

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

### CITY OF OREM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES May 6, 2026

The following items are discussed in these minutes:

#### CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

- **3.1** - Approval of Minutes from the 03-18-26 Planning Commission Meeting
- **3.2** - Approval of Minutes from the 04-15-26 Planning Commission Meeting
- **3.3** - Plat Amendment - The Berkshires Plat V - Located generally at 1269 S 1100 East

#### ACTION ITEMS:

- **4.1** Site Plan / Parking Exception Request - Boulder Industrial - Located generally at 1353 W 130 South

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- **5.1 Rezone - "360 W 1500 South"** - Request to rezone the property located generally at 360 W 1500 South from Public Facilities (PF) to Residential (R8) for the development of a residential subdivision. Approximately 5.45-acres.
- **5.2 Text Amendment - "Fun City"** - Request to amend the text of Article 22-11-17(B) of the Orem City Code by including Standard Land Use #7424, Recreation Centers, as a permitted use in the PD-5 Zone.
- **5.3 Text Amendment - "Mini Moustachery"** - Request to amend Appendix A of the Orem City Code by including Standard Land Use #6231, Barber Shops and Standard Land Use #6232, Tattoo and Body Piercing as permitted uses in the M2, Manufacturing Zone.
- **5.4 Right-of-Way Vacation - "Home Depot"** - Request to vacate a 0.16-acre portion of the 1000 South right-of-way terminating at 590 East.

A recording of the meeting can be viewed online at  
[https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M\\_YxX0cye\\_yi](https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M_YxX0cye_yi).

## PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION

**Place:** Orem City Council Conference Room, 56 North State Street

Chair Komen called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 4:29 PM.

**Those present:** Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson, Planning Commissioners; Quinn Mecham, City Council Liaison; LaNae Millett, Crystal Muhlestein, City Council Members; Jared Hall, Matthew Taylor, Rebecca Gourley, Grace Bjarnson, Emma Tenney, Planning and Zoning

Staff.  
DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

**Those excused:** Gary McGinn, Director of Community Development.

1. Update on Heart of Downtown Plan

This item was postponed until the next meeting, May 20th. In lieu of this, Jared Hall presented an overview of how to access the Planning Commission packet.

2. Discussion of Agenda Items

Commissioners asked questions about the items on tonight's agenda. A recording of the discussion can be viewed online at [https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M\\_YxX0cye\\_yi](https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M_YxX0cye_yi).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:21 PM.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**Place:** Orem City Council Chambers, 56 North State Street

At **5:31 p.m.** Chair Komen called the Planning Commission meeting to order. An invocation was offered by Karl Radmall.

**Those present:** Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson, Planning Commissioners; Quinn Mecham, City Council Liaison; LaNae Millett, Crystal Muhlestein, City Council Members; Jared Hall, Rebecca Gourley, Grace Bjarnson, Emma Tenney, Planning and Zoning Staff.

**Those excused:** Gary McGinn, Director of Community Development; Matthew Taylor, Planning and Zoning Staff.

### **Agenda Item 3, Consent Agenda Items**

- **3.1** - Approval of Minutes from the 03-18-26 Planning Commission Meeting
- **3.2** - Approval of Minutes from the 04-15-26 Planning Commission Meeting
- **3.3** - Plat Amendment - The Berkshires Plat V - Located generally at 1269 S 1100 East

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

**Planning Commission Action:** Commissioner Susan Madsen motioned to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Karl Radmill seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

### **Agenda Item 4, Action Items**

#### **4.1 SITE PLAN / PARKING EXCEPTION REQUEST - BOULDER INDUSTRIAL - LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT 360 W 1500 SOUTH**

Jared Hall presented this item, a request for a parking reduction for Boulder Industrial. After the staff presentation, the applicant, Landon Trost, was invited to come forward.

Commissioners asked the applicant questions regarding the use of the existing office space on the property. Commissioner Reeves asked Mr. Hall what the City Code requires in order to offer approval for a parking reduction. Mr. Hall answered that a parking study is required.

