



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
40
41

PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
August 13, 2015

PRESENT: Chair Drew Armstrong, Commissioners Amy Cardon, Lisa Coombs, Jennifer Baptista, Matt Nydegger, and Scott Richards

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

Vice Chair Levi Adams and Commissioners Dallin Nelson and Peter Steele were excused. Commissioner Scott Richards would be arriving late.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

- **Pledge of Allegiance:** Commissioner Baptista led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Coombs gave the opening remarks.
- **Agenda Approval:**
 - **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved to APPROVE the written agenda as public record, with Items 5 and 6 being cancelled, Item 1 being stricken, and Item 9 moved to Item 1. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.
- **Staff Reports:**
 - **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports as part of the public record. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.
- **Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from Commission Members:** Chair Armstrong declared a conflict with Item 7. He asked Commissioner Cardon to act as Chair for that Item.

1 **ITEM 1** – Public Hearing to consider a request by Pleasant Grove City for a proposed bike park
2 consisting of approximately 120 acres on property located at approximately 1450 North Murdock
3 Drive in the R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **BIG SPRINGS NEIGHBORHOOD.**
4

5 Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, presented the proposed plan regarding the Bonneville
6 Shoreline Trail Bike Park. As a brief history, Director Giles informed the Commission that
7 Pleasant Grove City obtained funding in 2012 to produce a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan,
8 and the City Council adopted that Plan in 2013. The Master Plan suggests interconnecting trails
9 between the Battle Creek, Bonneville Shoreline, and Murdock Trails. Director Giles stated that
10 Wade Springs was the recommended location for the bike park for several reasons, including its
11 proximity to the Murdock Trail, City ownership, terrain, existing facilities and space to develop
12 additional facilities in the future, and a permanent water source. High School Mountain Bike
13 Coach, Jason Cowley, approached City Council Member Cyd LeMone last September and
14 suggested additional trail development in the area of Wade Springs. The hope was to improve
15 the area and attempt to stifle the creation of illegal ATV trails. Director Giles stated that the
16 project would be completed in phases, as follows:
17

- 18 1. Phase I – includes Grove Creek Trailhead to Cedar Hills boarder Bonneville
19 Shoreline Trail and Bike Course.
20
- 21 2. Phase II – includes bike park facilities and additional parking or access points, if
22 found to be necessary.
23
- 24 3. Phase III – includes connecting the Battle Creek Trailhead to Lindon.
25
- 26 4. Phase IV – involves connecting the Battle Creek Trailhead to the Grove Creek
27 Trailhead.
28

29 Each phase will consist of obtaining approval from the governing agencies and landowners,
30 determining illegal access routes and solutions to remove them, identifying areas for reclamation,
31 designing and constructing the multi-use trail system utilizing IMBA (International Mountain
32 Biking Association) standards, and identifying and utilizing partners and volunteers. Director
33 Giles confirmed that they would only be discussing Phase I tonight.
34

35 It was determined that funding would not be included in the discussions and the Planning
36 Commission can only determine if the plan meets the intentions of the Master Plan and goals of
37 the City.
38

39 Commissioner Baptista asked if all of the private landowners had been contacted regarding the
40 proposed Plan. Director Giles stated that they had contacted all but one and one property owner
41 did not want the trails on their property but gave them access to the property for design purposes.
42 He also stated that the property owners have requested that an approved design plan be presented
43 prior to entering into an agreement with the City.
44

45 Mr. Cowley gave his address as 582 East 780 North and stated that a number of his students
46 were present at the meeting to better understand the civic process involved in creating bike trails.

1 He presented aerial photographs of the area and the proposed trail system, as well as photographs
2 of the types of trails they would be constructing. He confirmed that the trails will be thin, dirt,
3 single-track trails built using existing materials. Also, the vast majority of the work would be
4 done by hand. With regard to restricting ATVs and other motorized vehicles, they would be
5 installing gates and barriers at access points, while providing gate keys to property owners and
6 emergency services. Mr. Cowley also described his plans to revegetate the area and repair
7 damage done by motor vehicles.

8
9 In response to a question from Commissioner Coombs, Mr. Cowley expounded on the measures
10 they would take to keep ATVs off of the trail system. They would also be installing signage and
11 imposing fines. In addition, with more citizens using the trail system there will be an increase in
12 self-policing.

