Lots A, B, and C—to accommodate company growth and eliminate the
39 need for street parking. Parking Lot A is located west of the pond; Parking Lot B wraps
40 around the new building; Parking Lot C is an existing lot being updated to reflect
41 accurate stall counts. In addition to new parking, a pedestrian bridge is being
42 considered over the pond to provide safe and efficient access between the office
43 spaces.

44 Mark highlighted that the building height—44 feet—is well below the industrial zone's
45 75-foot maximum, and that Brigham City code does not regulate materials or color
46 choices for buildings in this zone. Design review at this level is limited to general
47 conformance, and approval would not be withheld based on subjective aesthetic
48 preferences.

49 Mark walked through comments from the staff review, emphasizing that while some
50 departmental concerns remained unresolved, these were minor and could be addressed
51 during the finalization phase. Mark explained that the city does not expect full resolution
52 of all comments prior to Planning Commission review; instead, it is standard practice to
53 approve applications conditionally, with city staff ensuring completion and compliance
54 before permits are issued.

55 A few key engineering concerns were noted by the commissioners:

- 56 • Two entrance driveways on the west parking lot are closer together than typically
57 allowed; however, the unique 70-foot right-of-way and a planned overpass project
58 may influence final decisions. The city engineer and public works director will make
59 the final call or grant a variance if needed.
- 60 • There were drainage concerns, particularly regarding ponding, curb elevations, and
61 ensuring water flow directs toward the south storm inlet. These details will need to
62 be addressed in the updated grading plan.

63 A question regarding requirement for a dry secondary irrigation line was raised based
64 on Engineering Department comments. Mark explained it is a requirement with

65 subdivision improvements but not this project. The applicants are considering
66 extending the line to their property while connecting other utilities in the street. While
67 this system is not yet active in the area, the city is planning for future buildout, and new
68 developments must be prepped accordingly.

69 Mark closed his presentation by reaffirming that staff supports the application and views
70 the new office and site improvements as a positive contribution to the area's industrial
71 zone.

72 Representing Whitaker Construction, Dave Putnam addressed the commission to
73 express the company's support for the application and appreciation for the planning
74 process. He confirmed that the development team had reviewed the staff and
75 engineering comments in full and had no objections to the listed requirements and
76 conditions.

77 The discussion then turned to the project engineers from Hanson Associates. Mike
78 Jensen, the lead design engineer, offered additional technical insight into the site's
79 grading and stormwater strategy. Jensen assured the commission that most of the
80 engineering department's comments were minor issues, involving routine refinements
81 such as curb adjustments and grading tweaks. He expressed confidence in their team's
82 ability to address all outstanding items quickly and work closely with the city to finalize
83 the plans.

84 After all questions and comments had been addressed, the commission expressed
85 general consensus in support of the project, appreciating both the applicant's
86 responsiveness to city requirements and the high standard of development
87 demonstrated throughout the site design. Variance for 60-70 foot road

88 **Motion:** Commissioner Coppieters moved that the Planning Commission, acting as the
89 Land Use Authority, approve application #25-037 subject to Staff comments, Findings of
90 Fact, and stipulations. Also noting that the spacing between the two entrances and the
91 western parking lot needs to be addressed per public work standards or a variance
92 approved, as well as addressing anything else that has been indicated that needs to be
93 addressed as part of this plan. Commissioner Herbert seconded the motion and it
94 passed unanimously.

95 **Training: Subdivision Improvement Guarantees**

96 Mark began by grounding the discussion in Utah State Code (10-9a-604.5),
97 which governs how cities may require and manage assurances that public
98 infrastructure improvements will be completed by developers. These
99 improvements typically include utilities, roadways, stormwater systems,
100 sidewalks, curbs, and landscape features that become part of the public domain
101 once construction is complete.

102 Mark explained that before any subdivision plat can be recorded—and before a
103 developer can legally sell individual lots—cities require a form of improvement
104 completion assurance. This requirement ensures that the public improvements

105 shown on the approved plans will be installed, even if unforeseen circumstances
106 (like financial issues or project abandonment) arise.

107 Mark outlined the three main types of financial guarantees accepted by Brigham
108 City:

- 109 1. Cash Deposit in Escrow
- 110 2. Cash Held by the City
- 111 3. Surety Bond

112 Mark concluded by reminding commissioners that while Planning Commission
113 members don't directly manage bonds or assurances, they play a critical role in
114 understanding how development is regulated and protected. Their knowledge of
115 these systems supports sound decision making and helps ensure that public
116 infrastructure is installed and maintained to the city's standards.

117 Commissioners thanked Mark for the thorough and practical overview, noting
118 how useful it was to better understand the financial mechanics behind new
119 development approvals.

120 Motion to adjourn

121
122 **Motion:** Commissioner Richens moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner
123 Constantineau seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

124 The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

125
126 *This certifies that the regular meeting minutes of June 3, 2025, is a true and accurate copy as
127 approved by the Planning Commission on July 1, 2025.*

128 Signed: _____

129 *Destry Larsen, Administrative Assistant*

130