Chair Komen read aloud the relevant code, 22-15-5(E):

*“Reduction of Required Parking:* The approving authority of a site plan may grant a reduction of up to fifty percent (50%) in the required number of parking stalls for commercial, industrial, and mixed use developments, if the applicant presents a parking-traffic study prepared by a traffic engineer, and demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the expected vehicle use and parking space demand for the development will be less than that predicted by the Institute of Transportation Engineers vehicle trip generation rates or less than minimum City parking requirements because:

1. The site incorporates a mix of office or retail uses with assembly and occupancy type uses identified in Section 22-15-4(F) which reduces the need for parking spaces because of shared parking; or
2. The site is adjacent to a mass transit route and the applicant provides a transit stop and related Amenities, including a public plaza, pedestrian sitting areas, and additional landscaping (not to exceed 25% of the total area dedicated as a transit stop); and
3. It is demonstrated that the use of alternative modes of transportation, including mass transit, bicycles, and walking by customers, clients, or employees of the development will reduce the need for parking space.”

Commissioner Madsen expressed concern with offering an exception, because tenants and uses at this location might change in the future.

**Planning Commission Action:** Chair Komen motioned to continue this item until a parking study is completed. Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

## **Agenda Item 5, Public Hearings**

### **5.1 REZONE - “360 W 1500 SOUTH” - LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT 360 W 1500 SOUTH**

The City of Orem is the applicant for this item, a request to rezone the property located generally at 360 W 1500 South from Public Facilities (PF) to Residential (R8) for the development of a residential subdivision. Jared Hall spoke on behalf of the City to present this item. He noted that the General Plan classifies this area as low-density residential, and that it is surrounded by residential zones.

Commissioners asked questions about the property, including the grade, before Chair Komen opened the meeting to public comment. The comments were as follows:

Danelly Ballard is a resident nearby. She stated that she purchased her home because of the area’s greenery and noted that the property is already being used informally as a park by neighborhood residents. She states that she was able to collect 23 signatures from one hour of walking around her neighborhood, all supporting the preservation of the property as park space. She also expressed concern about the loss of green space in Utah.

Jeff Mon, a neighbor, stated that if the property is already functioning as a park, it should remain that way.

Steve Salmon said he has lived in the area for 33 years and asked if it would still be possible for him to develop the vacant lot he owns in the area if the land use designation changed.

Nicole VanOrmen, who owns property in the Sunflower Dunes subdivision, discussed issues with not having sewer hookup availability. She expressed that if the parcel is developed, they would like sewer and water hookups to be provided.

Jay Liechty owns property in the nearby Acadia Heights subdivision. He said he does not want the site developed, but would like sewer lines extended through the area. He asked whether the City would install sewer infrastructure if the property were used as a park. He expressed that although he would prefer trees and a park, the neighborhood children would likely enjoy more neighbors to play with.

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

Tana Oskana brought up that she bought her property on a dead end intentionally, and putting a through street there would negatively impact the neighborhood and children in the area.

Dawn Mon said her first preference would be a park, and her second preference would be the subdivision with the through street option. She expressed concern about visibility and safety issues with the existing street layout, and stated traffic concerns should be addressed.

Chuck McCartney said they purchased their home because the street was a dead end, and noted many children play in the area. He stated his preferred option would be a cul-de-sac and believed a through street would create safety concerns.

The following are comments sent in to the Planning and Zoning department about this item, and were read into the public hearing by staff:

David Terry, via phone call:

He is 100% against the cul-de-sac. He wants the road to go through. He lives at 1640 S and all the neighbors agree about the through road because currently 1640 S is a major thoroughfare for people coming down the hill and getting on the freeway. The road takes all the traffic to get on to the freeway. Cars coming down the hill are going way too fast. The day before he called a kid who had a ball go out into the road and a car came down the hill too fast and hit the ball and almost hit the child. People race on the road. Traffic needs to be slowed down there. Putting in a through street will release a little of the pressure on 1640 S.