13
14 Mr. Cowley continued by discussing the environmental impact the trail system could have on the
15 City and presented statistics from Corner Canyon. He touched on the increase in property
16 values, the number of daily visitors, and sales tax revenue for the surrounding cities. Pleasant
17 Grove could potentially bring in \$10,000 annually.

18
19 There were concerns that arose during the process with the parking. Without any improvements,
20 they currently have 85 to 90 parking spaces to cover roughly 11 miles of trail, which he believed
21 was sufficient for everyday use. There are, however, potential areas for expansion, but those
22 options would only be pursued if the need arises. The high school plans to host one large event
23 with there being two options for additional parking. The first would be a detention basin owned
24 by the Utah County Water Users Association for temporary parking. The other was to park at
25 the school and shuttle to the event.

26
27 The second concern dealt with maintenance costs, however, this was an issue to be discussed
28 with the City Council. Mr. Crowley stated that they intend to call the bike park Valhalla Park
29 and Trails, with each trail being named after Norse mythology, which would tie into the school.

30
31 Jake Carsten, from Austin, Texas, was a professional brought in to design and build the trail
32 system according to IMBA (Inter Mountain Biking Association) standards. He informed the
33 Commission that he had worked on systems like this one across the country in 33 states. He
34 discussed the proposed design layout, grading, and trail stability. Chair Armstrong was intrigued
35 by the prospect of cleaning up the illegal ATV trails in the area.

36
37 Jake Weber gave his address as 7872 Dornock Drive in Eagle Mountain and stated that he
38 designed and helped construct the trail system in Eagle Mountain. Although they did not have
39 ATV trails to clean up, they do have two illegal paintball fields, which essentially looked like
40 junk yards. He discussed the process they are going through to clean that up and their efforts to
41 keep it clean.

42
43 Commissioner Nydegger asked Mr. Carsten about the challenges they will encounter with trail
44 construction in the area. Mr. Carsten responded that there will be very few challenges, as the soil
45 is good overall. The biggest issue they will face will be planning for water runoff and natural
46 erosion, which they have already considered in their design.

1 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing and requested that the residents refrain from
2 repeating what has already been said. He also asked that they avoid speaking about politics or
3 funding of the item.

4
5 Scott Vanuiter gave his address as 1327 North 850 East and commented that he likes the plan.
6 He wanted to know how they plan on keeping people from parking on the street in the
7 surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Vanuiter also commented on the deer hunters discharging
8 firearms close to his home. Mr. Cowley commented that the proposed park will potentially push
9 deer hunters further back, as they have to be a certain distance from the City. With regard to
10 parking, he stated that there would be more police action with the increase in people up in the
11 area.

12
13 Dick King, who resides at 1128 Mahogany Lane, expressed his concern for the possible shift in
14 liability to the City with the park going in. Chair Armstrong stated that the City would have no
15 more liability than they do with their current City parks. There are also State laws that exclude
16 the City from certain types of liability and the current insurance policy would govern the rest.

17
18 Libby Flegal gave her address as 1127 East 30 South and expressed the hope that the proposed
19 trail system will keep bikers off of the Murdock Canal, which is very dangerous.

20
21 Brad Peterson identified himself as the Director of the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation and
22 gave his address as 2730 Swasont Way in Salt Lake City. He commented that Pleasant Grove
23 City has a tremendous opportunity with this trail system and stated that it will bring the
24 community together. He encouraged the Planning Commission to support this plan.

25
26 Candace Sibley gave her address as 1385 North Murdock Drive and expressed concern with the
27 noise that the trails will create. She asked if they had planned to provide a buffer between the
28 trails and the residents on Murdock Drive. Mr. Cowley responded that the proposed trail in the
29 area will be for foot traffic only and should not create much noise compared to the ATVs that are
30 currently ridden in the area. He confirmed that they had not planned for a buffer there, but was
31 willing to consider those options. Mrs. Sibley also expressed a desire to see the Environmental
32 Impact Study that affects the water shed. Mr. Cowley stated that a study would not be done, but
33 that they would be going forward with the sustainable trail building techniques. There would
34 also be no wildlife impact or traffic studies conducted with regards to this plan, mainly for
35 economic reasons. What they intend to do would be to improve the area rather than create
36 potential hazards.

