



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
December 11, 2014

PRESENT: Chair Scott Richards, Vice-Chair James Malone, Commissioners Julia Whetman, Eric Jensen and Dallin Nelson. Commissioners Levi Adams, Drew Armstrong and Amy Cardon were excused.

STAFF: Community Development Director Ken Young, City Planner Royce Davies, Planning Tech Barbara Johnson, and NAB Chairperson Libby Flegal.

The meeting started at 7:00 p.m.

Chair Richards welcomed those present to the meeting.

Commission Business:

a. Opening Remarks: Commissioner Whetman gave the opening remarks.

Chair Richards announced that this will be Commissioner Whetman's final Planning Commission Meeting. He thanked her for her service. Additionally, he recognized Gary Yeates and Lisa Coombs as Planning Commission Alternates who will assume their newly appointed roles at the start of the new year.

b. Agenda Approval:

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Malone moved to approve the written agenda as public record, noting that Item 1 has been cancelled, and Item 2 will be continued to January 8, 2015. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion, and the Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

c. Staff Reports:

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the Staff Reports as part of the public record. Commissioner Whetman seconded the motion, and the Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

1 **d. Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from commission members:** There
2 were none.

3
4 **ITEM 1** Public Hearing to consider the request of Andy Larson for a preliminary plat approval
5 for a ten lot subdivision called Palisades Plat C located at approximately 750 East 660 South in
6 the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) zone. **SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD.**
7 **Cancelled.*

8
9 **ITEM 2** Public Hearing to consider the request of Dennis Thayne for a preliminary plat approval
10 for a three lot subdivision called Nick's Place Plat B located at approximately 728 West 4000
11 North in the RR (Rural Residential) zone. **MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD.** **Continued to*
12 *January 8, 2015.*

13
14 **ITEM 3** Public Hearing to consider the request of Kim Sprague and Pleasant Grove City to
15 rezone approximately two acres from R1-20 to R1-9 on property located at approximately 900
16 East 100 North. **MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD.**

17
18 City Planner, Royce Davies, presented the staff report and displayed an aerial photo of the
19 subject property. He explained that the applicant is requesting approval to rezone approximately
20 1.3 acres of property. Additionally, Mr. Sprague is requesting that the City add approximately
21 0.7 acres with a combined total of approximately two acres to be rezoned from an R1-20 (Single
22 Family Residential) Zone to an R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone located at approximately
23 900 East 100 North. This request would allow for a subdivision to be created with the lot sizes
24 that reflect the new R1-9 zoning.

25
26 The General Plan designation of the property affected by the proposed rezone is Medium Density
27 Residential. This designation allows for R1-8, R1-9, and R1-10 (Single Family Residential)
28 zones. Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezone request. Further clarification on the
29 properties in the area was provided at the request of Commissioner Malone.

30
31 The applicant, Kim Sprague, gave his address as 190 North 850 East. Mr. Sprague explained
32 that he plans to develop a flag lot subdivision cul-de-sac in the area. He noted that access would
33 be provided off of 100 North.

34
35 Chair Richards opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Richards
36 closed the public hearing.

37
38 **MOTION:** Commissioner Whetman moved that the Commission recommend that the City
39 Council approve the request of Kim Sprague and Pleasant Grove City to rezone approximately
40 two acres located at approximately 900 East and 100 North from an R1-20 (Single Family
41 Residential) Zone to an R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the exhibits,
42 conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Jensen seconded the
43 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

1 **ITEM 4** Public Hearing to consider the request of Steven Stoddard to amend Section 10-18-2-N
2 of the City Code to allow the slope of a driveway to exceed the current maximum. **CITY**
3 **WIDE.**
4

5 Mr. Davies presented the staff report, and explained that in October 2014 the applicant, Steven
6 Stoddard, had a meeting with the Engineering and Planning Departments to discuss the
7 possibility of a driveway that would exceed the 10% slope on his property located at 467 East
8 1400 North.

9
10 Mr. Stoddard decided to apply for a text amendment to increase the allowable driveway slope.
11 The proposed ordinance amendment would increase the maximum driveway slope to 20% or
12 more. After consideration by planning staff, the proposed maximum slope was reduced to 18%.
13 The proposed ordinance amendment was reviewed by the Community Development Director and
14 City Planner. In addition to a change in the maximum slope, an additional requirement was
15 made that no parking will be allowed on any area of the driveway with a slope exceeding 10%.
16 The intent of the ordinance is to allow development options for property owners who cannot
17 reasonably install a driveway with a slope under 10%.