Amy Liechty, via email:

“Hello. I live at 345 W 1600 S. My property borders the city property that used to be owned by UDOT and that I hear the city is now wanting to rezone in order to build homes. I am opposed to the rezone.

Before we purchased our home, we met with the city and we were assured that the city would not be building homes on the property. The city planner we spoke with told us the city could not do anything with the property other than make it into a park. That assurance is one of the main reasons we chose to purchase the home.

There are many people from the surrounding apartments and neighborhoods who use that property as a park. In the summertime, you can see lots of people walking their dogs and riding dirt bikes on the hills. It is already being enjoyed as a city park of sorts.

My foremost concern for the development of the property; however, is a safety issue. We live on a street that has been forgotten by the city. In the wintertime, the city doesn't plow our street. Every week we have to hike our garbage can past two homes up to 1600 south because the garbage service won't come down our street. There is only one way into our home and one way out. Unless, of course, we go through the city property. If the city developed the city property that borders our home, we would

be trapped. If our neighbors homes ever caught fire and we needed to evacuate, we would have no way out.

Please leave the city property undeveloped. Do not rezone it for homes.

Thank you,  
Amy Liechty”

Chair Komen closed the public comment section of the meeting.

In response to questions asked during the public comment, Mr. Hall stated staff was uncertain whether access through the area would continue if it stayed as a park. He also stated that it is unlikely that a sewer line would be installed without property sales to recoup the costs. In response to why a park is not being pursued, he said that the Parks Department had not found it viable. However, a special use park, such as a bike park, might be possible.

Chair Komen invited Jay Liechty and Nicole VanOrmen back to the podium to provide additional context on roads in the area, in response to questions raised by Commission members.

The public comment portion was briefly reopened.

Steve Solomon referenced a previous neighborhood meeting discussion involving the possibility of a private lane if sewer infrastructure were extended by the City.

Nicole VanOrmen provided further clarification regarding roads and private lanes.

Jay Liechty also provided further clarification regarding roads and private lanes.

Chair Komen closed the public comment again.

Chair Komen asked at what point a prescriptive easement is created through use of the dirt lane. Mr. Hall noted that legal staff was not present, and referred the question to the City Attorney’s office.

Commissioner Radmall clarified that this meeting was only for determining if a zoning change is appropriate, not approving plans for a subdivision.

Mr. Hall noted that rezoning the property as an R8 does not preclude the possibility of developing it as a park, since parks are a permitted use in the R8 zone. Commissioner Hawkins asked what problems the city is solving by requesting a zoning change, and Mr. Hall responded that the proposal could help address sewer access issues associated with Sunflower Dunes while also creating additional single-family housing opportunities. He stated there are challenges that may discourage private developers but that the City may be better positioned to address.

DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

Commissioner Runolfson noted the divided opinions among neighborhood residents and the responsibility of the Planning Commission to make long-term decisions for the community.

Commissioner Madsen stated that extending water and sewer infrastructure would be costly and that residential development may be necessary to offset infrastructure expenses. She also noted the proposal could provide additional single-family housing opportunities.

Commissioner Runolfson stated interest in exploring a hybrid solution involving completion of Sunflower Dunes and a specialized park amenity, such as a bike park.

Additional discussion occurred regarding Public Facilities (PF) zoning and whether that designation could provide alternative opportunities while maintaining flexibility for future park development.

**Planning Commission Action:** Commissioner Darren Hawkins moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the request to rezone the property located generally at 360 W 1500 South from Public Facilities (PF) to Residential (R8) for the development of a residential subdivision. Commissioner Radmill seconded the motion.

Before voting, Commissioner Runolfson made a motion to reconsider that motion. Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Britton Runolfson

NO: Darren Hawkins, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves

ABSTAIN: None

The motion passed.

Commissioner Runolfson moved to continue the request to the June 3rd Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: Karl Radmall

ABSTAIN: None

The motion passed.