37
38 Vance Hillman gave his address as 1349 North 730 East and stated that he has resided in the area
39 for 18 years. During that time he has witnessed many issues involving water runoff. He also
40 fears there will be an impact on the wildlife with the increased number of people using the trail
41 system. Mr. Hillman was not opposed to the proposal but stated that the concerns need to be
42 addressed.

43
44 *Note: Commissioner Richards joined the meeting at 8:17 p.m.*

1 John Mitchell gave his address as 1165 Grove Creek Drive and expressed concerns regarding
2 parking at the Grove Creek Trailhead. He suggested that the design team consider using the
3 catch basin on the southeast side of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail for possible event parking.
4 Mr. Mitchell also stated that his neighborhood has a covenant not to erect fences. He feared that
5 the fences Mr. Cowley is proposing will violate that. Mr. Cowley addressed the concerns and
6 stated that the Planning Commission and City Council will have to approve any proposed
7 parking for the events and be willing to look into the suggested area. He also pointed out that
8 there were no proposed trails in the area near Mr. Mitchell's home, and fencing will not likely be
9 installed there, however, they have the budget to put access restrictions in their neighborhood if
10 the residents are willing to allow them.

11
12 Brian Greene, who resides at 1113 East Mahogany Lane, expressed his deep concern that the
13 proper process was not being followed. He stated that the residents have had very little
14 knowledge of the proposal, and were assured that everything was being taken care of.
15 Conceptually, he was not opposed to the plan, but stated that it has to follow proper procedure.
16 He expressed concern that only a small part of Wade Spring had been designated as a future park
17 in the General Plan, while this plan covers 129 acres. Mr. Greene read from the City Code
18 regarding adherence to the General Plan. His other concern pertained to the environmentally
19 sensitive lands that were included in the Trail Plan.

20
21 Mr. Cowley stated that they have agreements from the landowners that allow them to begin the
22 design process. They would like to see the approved design before entering into an agreement
23 with the City. He also confirmed that Metro has participated in the design process.

24
25 Mr. Greene addressed the sensitive lands issue again and stated that the City cannot assume that
26 this plan is risk free. According to City ordinance, if the City Engineer feels that any risk exists,
27 he can require the applicant to submit a geotechnical report. He was concerned because they
28 were told that the reports are not happening due to lack of funding.

29
30 Commissioner Nydegger stated that the plan follows the General Plan because the park will be
31 on City property, with only the trail system being on privately owned land. He stated that they
32 were going through the correct process for this plan. Mr. Cowley added that the City would not
33 be taking ownership of the land once the trails are constructed. As long as the landowner allows
34 it and there is no fee for the trail use, it adheres to State Code.

35
36 There was discussion regarding potential risk and the City Engineer's ability to request that
37 certain studies be conducted. Chair Armstrong was of the opinion that these trails will vastly
38 improve the area rather than create geological hazards. Community Development Director, Ken
39 Young, stated that the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to continue the matter
40 if they feel there are concerns that need to be addressed. They could also approve the plan with
41 the condition that the City Engineer assess the area for potential risks.

42
43 Director Giles commented that this design was carefully put together with the help of a seasoned
44 professional, Mr. Carsten. He confirmed that the design could change after the landowners and
45 Metro look at it, but those changes would be carefully made.

46

1 After deliberation, it was determined that this follows the General Plan as well as the Trails
2 Master Plan. No General Plan amendment would be necessary.

3
4 There was a discussion regarding potential environmental hazards and what Mr. Carsten had
5 done to take those into account with his designs. It was confirmed that once the City Council
6 approves the request they can start construction. Construction, however, would still be subject to
7 the property owners, which could push construction out several months. Director Giles stated
8 that they could begin construction on City property the soonest. Chair Armstrong asked what
9 would happen if the landowners opt out of the agreement in the future. Mr. Cowley stated that
10 they would adjust the trail designs around the property and go in and make the adjustments.

11
12 Mr. Peterson commented that there was some uncertainty with a trails plan like this, but this was
13 common throughout the state. He stated bluntly that this was part of the reality of trail building.