18
19 Mr. Davies stated that staff has determined that increasing the maximum allowable driveway
20 slope while prohibiting parkway on driveway areas exceeding 10% is in harmony with the goals
21 and intentions of the General Plan for Pleasant Grove Off Street Parking Standards. Aerial
22 photos of the subject property were presented and discussed.

23
24 The applicant, Steven Stoddard, gave his address as 1160 North Murdock Drive. He explained
25 that the slope is currently at around 14%. When he purchased the lot, Mr. Stoddard did not
26 realize that there was a maximum slope requirement of 10%. In working with the Planning and
27 Engineering Departments, it was determined that meeting this requirement would not be
28 plausible. It was noted that a variance would not apply in this situation, because it was a self-
29 imposed hardship.

30
31 Chair Richards thanked Mr. Stoddard for trying to comply with the ordinance. He then opened
32 the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Richards closed the public hearing.

33
34 Commissioner Malone remarked that enforcing a 10% slope is impractical. He did not feel that
35 allowing for an 18% slope would be unreasonable.

36
37 **MOTION:** Commissioner Jensen moved that the Commission recommend that the City Council
38 approve the proposed text amendments Section 10-18-2-N, increasing the maximum allowable
39 driveway slope to 18% while prohibiting parkway in driveway areas that exceed 10%, in the
40 Pleasant Grove City Code; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff
41 report. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion.

42
43 Community Development Director, Ken Young, suggested that additional verbiage be added to
44 the motion. The Commission discussed the proposed verbiage. Further comments were made by
45 Von Mayo who resides at 50 North 1300 East.

1 **REVISED MOTION:** Commissioner Jensen moved that the Commission recommend that the
2 City Council approve the proposed text amendments Section 10-18-2-N, increasing the
3 maximum allowable driveway slope to 18%, while prohibiting parking in the driveway areas that
4 exceed 10% in the Pleasant Grove City Code, and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings
5 contained in the staff report and as modified by the following conditions:
6

- 7 1. An additional off-street parking area be provided to meet requirements.
- 8
- 9 2. Verbiage of the amendments be reviewed by the City Attorney.

10
11 Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
12 The motion carried.
13

14 **ITEM 5** Public Hearing to consider the request of Guy Fugal to amend Section 10-13-B RAO to
15 allow 60 feet total driveway width and 60 feet between driveways on property located at
16 approximately 504 West 1100 North. **NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD.**
17

18 Chair Richards explained that the properties are located in a Residential Agricultural Overlay
19 Zone, which requires a minimum of two acres. It was noted that there are two RAO zones in the
20 City. Mr. Davies presented the staff report and displayed aerial photos of the area. He added
21 that there are very few properties left in Pleasant Grove that are residential with over two acres.
22 He stated that the proposed ordinance amendment is a specific change that will only affect the
23 properties in the overlay.
24

25 Mr. Davies explained that the proposed ordinance amendment will increase the maximum
26 combined driveway width in the RAO to 60 feet, with a required 60-foot separation between the
27 driveways. The new driveway will be approximately 25 feet wide, in addition to an existing
28 driveway that is approximately 30 feet wide. This exceeds the maximum combined driveway
29 width of 40 feet, as is outlined in Section 10-18-2-W-a of the City Code. To maintain scale in
30 driveway separation, it is proposed that the minimum driveway separation in Section 10-18-2-
31 Wd be increased from 20 feet to 60 feet.
32

33 Mr. Davies continued that because the Fugals have a larger lot size and a lengthy frontage of
34 about 296 feet, allowing a larger combined driveway width would fit the scale of this property.
35 There is one other RAO designated property in Pleasant Grove located at approximately 450
36 South 1100 East, which does not currently have street frontage. However, this property does
37 have dimensions that would allow for at least 200 feet of street frontage if it were bisected by a
38 road in the future.
39

40 It was noted that because of the large nature of these lots, the minimum required frontage in the
41 proposed text amendment would be 200 feet to allow for a combined total of 60 feet of driveway
42 width per frontage. At the suggestions of the Engineering Department, a space of 60 feet will be
43 required between driveways to match the scale of the increase in allowable combined driveway
44 width. Staff recommended approval of the proposed amendments, because they see it as a
45 benefit to this particular overlay.