**5.2 TEXT AMENDMENT - "FUN CITY" - AMENDING ARTICLE 22-11-17(B) OF THE OREM CITY CODE**

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

Rebecca Gourley presented this item, a request to amend the text of Article 22-11-17(B) of the Orem City Code by including Standard Land Use #7424, Recreation Centers, as a permitted use in the PD-5 Zone.

Commissioner Reeves asked whether a formal definition for a “recreation center” exists within the City Code. Rebecca stated there is currently no formal definition.

Chair Komen asked where the SLU codes originated, and Mr. Hall provided background information regarding the codes and their use.

Kenny Styles, representing the property owner, addressed the Commission. He stated that large commercial spaces such as the subject property can be difficult to lease and noted that neighboring businesses support the proposed use.

Li Shan, representing Fun City, described the proposed recreation facility, which would include trampolines, foam pits, climbing walls, and ninja-style obstacle courses.

Chair Komen opened the meeting for public comment.

Steve Usdan stated that the market has changed and expressed support for the proposed use. He stated there is a community need for this type of recreation facility and noted that similar businesses have performed well in other locations.

Marion Baxter expressed support for the proposal, stating the use would be a good fit for the area. She thanked the Commission for the opportunity to provide positive feedback and stated Utah Valley would benefit from the draw this would create.

The following comment from Orem Family Center, LLC was read into the record by staff:

“Dear Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners:

As the owners of the property at the Family Center at Orem on East University Parkway, we support the Applicant’s (Fun City) request for the text amendment to allow for the proposed recreational use at the 40,035 square foot tenant space located at 172 East University Parkway.

We own and manage more than 2,400,000 square feet of commercial property throughout Utah, including approximately 525,000 square feet in Orem between Family Center at Orem, University Crossing and Orem Center State Plaza. Over the last few decades, the nature of brick-and-mortar commerce has evolved significantly—the market for traditional retail uses has changed, with customers seeking a variety of experiential and service uses at both neighborhood and regional shopping centers. This has provided challenges for communities who desire these new uses—such as Fun City, an indoor recreation and family entertainment facility—which are, unfortunately, not contemplated or permitted by the current Zoning Codes.

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

Here, the proposed Fun City facility would create one new tenant space out of two existing ones (formerly occupied by Lumber Liquidators and Joann's each of which filed for bankruptcy and closed). Specifically, Fun City would provide a year-round, indoor trampoline park containing foam pits, climbing elements, and obstacle/ninja courses to serve both children and adults. This kind of new use offers a healthy environment for active, physical recreation, and delivers a community-oriented alternative to pervasive social media engagement. Moreover, this use is viewed by the shopping center's tenants (including Michael's) as complementary to their businesses, and will enhance the center's overall desirability.

Additionally, Fun City will have a direct impact on the local economy, as it anticipates employing 30–50 people and generating approximately \$2 million in annual revenue. We have seen similar facilities succeed in nearby communities in other retail shopping centers we own, such as the Van Winkle Shopping Center in Murray, Utah (Fun City), the former Dan's Market at 33rd and 23rd in Millcreek, Utah (Slick City), and Fort Union Shopping Center in Midvale, Utah (Urban Air). Permitting a family-oriented business to replace a vacant, and large, commercial space advances the City's economic goals and will fulfill a market demand.

We urge the Commission to approve the Applicant's reasonable request for the text amendment, which will not only meet an identified need in the current market, but also provide economic benefits to the community. Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to our continued investment in the City of Orem.

Sincerely,

Steven Usdan  
Authorized Representative  
Orem Family Center, LLC  
an affiliate of Community Development Real Estate, LLC"

The public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Runolfson asked Mr. Styles questions regarding management and operation of the facility. Chair Komen also commented that additional recreation opportunities of this type would be beneficial in Orem.

## DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

**Planning Commission Action:** Commissioner Radmall made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the request to amend the text of Article 22-11-17(B) of the Orem

City Code by including Standard Land Use #7424, Recreation Centers, as a permitted use in the PD-5 Zone. Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

### **5.3 TEXT AMENDMENT - “MINI MOUSTACHERY” - AMENDING APPENDIX A OF THE OREM CITY CODE**

Rebecca Gourley presented this item, a request to amend Appendix A of the Orem City Code by including Standard Land Use #6231, Barber Shops and Standard Land Use #6232, Tattoo and Body Piercing as permitted uses in the M2, Manufacturing Zone.

Commissioner Runolfson asked whether the City could adequately regulate concerns associated with the proposed use and expressed concern that allowing the use within the M2 zone could lower operational standards for individual operators. Staff noted that operators would be required to provide appropriate certifications and comply with building inspections in order to obtain a business license.

Commissioner Radmall noted that this use is already permitted in the C2 zone, which tends to be located closer to the center of town, and this has not created significant issues. Locations within the M2 zone would generally be even farther removed from residential areas. Commissioner Runolfson commented that M2 areas are less developed and may have less community oversight compared to other commercial areas.

The applicant, Ethan Taylor, was invited to come forward. He stated he has owned the building for approximately 30 years. He stated the business would generate tax revenue for Orem and serve employees working in the surrounding industrial area who may wish to obtain grooming services during work breaks. He stated the business would provide employment opportunities and noted that hairline tattoo services are increasingly common.

Commissioners asked how much of the business activity would involve tattoo services. The applicant responded that tattoo-related services would be incidental to the primary use and that the business would focus primarily on men’s grooming services.

Chair Komen opened up the meeting for public comment.

### **DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026**

Marion Baxter spoke in support of the application. She stated that permanent makeup services for both men and women fill an important need and opportunity in Orem and stated the proposed location was appropriate.

Chair Komen closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hawkins stated tattoo-related uses are already permitted in many locations and noted that existing regulations are in place to reduce potential criminal activity. He stated the proposal did not represent a major expansion of tattoo-related uses and appeared to be an appropriate and needed use for the area. Commissioner Madsen mentioned the area is already substantially built out and expressed confidence that property owners would not lease space to operators they viewed as problematic. She stated she was not concerned about an overconcentration of tattoo businesses and preferred the use in the proposed location over other alternatives. Commissioner Reeves commented that allowing the use within the M2 zone was unlikely to result in a significant increase in tattoo businesses due to the limited amount of remaining developable property in the zone. Commissioner Radmall pointed out that tattoo services would not function as a standalone use and would instead remain accessory to the primary grooming business.

**Planning Commission Action:** Commissioner Madsen made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed amendments to Appendix A of the Orem City Code by including Standard Land Use #6231, Barber Shops and Standard Land Use #6232, Tattoo and Body Piercing as permitted uses in the M2, Manufacturing Zone. Commissioner Runolfson seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

#### **5.4 RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION - "HOME DEPOT" - LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1000 S 590 EAST**

Jared Hall presented this item, a request to vacate a 0.16-acre portion of the 1000 South right-of-way terminating at 590 East.

Commissioners asked for more information on right-of-way vacations.

Chair Komen opened the meeting to public comment. As no members of the public were present to speak, the public hearing was closed.

DRAFT MINUTES FOR MAY 6, 2026

**Planning Commission Action:** Commissioner Hawkins made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the request to vacate a 0.16-acre portion of the 1000 South right-of-way terminating at 590 East. Commissioner Runolfson seconded the motion.

YES: Madeline Komen, Darren Hawkins, Micah Ladle, Susan Madsen, Karl Radmall, Jeff Reeves, Britton Runolfson

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

**Adjournment:**

Chair Komen asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Runolfson motioned to adjourn, Commissioner Madsen seconded. All present Commissioners voted yes.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at **8:06 PM**.

A recording of the meeting can be viewed online at

[https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M\\_YxX0cye\\_yi](https://www.youtube.com/live/LpJTHo0ApCk?si=oCG3M_YxX0cye_yi).

Reviewed and Approved: DRAFT