14
15 Commissioner Baptista asked what options a property owner would have for development, if
16 they chose to withdraw from the trail system. It was confirmed that subdividing and constructing
17 a home would be unreasonable, considering the grading. Planner Davies stated that the majority
18 of the property here is in the County rather than the City, which would make development even
19 more difficult.

20
21 Lavella Hopkin gave her address as 861 North 1100 East and expressed concern regarding
22 increased traffic in her neighborhood due to the Grove Creek Trailhead entrance. She
23 commented that a traffic study should be done.

24
25 Linda Monninger gave her address as 1331 North Murdock Drive and expressed concern
26 regarding neighborhood traffic.

27
28 Commissioner Baptista asked if a traffic study would be required. City Engineer, Degen Lewis,
29 described the difficulty of conducting a study for this situation.

30
31 Linda Warnick, who resides at 1345 North 730 East, asked if the trails would be open
32 continuously. Mr. Cowley responded that they would be open from dawn to dusk with
33 occasional special events.

34
35 Brett Garrett gave his address as 1532 North 500 East and commented on the water shed. He
36 wanted to be sure that this was protected properly. He also stated that there could be other
37 access points in addition to 1100 North, which would reduce the traffic. Mr. Cowley commented
38 that this would be taken into consideration for Phase II of the project. They would like to
39 monitor the trails for one year before proceeding to the next phase to determine if and where
40 adjustments need to be made.

41
42 Dani Rowen gave her address as 462 East 420 South and commented that this will be a great
43 asset to the community. She asked if anything else could logically be built here. Mr. Cowley
44 asked the residents not to dismiss something that could benefit thousands of citizens in Pleasant
45 Grove and surrounding cities.

1 Aaron Alder, who resides at 1131 East Mahogany Lane, stated that they didn't know anything
2 about the plan until recently, and there should have been more discussion. Commissioner
3 Coombs commented that there had been several meetings over the last few years, including
4 homeowner's association meetings on the proposed plan.

5
6 Brad Conder gave his address as 1141 East Mahogany Lane and stated that he was the
7 designated representative for their neighborhood. During their meetings with Mr. Cowley and
8 Council Member LeMone, they were promised answers to their concerns prior to tonight's
9 meeting. Mr. Conder emailed a list of questions and concerns to Council Member LeMone a
10 month ago and only received a response the previous night.

11
12 Mr. Young and Engineer Lewis recommended that the item be continued as there had been
13 sufficient concerns raised by the public. Director Giles stated that there was some urgency to the
14 item, as the grant gave a deadline of October 1, 2015, for submittal of any invoices to be
15 reimbursed. They could, however, request an extension. He also stated that the majority of the
16 grant funds were going to the design process.

17
18 There were no further public comments. Chair Armstrong closed the public hearing.

19
20 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission CONTINUE
21 indefinitely the request for a proposed bike park consisting of approximately 120 acres on
22 property located at approximately 1450 North Murdock Drive in the R1-20 (Single-Family
23 Residential) Zone, with a request for further information on which the Commissioners could base
24 a sound decision. Commissioner Baptista seconded the motion. The Commissioners
25 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

26
27 **ITEM 2** – Public hearing to consider the request of Brian and Carly Taylor for a Conditional
28 Use Permit for a fence exceeding six (6) feet in height on property located at approximately 924
29 East Orchard Drive in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **SCRATCH GRAVEL**
30 **NEIGHBORHOOD.**

31
32 Planner Davies presented the staff report regarding a request for a Conditional Use Permit to
33 allow the construction of a fence exceeding six feet in height on property at 924 East Orchard
34 Drive. The applicant was requesting an eight-foot fence along the eastern property line as their
35 neighbor's property is roughly four feet higher than theirs.

36
37 The applicant, Carly Taylor, gave her address as 924 East Orchard Drive and stated that they
38 were requesting the Conditional Use Permit due to the grade difference between properties. She
39 also indicated that the fence would not be long the rear of the property, but along the east side.

40
41 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
42 closed the public hearing.