1 Chair Richards asked if the ordinance amendments would be based on the RAO zone. Mr.
2 Davies answered in the affirmative. Chair Richards pointed out that on this particular property,
3 there will be delivery trucks and a need for driveways that are wider than normal. Engineer
4 Lewis stated that theoretically there could be a 60-foot driveway, however, he suggested it be
5 limited to 40 feet. Chair Richards stated that off-street parking should also be considered in this
6 situation. Commissioner Malone asked if the property owners in the other RAO zone were
7 notified of tonight's discussion. Director Young replied that their situation is much different than
8 this one, because they only have one access road and do not have any street frontage.

9
10 Brian Westover was present representing Guy and Paula Fugal. He gave his address as 132 West
11 1800 North. Mr. Westover explained that the existing driveway is overbuilt for its future
12 intended purposes. Additionally, because Mr. Fugal's mother still lives on the property, the
13 applicant does not want the current road to be the main access. Therefore, an alternative
14 entrance was planned. Mr. Westover explained that the measurements for the lowest entrance
15 are 17 feet.

16
17 Chair Richards opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Richards
18 closed the public hearing.

19
20 Chair Richards suggested that the width of the driveway be limited to the recommended 40 feet,
21 which would be a sufficient amount of space.

22
23 **MOTION:** Commissioner Malone moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the
24 City Council approve the proposed text amendments to Section 10-13-B, increasing the
25 maximum combined driveway width to 60 feet, and requiring 60 feet of separation between
26 driveways, in the Pleasant Grove City Code; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings
27 contained in the staff report and as modified by the following condition:

- 28
29 1. No single driveway can exceed 40 feet in width.

30
31 Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
32 The motion carried.

33
34 **ITEM 6** Public Hearing to consider the request of Sterling Boren for a conditional use permit to
35 construct an accessory building that is larger than permitted for the zone on property located at
36 approximately 30 West 1200 North in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential) zone. **NORTH**
37 **FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD.**

38
39 Mr. Davies presented the staff report and stated that the size of an accessory building may not
40 exceed 10% of the minimum lot area of the zone unless a waiver is approved through a
41 conditional use permit. This lot is in the R1-8 Zone, so 10% of the minimum lot size would be
42 800 square feet. The proposed building is 2,100 square feet, which is more than 10% of the
43 minimum lot size in the zone. The proposed location of the building is north of the home in the
44 rear yard. An aerial photo of the subject property was presented and the location of the proposed
45 building was identified.

1 City Code states that the accessory building must be smaller than the footprint of the home. The
2 garage footprint is not included in the primary building footprint. Without including the garage,
3 the footprint of the home is currently approximately 2,294 square feet. This exceeds the
4 footprint of the proposed accessory building.

5
6 Mr. Davies explained that the applicant indicated that he is willing to do whatever he can to
7 ensure that the accessory building matches the look of the main dwelling. Section 10-9-B7-F-4
8 of the City Code indicates that accessory structures exceeding 500 square feet shall match the
9 main dwelling architecturally with similar materials and colors. The applicant planned to build a
10 steel structure, with the intent to paint it as the same color as the home. Mr. Davies noted that
11 the primary color of the home is a tan brick. Furthermore, the building will be 17 feet in height.
12 A copy of the site plan was then presented.

13
14 The applicant, Sterling Boren, gave his address as 30 West 1200 North. Mr. Boren explained
15 that the purpose of the building is to park a 40-foot fifth wheel trailer, other recreational vehicles,
16 and a tractor. One of his neighbors commented that he would prefer to see a building on the
17 property, rather than all of the equipment scattered in the backyard. The color of the steel
18 building will match the siding on the home, and the trim will be identical to the trim on the house
19 as well.

20
21 Director Young expressed concern that a building of this size will stick out in a residential
22 neighborhood, because it will look more industrial. He explained that specific requirements are
23 in place so that there isn't a deterrence from the residential neighborhood. Director Young
24 stressed the importance of also matching materials and suggested using wainscot if brick is not
25 available. He did not recommend allowing a painted steel building and felt that the structure
26 should better match or complement the home architecturally.