43
44 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
45 request of Brian and Carly Taylor for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an eight (8) foot fence in
46 the side yard of property at 924 East Orchard Drive, in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential)

1 Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions and findings contained in the staff report.
2 Commissioner Nydegger seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
3 The motion carried.
4

5 **ITEM 3 – Public Hearing to consider a request from Jodie Kiser for a Conditional Use Permit to**
6 **operate a school of art up to eight (8) students per class on property located at approximately 364**
7 **North 1800 East in the R1-10 (Single Family Residential) Zone. GROVE CREEK**
8 **NEIGHBORHOOD.**
9

10 Planner Davies presented the staff report and gave a brief history of the Art School. City Code
11 allows up to eight students per hour with a Conditional Use Permit. He presented aerial
12 photographs of the home and identified the areas that will be used for the art classes. These
13 areas comprise just over 10% of the home. There are also five off-street parking spaces. The
14 staff report included a condition that at least four parking spaces remain available at all times
15 during the hours of operation. Other conditions included maintaining a current business permit
16 and restricting the noise produced by the business.
17

18 The applicant, Jodie Kiser, gave her home address as 35 South 1400 East and stated that the
19 property associated with the art classes is her parent’s home. She had been operating the Art
20 School out of a neighbor’s residence, but her neighbor now has a need for the space. Ms. Kiser
21 commented that her home is not available for classes as it was built in the 1920’s and the
22 basement is too shallow to allow for escape in the case of fire.
23

24 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing.
25

26 Eileen Chamberland gave her address as 369 North 1180 East and stated that she was in favor of
27 the application. She had no concerns regarding traffic, parking, or noise.
28

29 There were no further public comments. Chair Armstrong closed the public hearing.
30

31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
32 request of Jodie Kiser for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an Art School with up to eight (8)
33 students per hour on property at 364 North 1180 East, in the R1-10 (Single Family Residential)
34 Zone; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report.
35 Commissioner Baptista seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
36 The motion carried.
37

38 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing to consider a request from Celia Brasfield for a Conditional Use**
39 **Permit to operate a music school for six (6) to eight (8) students at a time on property located at**
40 **approximately 1184 East 400 South in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone. BATTLE**
41 **CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD.**
42

43 Planner Davies stated that the above item was similar to the previous one, except that this one
44 involves a Music School rather than an Art School. In this case, the applicant is requesting six to
45 eight students per hour at property located at 1184 East 400 South. She would like to use

1 roughly 10% of the home for the school. As with the previous application, there are five off-
2 street parking stalls and the same conditions would be required.

3
4 The applicant, Celia Brasfield, gave her address as 1184 East 400 South and stated that the
5 neighbors have not expressed concerns regarding noise or parking. Ms. Brasfield indicated that
6 she has not started teaching yet, so this would be a new business.

7
8 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
9 closed the public hearing.

10
11 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
12 request of Celia Brasfield for a Conditional Use Permit to allow up to eight (8) students per hour
13 on property at 1184 East 400 South, in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone; and adopt the
14 exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Coombs seconded
15 the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

16
17 **ITEM 5** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Shawn Herring and Kevin Ellis for a
18 Conditional Use Permit to allow two (2) twin homes on two lots part of a proposed flag lot
19 subdivision located at approximately 298 North 100 East in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential)
20 Zone. **LITTLE DENMARK NEIGHBORHOOD** *Cancelled.

21
22 **ITEM 6** – Public hearing to consider the request of Shawn Herring and Kevin Ellis for approval
23 of a three-lot preliminary flag lot subdivision on property located at approximately 298 North
24 100 East in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential) Zone. **LITTLE DENMARK**
25 **NEIGHBORHOOD** *Cancelled.

26
27 **ITEM 7** – Public Hearing to consider a request by Aric Jensen and Pleasant Grove City for
28 proposed text amendments to the Pleasant Grove City Code, Sections 10-11E: Downtown
29 Village Zone, 10-11E-2-1: Permitted, Conditional and Accessory Uses, And 10-11-G:
30 Downtown Mixed Use Overlay in the Downtown Village Zone, regarding historic buildings and
31 single family lots. **OLD FORT NEIGHBORHOOD.**

32
33 Commissioner Richards assumed the Chair for this agenda item.

34
35 Planner Davies presented the staff report and presented each proposed changed, including those
36 made to front setbacks on Main Street and other areas of the zone, side yard setbacks, and
37 accessory building setback requirements. He stated that the applicant is required to construct a
38 carport in the back of the property for parking. The proposed changes would allow him to be
39 closer to the property line and are pursuant to the International Building Code.