27
28 Mr. Boren noted that the accessory building will be 120 feet back from the street. Additionally,
29 he explained that the dimensions will be 36 x 60 feet, and 17 feet in height. Mr. Boren stated
30 that his home will be taller than the accessory building. Commissioner Malone referred to a
31 previous comment Mr. Boren made about not being able to find brick, which is the same material
32 as his home. He asked the Commission if they should take the applicant's word on whether or
33 not the material is available. Chair Richards agreed with Director Young, that the applicant
34 should match the accessory building to the home as closely as possible. However, he asked who
35 determines if the proposed design is sufficient. Director Young answered that the Commission
36 has the authority to waive any masonry or architectural requirements as they are defined by City
37 Code.

38
39 Chair Richards opened the public hearing.

40
41 Todd Sheridan gave his address as 65 West 1200 North. He asked Mr. Boren for clarification on
42 where the building will be located. The site plan and photos of the property were reviewed and
43 the location of the proposed building was identified.

44
45 There were no further public comments. Chair Richards closed the public hearing.

1 Mr. Boren pointed out that there is an existing 10 x 20 shed on the property that will be
2 demolished when the accessory building is completed. Engineer Lewis added that the official
3 site plan also mentions the existing shed. There was continued discussion regarding the
4 appearance of the proposed building. Commissioner Malone remarked that he also has an
5 accessory building on his property, which is painted the same color as his house and it looks fine.
6 He felt that having the colors match would be sufficient. Chair Richards stated that he also did
7 not have concerns with the appearance of the proposed building, especially because of where it
8 will be located on the property.

9
10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved that the Planning Commission approve a conditional
11 use permit for Sterling Boren to construct an accessory building exceeding 10% of the minimum
12 lot size in the R1-8 Zone, and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff
13 report, and as modified by the following conditions:

- 14
15 1. A waiver of the architectural requirements as they are listed in Section 10-9-B7-F-4 of
16 the City Code.
- 17
18 2. All final planning, engineering, and Fire Department requirements must be met.

19
20 The motion died for lack of a second.

21
22 Director Young read Section 10-9-B7-F-4 of the City Code, which outlines the architectural
23 requirements of accessory buildings exceeding 500 square feet. Commissioner Malone
24 suggested the item be continued for further consideration due to the size of the proposed
25 structure. He remarked that he would prefer to see a smaller building that is less invasive to the
26 property and neighborhood. Commissioner Malone clarified that he did not have issues with the
27 building's appearance.

28
29 Commissioner Whetman stated that she would like to see an effort to match the materials that
30 will be used. She also expressed concerns with the size of the building, as well as the exterior.
31 Commissioner Nelson agreed with previous comments made by other Commissioners.
32 Commissioner Jensen supported the waiver of the architectural requirements and added that
33 property rights also need to be considered. There was continued discussion on points previously
34 made. Chair Richards remarked that he would like to see pictures of the building materials.

35
36 Chair Richards re-opened the public hearing.

37
38 Mr. Boren reported that he already purchased the building at a greatly reduced price. Director
39 Young requested that Mr. Boren submit a picture of the building purchased. Commissioner
40 Malone thanked Mr. Boren for his time and effort and stated that as a Commission, they are
41 seeking compromise. He asked if Mr. Boren would be willing to downsize the building, should
42 the item be continued to a future date. Mr. Boren answered in the affirmative.

43
44 Mr. Sheridan asked about the tractor, and commented that it would be better for the neighbors to
45 have Mr. Boren park his vehicles and store his equipment in an accessory building, rather than in

1 the middle of his backyard. He stated that this would foster a residential atmosphere more
2 successfully than what is currently in place.

3
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved that the Planning Commission approve a conditional
5 use permit for Sterling Boren to construct an accessory building exceeding 10% of the minimum
6 lot size in the R1-8 Zone, and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff
7 report, and as modified by the following conditions:

- 8
9 1. The building shall be a 30 x 52 in size, and the square footage should not exceed 1,560
10 square feet.
11
12 2. All final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements must be met.
13
14 3. The masonry requirements will be waived.
15

16 Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. Chair Richards, and
17 Commissioners Malone, Nelson and Jensen voted "Aye" and Commissioner Whetman voted
18 "Nay". The motion passed 4-to-1.

19
20 **ITEM 7** Public Hearing to consider the request of Marja Reynolds for a conditional use permit
21 to have group music lessons in her home located at 864 West 1650 North in the R1-15 (Single
22 Family Residential) zone. **NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD.**

23
24 Mr. Davies presented the staff report and explained that the applicant plans to operate a group
25 music lessons business that would allow up to eight people at one time. Section 10-21-6-A of
26 the City Code states that the number of patrons or customers coming to a home may range up to
27 six per hour. This is dependent upon approval by the Planning Commission and is based on
28 whether or not the use adversely affects the neighborhood, as well as if sufficient off-street
29 parking is provided. Photos of the property were then presented and reviewed.

30
31 Mr. Davies relayed that Ms. Reynolds, the applicant has indicated that there are two off-street
32 parking spots available in the driveway, and that four more cars can be accommodated on the
33 street in front of the home. The City Code does not establish a minimum parking requirement
34 for home occupation businesses. Therefore, staff recommended that the Commission consider
35 both parking and access as equally important to the operation of the business.

36
37 Ms. Reynolds also indicated that the length of the class tends to determine whether patrons park
38 and wait during the class or drop off and pick up. The property is also on a thru street, which
39 allows for effective drop off and pick up with fewer traffic issues than if the property were
40 located on a discontinuous street. Staff encouraged the Commission to discuss a plan with the
41 applicant regarding the provision of sufficient parking.

42
43 Mr. Davies stated that the business is under 25% of the total square footage of the home, which
44 is a requirement. Staff concluded that this type of home business does not adversely affect the
45 neighborhood. Furthermore, all other planning and zoning requirements were met.

1 The applicant, Marja Reynolds, gave her address as 864 West 1650 North and explained that her
2 business will involve group music lessons. Currently she teaches two toddler classes per week
3 (ages two to four), which are 30-minute classes where parents stay and attend with their children.
4 The other classes involve parent participation either once or twice a month. For other classes,
5 parents drop off their children and pick them up after class.

6
7 In response to a question from Commissioner Jensen, Ms. Reynolds noted that at most there are
8 between four to six cars at her home at one time. However, with the request to allow up to eight
9 students at a time, there could be a maximum of eight cars at her home at one time. Ms.
10 Reynolds mentioned that it is very common for her students to carpool to class. Furthermore,
11 many of the children already live in the neighborhood and walk to her home.

12
13 Paul Reynolds identified himself as Ms. Reynolds's husband. He stated that he is usually home
14 when students arrive for class. He had observed that on average, there are four to five vehicles
15 parked in front of the house. Ms. Reynolds added that she has statements from her neighbors,
16 including families who are on the waiting list to join her classes. She presented a copy of the
17 written statements to the Commission.

18
19 Commissioner Malone asked Ms. Reynolds to elaborate on the nature of the music classes she
20 teaches. She stated that classes are taught two days out of the week and run from 9:30 a.m. to
21 11:30 a.m., 12:45 p.m., and from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

22
23 Chair Richards opened the public hearing.

24
25 Beth Duckwitz gave her address as 829 West 1650 North, which is directly across the street from
26 Ms. Reynolds's home. Ms. Duckwitz informed the Commission that she is home all day and she
27 has never noticed more than five cars at the Reynolds home at a time. She stated that traffic has
28 not been a problem. Additionally, Ms. Duckwitz explained that she has a son in Ms. Reynolds'
29 class and he would be very disappointed if he was ever unable to attend.

30
31 Shawna Anderson gave her address as 836 West 1650 North, which is next door to the Reynolds
32 residence. Ms. Anderson voiced her support for Ms. Reynolds' business and noted that she also
33 has a six-year-old daughter who attends one of the classes. Ms. Anderson stated that the traffic
34 has not been a problem and that she doesn't mind if patrons have to park in front of their home.
35 Furthermore, most of the people driving to the Reynolds residence have small children and are
36 conscientious drivers. Ms. Anderson concluded that this business greatly benefits the
37 community.

38
39 Blair Campbell gave her address as 718 West 1650 West. She explained that while her children
40 are not in Ms. Reynolds' class, she wishes they were and mentioned that she has to drive to Orem
41 for their music classes. She echoed comments made previously about traffic and stated that this
42 has never been a problem. She voiced her support for Ms. Reynolds' proposal.

43
44 There were no further public comments. Chair Richards closed the public hearing.

1 Chair Richards explained that when the Commission reviews these types of home-based
2 businesses, they assess the issues that impact the entire neighborhood.

3
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Whetman moved that the Planning Commission approve a
5 conditional use permit for Marja Reynolds to operate a group music lessons home occupation
6 business for up to six people as allowed by City Code in the R1-15 Zone and adopt the exhibits,
7 conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Nelson seconded the
8 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

9
10 **ITEM 8** Report of findings concerning an addition to the City Code that would allow accessory
11 apartments in single-family homes.