40
41 Mr. Young addressed the residential density requirements in the Downtown Village Zone and
42 stated that the ratio of units per acre did not work well in this area where the lots are very small.
43 Instead, they proposed to allow three residential units per 1,000 square feet of commercial space.
44 There was a discussion regarding this ratio and it was clarified it does not limit the size of the
45 residential units, just the number of unit that could be built.

1 Planner Davies presented additional changes regarding ownership versus rental units,
2 accessibility, garages, and parking structures.

3
4 The applicant, Aric Jensen, stated that previously he acted as Planning Director for Bountiful
5 City for 10 years and worked with other cities in a similar capacity prior to that. After leaving
6 the City, he joined the developer who had been working on Bountiful's Main Street and
7 indicated that they planned to do similar projects in Pleasant Grove. Mr. Jensen stated that the
8 proposed changes would allow them to pursue their projects.

9
10 Commissioner Richards opened the public hearing. There were no public comments.
11 Commissioner Richards closed the public hearing.

12
13 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the
14 request of Aric Jensen and Pleasant Grove City for proposed text amendments to the Pleasant
15 Grove City Code, Section 10-11E: Downtown Village Zone, 10-11E-2-1: Permitted, Conditional
16 and Accessory Uses, and 10-11G: Downtown Mixed Use Overlay in the Downtown Village
17 Zone, regarding historic buildings and single family lots, in the Downtown Village Zone and
18 Mixed Use Overlay Chapters of the Pleasant Grove City Code; and adopt the exhibits,
19 conditions, and findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Coombs seconded the
20 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

21
22 **ITEM 8** – Public Hearing to consider a request by Pleasant Grove City for proposed text
23 amendments to the Pleasant Grove City Code, Sections 10-9B-2E: Accessory Uses, 10-9B-7F:
24 Accessory Buildings, and 10-9B-11: Permissible Lot Coverage in all Single Family Residential
25 Zones, regarding accessory building standards. **CITY WIDE.**

26
27 Planner Davies presented the staff report and stated that the City had already amended the Code
28 regarding accessory buildings in the Rural Residential zones, and the proposed amendment
29 would make similar changes to accessory buildings in the R1 (Single Family Residential) zones.
30 Planner Davies presented the changes to the Code including design and architectural
31 requirements to match the main dwelling and a required conditional use permit for buildings
32 exceeding 18 feet in height. There were also setback requirements in relation to the height of the
33 accessory building.

34
35 With regard to the size of the buildings, Mr. Young commented that there was language
36 discussed but not included in the staff report. Staff felt it was appropriate to put a cap on the size
37 of accessory structures in R1 zones and limit it to 15% of the minimum lot size for the zone. He
38 asked that this be included in the motion.

39
40 Commissioner Baptista noticed an error in the staff report for item 10-9B-7F-3. In one instance
41 the percentage was changed from 15% to 12%, but that was inconsistent in the remainder of the
42 paragraph. She suggested this also be included in the motion.

43
44 Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Armstrong
45 closed the public hearing.

1 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the
2 City Council APPROVE the proposed text amendment to modify yard requirements in Section
3 10-9B-2E, 10-9B-11 of the R1 Single-Family Residential Zones Chapter of the City Code, in the
4 Pleasant Grove City Code; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff
5 report, including the following:

- 6
7 1. The correction of item 10-9B-7F-2, to be twelve (20) feet in height for both
8 heights referenced.
9
10 2. The correction of item 10-9B-7F-3, changing 12% to 15%.

11
12 Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”.
13 The motion carried.

14
15 **Review and approve the Minutes and Report of Actions from the following meetings:**

16
17 **Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for July 23, 2015.**

18
19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting
20 Minutes of July 23, 2015, with the correction of the Item 1 being changed from an eight-lot
21 subdivision to a two-lot subdivision. Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The
22 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

23
24 **MOTION:** Commissioner Baptista moved to adjourn. Commissioner Adams seconded the
25 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

26
27 The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.
28
29

30 _____
31 Planning Commission Chair

32
33
34 _____
35 Barbara Johnson, Planning Technician

36
37
38 _____
39 Date Approved