12
13 Chair Richards informed those present that a survey has been circulated for a few months
14 regarding accessory apartments. It was reported that thus far there have been approximately 820
15 responses. Mr. Davies presented several slides outlining the survey results as well as the new
16 proposed City Code.

17
18 Mr. Davies explained that basements or garages that are rented out of single-family homes are
19 defined as accessory apartments. Accessory apartments are not defined as duplexes or triplexes
20 but look and feel like single-family homes. The new City Code was originally proposed by the
21 City Council a few months ago. Mr. Davies mentioned that nearly every other city in Utah
22 County allows accessory apartments and Pleasant Grove would like to get on board. He
23 acknowledged all of the hard work done by the Accessory Apartment Board and stated that the
24 board is comprised of neighborhood chairs within the community.

25
26 Mr. Davies reported that the survey was created on October 28, 2014. The number of complete
27 responses is 110, meaning that those individuals completed the entire survey, rather than just a
28 portion of it. The questions contained in the survey were then reviewed. Mr. Davies provided a
29 differentiation between attached versus detached accessory apartments.

30
31 The City's intent in creating the ordinance was to help residents supplement their income and this
32 will provide such an opportunity. Furthermore, the City would like to provide additional housing
33 options for people who can't otherwise afford to live Pleasant Grove. The State of Utah requires
34 the City have affordable housing as part of the General Plan and the new ordinance will help
35 meet that requirement. Mr. Davies stated that the proposed ordinance will also help with growth
36 impacts since when people are brought into accessory apartments the demand for new
37 construction is reduced. This creates more open space and more effective growth.

38
39 With regard to occupancy, the house needs to be owner occupied. There can be one person
40 alone, two related people, or up to four unrelated people living in a house. The general
41 guidelines include relation by blood, marriage, adoption, etc. Mr. Davies pointed out that
42 accessory apartments are allowed in any residential zone in the City. Apartment locations may
43 include basements, attics, garages, additions to a home, or a detached building located on the
44 property.

1 Mr. Davies stated that a separate physical address is not needed, however, a separate entrance is
2 required. Additionally, there needs to be an interior access that remains open, so that future
3 homeowners can still use these homes as a single-family residences. Parking requirements were
4 briefly reviewed and Mr. Davies noted that residents will need to be able to easily access their
5 own parking. In some cases, installation of a parking pad may be necessary.
6

7 An accessory apartment cannot exceed 50% of the total square footage of the main dwelling.
8 There can be no more than three bedrooms and there must be dedicated living areas.
9 Furthermore, there can't be more than two utility meters, and all meters need to be in the owners'
10 name. An accessory unit may not be sold separately, and it must be registered with the City for
11 legal purposes.
12

13 Jennifer Baptista gave her address as 32 North 1300 East and explained that her home meets the
14 criteria of an accessory apartment but is not used for this purpose. She noted that she shares a
15 home with her in-laws and that both names are listed on the deed. She asked if she would be
16 required to register as an accessory apartment. Chair Richards stated that this would be a
17 question for the City Attorney, but was under the impression that it would not be necessary.
18 Director Young added that the ordinance is for separate units within a home that are intended for
19 renting out to other tenants. In this situation, Ms. Baptista co-owns the dwelling. The
20 Commission then reviewed the details of how this item will be presented and reviewed next
21 month.
22

23 Von Mayo stated that he is in favor of the accessory apartments and noted that affordable
24 housing is important. However, he was of the opinion that administering an ordinance to
25 regulate accessory apartments is impossible. He explained that this type of an ordinance takes
26 away the personal agency of property owners. He felt this would backfire on the City. Mr.
27 Mayo spoke about the importance of having landlords in a community and stated that restrictive
28 ordinances will drive investors out of Pleasant Grove.
29

30 **Review and approve the Minutes and Report of Actions from the following meetings:**
31 **Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for November 13, 2014**
32

33 The minutes were reviewed and modified.
34

35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Malone moved to approve the Minutes of November 13, 2014, as
36 amended. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted
37 "Aye". The motion carried.
38

39 **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Jensen seconded the
40 motion and the Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.
41

1 The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

2

3

4

5 _____
6 Planning Commission Chair

6

7

8 _____
9 Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

9

10

11 _____
12 Date Approved

12

13
